OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FIRST SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

---

5 EDWARD VII., 1905

VOL. LXIX

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE ELEVENTH DAY OF JANUARY TO THE SECOND DAY OF MARCH, INCLUSIVE

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY S. E. DAWSON, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1905

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR WILFRID LAURIER

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

AT THE OPENING OF THE

FIRST SESSION OF THE TENTH PARLIAMENT

1905

CABINET FORMED JULY 13, 1896

President of the Privy Council (Premier)	Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, P. C., G. C. M. G. K.C., D.C.L. (*Oxon.*)
Minister of Trade and Commerce	Rt. Hon. Sir Richard J. Cartwright, G.C.M.G.
Secretary of State	Hon. R. W. Scott, K.C., LL.D.
Minister of Militia and Defence	Hon. Sir F. W. Borden, K.C.M.G., B.A., M.D.
Postmaster General	Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock, K.C.M.G., K C., M.A., LL.D.
Minister of Agriculture	Hon. Sydney Fisher, B.A.
Minister of Finance	Hon. W. S. Fielding.
Minister of Customs	Hon. Wm. Paterson.
Minister of Justice	Hon. C. Fitzpatrick, B.A., K.C.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries	Hon. Raymond Préfontaine.
Minister of Railways and Canals	Hon. H. R. Emmerson.
Minister of Inland Revenue	Hon. Louis Philippe Brodeur.
Minister of Public Works	Hon. C. S. Hyman.
Minister of the Interior	Hon. F. Oliver.
Without Portfolio	Hon. W. Templeman.
(Not in the Cabinet.)	
Solicitor General	Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, K.C.

CHANGES.

The Hon. Clifford Sifton is succeeded as Minister of the Interior by Hon. F. Oliver.
The Hon. James Sutherland is succeeded as Minister of Public Works by Hon. C. S. Hyman.

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

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Hon. R. F. Sutherland	Speaker.
Mr. Charles Marcil, M.P	Deputy Speaker.
Mr. T. B. Flint	Clerk of the House.
Mr. J. B. R. Laplante	Assistant to the Clerk.
Lieut.-Col. Henry Robert Smith	Sergeant-at-Arms.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS.

Albert Horton ..... Chief Reporter.

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

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

FIRST SESSION, TENTH PARLIAMENT

1905

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

BARKER, SAMUEL—Hamilton, East.
BARR, JOHN—Dufferin.
BEAUPARLANT, AIMÉ M.—St. Hyacinthe.
BÉLAND, HENRI SÉVÉRIN—Beauce.
BELCOURT, HON. NAPOLÉON ANTOINE—Ottawa.
BENNETT, WILLIAM H.—Simcoe, E.R.
BERGERON, JOSEPH G. H.—Beauharnois.
BICKERDIKE, ROBERT—Montreal, St. Lawrence.
BLACK, JUDSON BURPEE—Hants.
BLAIN, RICHARD—Peel.
BLAND, LEONARD T.—Bruce, N.R.
BOLE, DAVID WESLEY—Winnipeg.
BORDEN, HON. SIR FREDERICK W., K.C.M.G.—King's, N.S.
BORDEN, R. L.—Carleton, O.
BOURASSA, HENRI—Labelle.
BOURBONNAIS, AUGUSTIN—Soulanges.
BOYCE, ARTHUR CYRIL—Algoma West.
BOYER, GUSTAVE—Vaudreuil.
BRABAZON, Gerald H.—Pontiac.
BRISTOL, EDMUND—Toronto, Centre.
BRODER, ANDREW—Dundas.
BRODEUR, HON. LOUIS PHILIPPE—Rouville.
BROWN, JAMES P.—Chateauguay.
BRUNEAU, ARTHUR AIMÉ—Richelieu.
BUREAU, JACQUES—Three Rivers and St. Maurice.
BURROWS, THEODORE ARTHUR—Dauphin.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INGRAM, ANDREW B.—Elgin, E.R.

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

KEMP, ALBERT E.—Toronto, East.
KENNEDY, JAMES BUCKHAM—New Westminster.

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

MACDONALD, EDWARD M—Pictou.
MACDONELL, ANGUS CLAUDE—Toronto, South.
MACLAREN, ALEXANDER F.—Perth, N.R.
MACLEAN, ALEXANDER K.—Lunenburg.
MACLEAN, WILLIAM F.—York, Ont., S.R.
MACPHERSON, ROBERT GEORGE—Vancouver City.
MCCARTHY, LEIGHTON GOLDIE—Simcoe, N.R.
MCCARTHY, MAITLAND STEWART—Calgary.
MCCOLL, JOHN B.—Northumberland, Ont., W.R.
MCCOOL, CHARLES ARTHUR—Nipissing.
MCINTYRE, GILBERT H.—Perth, S.R.
MCISAAC, COLIN F.—Antigonish.
MCKENZIE, DANIEL D.—Cape Breton North & Vict.
MCKENZIE, PETER H.—Bruce, S. R.
MCLEAN, ANGUS A.—Queen's, P.E.I.
MCLENNAN, ANGUS—Inverness.
MARCIL, CHARLES—Bonaventure.
MARCILE, JOSEPH EDMOND—Bagot.
MARTIN, ALEXANDER—Queen's, P.E.I.
MARTIN, THOMAS—Wellington, N.R.
MAYRAND, HORMISDAS—Maskinongé.
MEIGS, DANIEL BISHOP—Missisquoi.
MILLER, HENRY HORTON—Grey, S.R.
MONK, FREDERICK D.—Jacques Cartier.
MORIN, JEAN BAPTISTE—Dorchester.
MULOCK, HON. SIR WILLIAM, K. C. M. G.—York, Ont., N.R.

NORTHRUP, WILLIAM BARTON—Hastings, E.R

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

PAQUET, EUGÈNE—L'Islet.
PARMELEE, CHARLES H.—Shefford.
PATERSON, HON. WILLIAM—Brant.
PARENT, GEORGE—Montmorency.
PERLEY, GEORGE H.—Argenteuil.
PICHÉ, CAMILLE—Montreal, St. Mary's.
PICKUP, SAMUEL W. W.—Annapolis.
PORTER, EDWARD GUSS—Hastings, W.R.
POWER, WILLIAM—Quebec, West.
PRÉFONTAINE, HON. J. RAYMOND—Maisonneuve.
PRINGLE, ROBERT A.—Stormont.
PROULX, EDMOND—Prescott.

RATZ, VALENTINE—Middlesex, N.R.
REID, JAMES—Restigouche.
REID, JOHN D.—Grenville.
RILEY, GEORGE—Victoria City, B.C.
RIVET, LOUIS ALFRED ADHÉMAR—Hochelaga.
ROCHE, WILLIAM—Halifax.
ROCHE, WILLIAM J.—Marquette.
ROSS, DUNCAN—Yale-Cariboo.
ROSS, JEAN AUGUSTE—Rimouski.
ROUSSEAU, JEFFREY ALEXANDRE—Champlain.

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

TALBOT, ONÉSIPHORE ERNEST—Bellechasse.
TALBOT, PETER—Strathcona.
TAYLOR, GEORGE—Leeds.
TELFORD, WILLIAM PATTESON—Grey, N.R.
THOMPSON, ALFRED—Yukon Territory.
TISDALE, HON. DAVID—Norfolk.
TOBIN, EDMUND WILLIAM—Richmond and Wolfe.
TURGEON, ONÉSIPHORE—Gloucester.
TURRIFF, JOHN G.—Assiniboia, East.

WALSH, ROBERT NELSON—Huntingdon.
WARD, HENRY ALFRED—Durham.
WATSON, ROBERT JAMES—Parry Sound.
WHITE, HON. PETER, Renfrew. N.R.
WILMOT, ROBERT D.—Sunbury and Queen's.
WILSON, NORMAN FRANK—Russell.
WILSON, URIAH--Lennox and Addington.
WORTHINGTON, ARTHUR NORREYS—Sherbrooke.
WRIGHT, AARON ABEL—Renfrew, S.R.
WRIGHT, WILLIAM--Muskoka.

ZIMMERMAN, ADAM—Hamilton, West.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

FIRST SESSION, TENTH PARLIAMENT

1905

ALBERTA—John Herron.
ALGOMA, EAST—Albert Edward Dyment.
ALGOMA, WEST—Arthur Cyril Boyce.
ANNAPOLIS—Samuel W. W. Pickup.
ANTIGONISH—Colin F. McIsaac.
ARGENTEUIL—George H. Perley.
ASSINIBOIA, EAST—John G Turriff.
ASSINIBOIA, WEST—Walter Scott.

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

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

DAUPHIN—Theodore Arthur Burrows.
DIGBY—Albert J. S. Copp.
DORCHESTER—Jean Baptiste Morin.
DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Louis Lavergne.
DUFFERIN—John Barr.

DUNDAS—Andrew Broder.
DURHAM—Henry Alfred Ward.

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

FRONTENAC—Melzar Avery.

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

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

INVERNESS—Angus McLennan.

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

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

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

LABELLE—Henri Bourassa.
LAMBTON, E. RIDING—Joseph E. Armstrong.
LAMBTON, W. RIDING—Thomas George Johnston.
LANARK, N. RIDING—Thomas Boyd Caldwell.
LANARK, S. RIDING—Hon. John Graham Haggart.
LAPRAIRIE-NAPIERVILLE—Roch Lanctôt.
L'ASSOMPTION—R. Charlemagne Laurier.
LAVAL—J. E. Emile Leonard.
LEEDS—George Taylor.
LENNOX AND ADDINGTON—Uriah Wilson.
LÉVIS—L. A. Carrier.
LINCOLN—Edward A. Lancaster.
LISGAR—Thomas Greenway.
L'ISLET—Eugène Paquet.
LONDON—Hon. Charles S. Hyman.
LOTBINIÈRE—Edmond Fortier.
LUNENBURG—Alexander Kenneth Maclean.

MACDONALD—William D. Staples.
MACKENZIE—E. L. Cash.
MAISONNEUVE—Hon. J. Raymond Préfontaine.
MARQUETTE—William J. Roche.
MASKINONGÉ—Hormisdas Mayrand.
MEGANTIC—François Théodore Savoie.
MIDDLESEX, E. RIDING—Peter Elson.
MIDDLESEX, N. RIDING—Valentine Ratz.
MIDDLESEX, W. RIDING—William Samuel Calvert.
MISSISQUOI—Daniel B. Meigs.
MONTCALM—François Octave Dugas.
MONTMAGNY—Armand Lavergne.
MONTMORENCY—George Parent.
MONTREAL, ST. ANNE—Daniel Gallery.
MONTREAL, ST. ANTOINE—Herbert B. Ames.
MONTREAL, ST. JAMES—Honoré Gervais.
MONTREAL, ST. LAWRENCE—Robert Bickerdike.
MONTREAL, St. MARY—Camille Piché.
MUSKOKA—William Wright.

Nanaimo—Ralph Smith.
NEW WESTMINSTER—James B. Kennedy.
NICOLET—Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux.
NIPISSING—Charles Arthur McCool.
NORFOLK—Hon. David Tisdale.
NORTHUMBERLAND (N.B.)—William Stewart Loggie.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) E.R.—Edward Cochrane.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) W.R.—John B. McColl.

ONTARIO, N. RIDING—George D. Grant.
ONTARIO, S. RIDING—Peter Christie.
OTTAWA CITY { Hon. Napoléon Antoine Belcourt. / Robert Stewart.
OXFORD, N. RIDING—George Smith.
OXFORD, S. RIDING—Malcolm S. Schell.

PARRY SOUND—Robert James Watson.
PEEL—Richard Blain.
PERTH, N. RIDING—Alexander Ferguson MacLaren.
PERTH, S. RIDING—Gilbert H. McIntyre.
PETERBOROUGH, E. RIDING—John Finlay.
PETERBOROUGH, W. RIDING—R. R. Hall.
PICTOU—Edward M. Macdonald.
PONTIAC—Gerald H. Brabazon.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE—John Crawford.
PORTNEUF—Michel Siméon Delisle.
PRESCOTT—Edmond Proulx.
PRINCE, (P.E.I.)—Alfred A. Lefurgey.
PRINCE EDWARD—George Oscar Alcorn.
PROVENCHER—Joseph Ernest Cyr.

QU'APPELLE—Richard Stuart Lake.
QUEBEC, CENTRE—Arthur Lachance.
QUEBEC, EAST—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G.
QUEBEC, WEST—William Power.
QUEBEC (County)—Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick.
QUEEN'S, (P.E.I.)— { Alexander Martin. / Angus A. McLean.

RENFREW, N. RIDING—Hon. Peter White.
RENFREW, S. RIDING—Aaron Abel Wright.
RESTIGOUCHE—James Reid.
RICHELIEU—Arthur Aimé Bruneau.
RICHMOND (N.S.)—Duncan Finlayson.
RICHMOND AND WOLFE (Q.)—Edmund William Tobin.
RIMOUSKI—Jean Auguste Ross.
ROUVILLE—Hon. Louis Philippe Brodeur.
RUSSELL—Norman Frank Wilson.

ST. HYACINTHE—Aimé M. Beauparlant.
ST. JOHN (N.B.), City—John Waterhouse Daniel.
ST. JOHN (N.B.), City & Co.—Alfred Augustus Stockton.
ST. JOHN AND IBERVILLE—L. Philippe Demers.
SASKATCHEWAN—John Henderson Lamont.
SELKIRK—Samuel Jacob Jackson.
SHEFFORD—Charles H. Parmelee.
SHELBURNE AND QUEEN'S, N.S.—Hon. William Stevens Fielding.
SHERBROOKE—Arthur Norreys Worthington.
SIMCOE, E. RIDING—William Henry Bennett.
SIMCOE, N. RIDING—Leighton Goldie McCarthy.
SIMCOE, S. RIDING—Haughton Lennox.
SOULANGES—Augustin Bourbonnais.
SOURIS—Frederick Laurence Schaffner.
STANSTEAD—Henry Lovell.
STORMONT—Robert A. Pringle.
STRATHCONA—Peter Talbot.
SUNBURY AND QUEEN'S (N. B.)—Robert D. Wilmot.

TEMISCOUATA—Charles Arthur Gauvreau.
TERREBONNE—Samuel Desjardins.
THREE RIVERS AND ST. MAURICE—Jacques Bureau.
THUNDER BAY AND RAINY RIVER—James Conmee.
TORONTO, CENTRE— { Edmund Bristol. / E. F. Clarke.
TORONTO, EAST—Albert E. Kemp.
TORONTO, NORTH—Hon. George Eulas Foster.
TORONTO, SOUTH—Angus Claude Macdonell.
TORONTO, WEST—Edmund Boyd Osler.
TWO MOUNTAINS—Joseph Arthur C. Ethier.

VANCOUVER (City)—Robert George Macpherson.
VAUDREUIL—Gustave Boyer.

VICTORIA (B.C.)—George Riley.
VICTORIA CITY (N.B.)—Hon. John Costigan.
VICTORIA AND HALIBURTON, (O.)—Samuel Hughes.

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

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

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

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

House of Commons Debates

FIRST SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, January 11, 1905.

To-day being the first day of the meeting of the first session of the Tenth Parliament for the despatch of business.—Thomas Barnard Flint, Esquire, LL.D., D.C.L., Clerk of the House of Commons, and Lieut.-Col. Henry Robert Smith, Serjeant-at-Arms, commissioners appointed by Dedimus Potestatem for administering the oath to members of the House of Commons, all attending and according to their duty, Henri G. LaMothe, Esquire, Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, delivered to the said Thomas Barnard Flint, Esquire, a Roll containing a list of the names of such members as had been returned to serve in this parliament.

The aforesaid commissioners did administer the oath to the members who were present, which being done, and the members having subscribed the roll containing the oath, they repaired to their seats.

The Clerk of the House said: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following communication from the Secretary of His Excellency the Governor General:

Ottawa, December 28, 1904.

Sir,—I am directed by His Excellency the Governor General to inform you that the Chief Justice of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor, will proceed to the Senate Chamber to open the session of the Dominion parliament on Wednesday, the 11th proximo at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

The Clerk of the House of Commons.

A message was delivered by Ernest John Chambers, Esquire, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate, when the Speaker of the Senate said:

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I have it in command to let you know that His Excellency the Governor General does not see fit to declare the causes of his summoning the present parliament of Canada until the Speaker of the House of Commons shall have been chosen according to law; but, to-morrow, at the hour of three o'clock in the afternoon, His Excellency will declare the causes of his calling this parliament.

And the House being returned.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Flint, the first duty which devolves on this House at the opening of this new parliament is to at once proceed to the election of a Speaker. I need hardly remark that the position of Speaker of this House, under our parliamentary system of government, is second to none, is, in fact, equal to the highest in the gift of either the Crown or the people. In the first place, the Speaker of the House of Commons is the channel of communication between the House and the Crown; he is the mouthpiece of this assembly; and, in the olden time, in the earlier parts of the history of the motherland, when the relations of the Crown and parliament were not as clear and as well defined as they are at the present moment, this part of the duties of the Speaker was of paramount importance. But we live in calmer and happier days, and the duties which the Speaker performs in this line are, we may say, only perfunctory. But, on the other hand, the duties which the Speaker has to perform as presiding officer of this House have increased importance. These duties require special qualifications which it is not always easy to find combined in the same person. In the first place, it is expected of him who fills this chair that he shall be of a mind at once judicial and fair, that both sides of the House and all parties may expect at his hand a uniform and fair treatment. It is expected of him also that he shall be well versed in parliamentary law. I have to submit to the House that in our judgment, and I believe in the judgment of all, Mr. Robert Franklin Sutherland, member for the north riding of Essex, is well qualified in all

these respects to fill the office of Speaker. The members of the present House who were his colleagues in the last parliament will agree with us, I believe, that we can fairly trust that in his hands the good traditions of the House of Commons as they have come to us from the motherland, as we endeavour to maintain them in this country, will be well preserved. I, therefore, beg to move, seconded by Sir William Mulock :

That Robert Franklin Sutherland, Esquire, member representing the electoral district of the north riding of the County of Essex, do take the Chair of this House as Speaker.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). No one can find fault with the definition of the duties of the Speaker as laid down by my right hon. friend who has made the motion (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The prime duty of the selection rests, of course, upon my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and I have no doubt that he has exercised his best judgment in selecting for the position a gentleman who fulfils his high definitions and ideals of this most important office. Personally, I have not had the pleasure of the acquaintance of the hon. gentleman who has been proposed, but I have been told by my colleagues on this side of the House that they consider him to be a gentleman who, by his independence and from their knowledge of him, will be one who will maintain the high traditions which have so long obtained, and which we trust will for ever obtain in this chamber. Under these circumstances, and with these ideals of the hon. gentleman, I can only say that this side of the House will give every reasonable support to the Speaker who has been selected, and hold up his hands in every way, so long as he carries out the high duties of that office, as I have no doubt he now intends to do.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. The discipline and the dignity of this chamber are in the hands of His Majesty's loyal opposition in common with the gentlemen on the other side of the House, and we are as anxious to have them maintained as they are.

The motion being put to the House,

The Clerk of the House (Mr. T. B. Flint) declared the motion carried in the affirmative nemini contradicente; and Robert Franklin Sutherland, Esquire, member for the north riding of Essex, duly elected to the Chair of the House.

Mr. Sutherland was conducted from his seat in the House to the Speaker's chair by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Sir William Mulock.

Hon. ROBERT FRANKLIN SUTHERLAND (Speaker-elect). Gentlemen of the House of Commons, I desire to express to you my sincere thanks for the honour you have conferred on me by electing me to the high position of Speaker to preside over your deliberations. No one can appreciate more highly than do I the honour of this selection. No one, on the other hand, can be more diffident than myself as to my capacity to discharge the duties of the office. At the outset I am very inexperienced, as you are aware, but I trust that that inexperience will in itself be met by your cordial feeling towards me, and that for a time at least I shall be permitted to occupy this position with kindness from both sides of the House. With your aid and co-operation I feel well assured that we will be able to vindicate our rights and privileges according to our established rules and usages, preserve that freedom of speech which is at the foundation of liberty, and at the same time maintain the dignity and decorum of such an assemblage as this. I need hardly say that I enter upon the duties of the office with a full desire to be impartial as between the two sides of the House.

May I be permitted, without at all desiring to suggest to the House that my knowledge of the language enables me to make a speech therein, to attempt to say a few words in French :

(Translation.) Hon. gentlemen, the French language being more familiar to a large number of members of this House, as also to a considerable number of electors in the constituency which I have the honour to represent here, I am glad to be able to tender to you in that language my sincere and grateful acknowledgments for the honour which has just been conferred upon me. Let me add that, with your co-operation and the aid of my English speaking friends, I will endeavour to discharge the duties of that exalted function with all the zeal and devotedness within my power.

The Serjeant-at-Arms then placed the Mace on the Table of the House.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 3.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, January 12, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

Mr. Speaker communicated to the House the following letter which he had received :—

Office of the Governor General's Secretary, Canada.

Ottawa, January 11, 1905.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber, to formally open the first session of the tenth paliament of the

Dominion of Canada, on Thursday, the 12th instant, at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

The Honourable
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

A message was delivered by Ernest John Chambers, Esq., Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod :

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

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

Then the Hon. Robert Franklin Sutherland, Speaker elect, said :

The House of Commons has elected me their Speaker, though I am but little able to fulfil the important duties thus assigned to me. If, in the performance of those duties, I should at any time fall into error, I pray that the fault may be imputed to me, and not to the Commons, whose servant I am, and who, through me, the better to enable them to discharge their duty to their King and country, humbly claim all their undoubted rights and privileges, especially that they may have freedom of speech in their debates, access to Your Excellency's person at all seasonable times, and that their proceedings may receive from your Excellency the most favourable consideration.

The hon. the Speaker of the Senate then said :

I am commanded by His Excellency the Governor General to declare to you that he freely confides in the duty and attachment of the House of Commons to His Majesty's person and government, and, not doubting that their proceedings will be conducted with wisdom, temperance and prudence, he grants and upon all occasions will recognize and allow their constitutional privileges.

I am commanded also to assure you that the Commons shall have access to His Excellency upon all seasonable occasions, and that their proceedings, as well as your words and actions, will constantly receive from him the most favourable construction.

Then His Excellency the Governor General, was pleased to open parliament by a speech from the Throne.

And the House being returned to the Commons Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to state that the House, having attended on His Excellency the Governor General in the Senate Chamber, I informed His Excellency that the choice of Speaker had fallen on me, and, in your names, and on your behalf, I made the usual claim for your privileges, which His Excellency was pleased to confirm to you.

FIRST READING.

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

1½

THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

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

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I desire on this occasion to asure you how sensible I am of the great honour conferred on me by the King, in appointing me to the distinguished position of Governor General.

My pleasure in being called upon to represent His Majesty in the Dominion has been heightened by the cordial welcome I have received on all sides and from all classes.

This favoured land, with its vast resources and improving facilities for transportation, is attracting people on an ever ascending scale, not only from the United Kingdom, but also from the United States and from many other countries.

As the opportunities for settlement under the advantageous conditions which exist are better known, this Dominion will become the home of an increasing number of happy and contented people, whose character and prosperity will add strength to the great empire of which you are so important a part.

It is gratifying to note that the trade of the Dominion, which in recent years has so steadily increased, is not diminishing, the aggregate trade for the last fiscal year being the largest on record. The revenue for the past six months is also greater than for the corresponding period of the preceding year.

On the invitation of the President of the United States, my government has joined in the formation of an international commission composed of three representatives from each country to investigate and report upon the conditions and uses of the waters adjacent to the boundary line between the United States and Canada, and to make such recommendations for improvements and regulations as shall best subserve the interest of navigation in said waters.

The rapid growth in the population of the Northwest Territories during the past two years justifies the wisdom of conferring on these territories provincial autonomy. A bill for that purpose will be submitted for your consideration.

The surveys necessary for the location of the line of the National Transcontinental Canadian Railway are being vigorously prosecuted, and it is confidently believed that tenders for the

construction of several sections may be invited during the coming season.

The display of Canadian products made last year at the St. Louis Exhibition proved such a marked success in attracting emigrants to the western prairies, that it is proposed to accept the invitation of the government of Belgium to send samples of our products and manufactures, to the exhibition to be shortly held at Liège.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

The accounts of the last year will be laid before you. It will be satisfactory to you to learn that the expenditure has been less than the revenue, leaving a surplus over all charges.

The estimates for the coming year will be submitted at an early date ; they have been prepared with a due regard for economy consistent with the development of the resources of the Dominion.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I invite your best attention to the subjects I have mentioned and invoke the Divine blessing on your deliberations.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That the speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both Houses of Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, be taken into consideration on Monday next.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That a special committee of five members be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed a list of members to form the select standing committees ordered by this House this day, such select committee to be composed of the following members :—Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Mr. Foster, Sir William Mulock, Mr. Hyman and Mr. Haggart.

Motion agreed to.

The SPEAKER.

REPORT PRESENTED.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Are we to meet to-morrow, or not until Monday ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We should meet to-morrow, but I suppose there is not much object in doing so.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. Why not adjourn until Monday ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not move that because I wanted to see what were the wishes of my hon. friends on the other side of the House. I did not move that the address be taken up to-morrow, because Friday is a rather inconvenient day, as many members wish to get away. I move that the House when it adjourns to-day, stand adjourned until Monday next.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the motion is put, will my right hon friend inform the House, or myself particularly, when he expects the Minister of Finance to be in his seat ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not expect the Minister of Finance to be in his seat until the end of the month.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, January 16, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the message, which was as follows :

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons an approved Minute of Council appointing the Honourable William Stevens Fielding, Minister of Finance, the Honourable Louis Philippe Brodeur, Minister of Inland Revenue, the Honourable Charles Smith Hyman, Acting Minister of Public Works, and the Honourable Henry Robert Emmerson, Minister of Railways and Canals, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons as commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of the 13th Chapter of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled 'An Act respecting the House of Commons.'

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 2) to amend the Railway Act of 1903.—Mr. E. A. Lancaster.

Bill (No. 3) to amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships. —Mr. E. A. Lancaster.

Bill (No. 4) to amend the Railway Act of 1903.—Mr. W. F. Maclean.

CONTROVERTED ELECTION—LISGAR.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada a judgment of the said court in the matter of the appeal from the Lower Court respecting the controverted election for the electoral district of Lisgar, declaring that the said petition had abated consequent upon the dissolution of the parliament to which the respondent in the said case had been elected.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, permit me, before proceeding to discuss the motion which I am about to make, to extend to you my congratulations, and I may say also the congratulations of this House, upon your elevation to the honourable position of first commoner of this Dominion of Canada; and the evident expressions of satisfaction and confidence in your appointment which have come from all quarters indicate the belief that you will fill that honourable position with honour to yourself and in keeping with the manner in which the distinguished men who have gone before you have filled it in previous parliaments. I desire, Mr. Speaker, to move that an humble address be presented to His Excellency in reply to the speech with which he has been pleased to open this session of parliament; and, I may be permitted first to express to the right hon. gentleman who leads this House my appreciation of the high honour he has paid to me in committing to me the task of making this motion. You will also permit me to say that I believe that honour is not one intended for myself personally, but rather for that famous and historic county which I have the honour to represent, and which to-day for the first time in a great many years has seen fit to extend its confidence to the distinguished gentleman who leads this House. Permit me also, sir, to ask from this House that consideration which always in the past has been freely extended to hon. gentlemen who venture to address it for the first time, as I am doing to-day.

Coming to the address, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that this House and this country generally, will reciprocate, His Excellency's expression of satisfaction upon his appointment as Governor General of Canada. The expressions upon public questions and the evident intelligent appreciation of the importance and greatness of this country, which have marked the utterances of His Excellency both in the mother country and since he has come to Canada, have warranted the cordial welcome with which he has already been received, and bespeak an equal reception from all classes of our people and from all parts of the country when His Excellency visits them in the performance of the duties of his office.

Let me say at once that it is evident the speech with which this parliament has been opened is one optimistic in every line. It indicates the happening in Canada of a number of new events. First, we have the advent of a new Governor General. Then the speech announces the inauguration of a new railway. Next in order we have the announcement of the creation of a new province and the coming into Canada of a new and large population, in fact, the general tone of the speech is essentially cheerful as befits the declaration of a government and a people who have confidence in themselves, who appreciate the vastness and greatness of the resources of the country, and who are full of self reliance and of hope in the future as being teeming with promise.

Let me say at the start that I do not propose to weary the House with any figures regarding trade returns, because these can easily be obtained from the blue-books, but, it must be eminently satisfactory to know that the trade increases which have characterized every step of our career during the past eight years show no signs of diminution but rather of continued steady improvement. Those among us who have been frightened by the bogey of an adverse balance of trade will be glad to hear that in the month of December last, the exports of Canada exceeded by two million dollars the exports during the same month of the previous year, and the additional fact that our revenue shows continual growth must of course be a matter of the greatest possible satisfaction to all. Then, with regard to surpluses, it would indeed be a great disappointment if the speech from the Throne did not, as it has done during the past eight years, announce an increase in that respect also. All signs point to the fact that the Canadian people are weary of discussions on theories of political economy. For a great number of years some hon. gentlemen have fancied that there was some virtue in the assertion of this or that or the other theory of political economy, but the business people of Canada have come to accept the idea that the making of a tariff is a business proposition and calls for dealing with conditions and not theories, and, as a consequence the tariff requires to be adjusted

practically so as to suit the needs and interests of the country from time to time. By a large majority the Canadian people, not so long ago, gave evidence in a manner so marked, so decidedly expressed, that no one can gainsay it of their confidence in the ability of this government to deal with the question of the tariff along the lines I have indicated.

Another item of great interest to our people is the announcement in the speech of the appointment of a commission to act with one similarly appointed by the United States government with regard to the preservation of the rivers and other waterways which are common to the two great countries. That is a declaration which I am sure, in this land of mountain and the lake, and this land of rushing rivers, this land in which our immense water-powers and waterways are destined to fill so important a place is one which will be welcomed by the House; and the labours of that commission which was originated by an Act of Congress passed in 1902, will no doubt be watched throughout this country with deep interest and I am confident will result in good to both nations. No one will gainsay the statement that Canadians generally regard the maintenance of friendly relations with the great English speaking people to the south of us as of prime importance, and without exception hope that the time will never come when those friendly relations may in anyway be impaired or unsettled; but while that is the case, and while we are prepared to discuss with them such matters of common interest as I have mentioned, I am sure that we all cordially endorse the declaration of the right hon. the First Minister that we will send no more delegations to Washington just now, to look for trade favours. We have now reached that stage when we have become self-reliant and confident in our own resources and great future. We have implicit reliance in the capabilities of Canada, and while prepared to favourably consider any proposition in the interests of both countries, looking towards an improvement in our trade relations, we do not feel disposed to-day to send any more delegations on the question of reciprocity.

The policy announced in the speech of granting provincial autonomy for the Northwest Territories marks an important epoch in our history. It is thirty-four years ago since the province of Manitoba was admitted into confederation and given all those rights, and that status in the federation which is enjoyed by every province in the Dominion, and at this moment it may be opportune to indulge in a retrospective glance and recall some of the advances and developments that have occurred since confederation. Thirty-eight years ago when confederation was established it embraced but four provinces and covered a territory stretching between Lake Superior and the sea. Each one of these provinces was then imbued mainly by local prejudices and limited by provincial aspirations. Each one was unacquainted with the other. There was no common tie save that of the constitution which bound them together. Our total trade then amounted to but one hundred and thirty one million dollars. Our railway mileage was but two thousand miles and our postal revenue but one million dollars. Our bank deposits amounted to but thirty-eight million dollars, and our people generally had but a limited appreciation of the resources and possibilities then awaiting development. Our outlook was purely provincial and the aspirations and ideas of our people were almost exclusively limited by the boundaries of the provinces in which they lived. It is but just to bear tribute to the foresight of that great statesman who presided at the inception of Canada's birth and who watched over this country when in her swaddling clothes. We can all, irrespective of party, regard him as one who did great things for Canada and whose name will always be embalmed in the history of this Dominion. In 1870, when the Northwest was a seething mass of rebellion and discontent, the Territories were brought into confederation. In 1871, British Columbia entered the union. In 1873 the little island of Prince Edward followed her example and in 1875 the Northwest was placed under the jurisdiction of a lieutenant governor. Then in 1880 all the British possessions in North America were placed under the Dominion of our federal parliament with the exception of Newfoundland. Then followed the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which bound all the provinces together and gave to the eastern provinces a common interest in the western heritage, and gave birth to that newer patriotism which has shown such rapid development in the last few years. Following the building of this railway, came new settlements. From all portions of the habitable globe came settlers into this new country, so that no less than three hundred and twenty-four thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight people during the past four years have gone into this new land—a number exceeding the population of some of our provinces and equalling that of others. When we stop to consider the fact also, that during the past four years 94,791 homesteads have been taken up in that country, we can form some conception of the rapidity of its growth. In those western territories, which are to be given provincial autonomy, there exists a country which exceeds in extent the countries of France, Germany and Italy taken together. This is indeed a precious heritage, this great Northwest land, which to-day forms part of our territory and in which we are about to inaugurate a system of government which will place that country on an equal footing with the other provinces in confederation. Realizing the advantages which Canada offers to new settlers, we have men from all lands and every clime taking up homesteads in that vast territory, where they will enjoy constitutional rights and privileges from

which they are debarred in lands from which they come.

The making of this new province, or these new provinces, as the case may be will establish a continuous line of provinces from sea to sea, and will, to a certain extent, round off confederation. As a result of this growth which I have but roughly outlined, a great change has been coming over Canada. Our outlook has widened during the thirty-eight years that have gone. We have ceased to view matters from a provincial or narrow point of view; our outlook has become a Dominion, a continental one. And, especially during the last eight years has this development gone on in so remarkable a degree that I may be pardoned for referring to it. One of the advantages of this marked advance of the last eight years is that old race and creed issues have been forgotten, and from sea to sea men do not now stop to consider those things, but we realize in a way we never did before that we are Canadians one and all. There is coming to Canada, but more particularly to young Canada, a realization of the great resources and extent of our country which was not present with us even a few years ago. When we recall that, in Canada we have an area that is more than one-third of the whole British empire, and as that idea has permeated the whole life of our people, there has grown a patriotic pride and a feeling of interest in and devotion to our country which, in other nations and in other times, it has required the stern teaching of war to evoke. And our pride in our institutions, in our literature, in our rapid growth in national life, has been enhanced by our faith in our country's resources, and by a realization of the fact that during the past eight years our trade increase has exceeded that of every other country in the history of the world. I have already given some figures showing our position at the time of confederation. To-day, our railway mileage exceeds 20,000 miles; our postal revenue is over $6,000,000 a year; the deposits in our banks instead of being $38,000,000, as they were thirty-eight years ago, are close upon $600,000,000. Once these facts are realized, we contemplate the position of Canada with growing exultation and pride. We realize that here in Canada, we have all the elements by which we may become the great flour, paper, cheese, butter and provision producer, as well as the great woodenware manufacturing centre of the world. These natural conditions are beginning to be appreciated, and are certain of early exploitation. But our outlook widening, as it has been on the federal and continental side, looks also toward the imperial field; and I am proud to say that I believe there is not in Canada any desire for any other future than in connection with the great empire to which we belong. At the same time, we should remember that he who would artificially or unnaturally hasten the solution of the problem of our future relations to the empire may create the worst stumbling block in the way of reaching the end which he desires to see attained. There are those who are accustomed to say that Canada has done nothing towards paying her debt of gratitude to the empire. I think they forget the efforts that have been put forth by Canada, and the help that has been rendered by Canada in constructing already one great transcontinental line and preparing for the immediate construction of another. The first of these already has been, and both of them must be, tremendous factors in binding the empire together, whether in peace or in war. In addition to that, Canada has shown herself, by her attitude at the time of the South African war, to be ready to stand by the empire in the hour of national necessity. We are going on with the inception of a Canadian navy—a small navy it may be, but we are moving along the proper line by arranging that when Canada spends her money on behalf of the empire she shall oversee that expenditure. It may be true—it is true—that Canada must make some sacrifices in order that the problem of the empire may be solved. Those of us who believe in imperial connection and the future of the empire are ready that these sacrifices should be made. At the same time, Canada's interests must be guarded, and there must be corresponding sacrifices in every other part of the empire, in order that a harmonious and a successful future may be assured.

The next paragraph of the address to which I will refer announces that satisfactory progress has been made in carrying out the policy of a national transcontinental railway which was approved by parliament two years ago and reaffirmed last session.

I am sure that hon. gentlemen opposite appreciate to-day, perhaps more even than they did in the past, the great importance to Canada of carrying to a successful issue the construction of this great railway. It is only fair to say that, although some of these hon. gentlemen, at the inception of this proposition, were disposed to combat the idea that the new Transcontinental Railway was necessary, at the conclusion of the discussion of that question, they frankly admitted that it was a good thing to have the new railway. But they interjected into the discussion a proposition which was utterly opposed to all the traditions of their party, when they suggested the government ownership and operation of that railway. To-day, I am sure, they will join with us in the satisfaction we all feel in learning that a great many of the difficulties that were expected in the inauguration of this enterprise are rapidly disappearing. Thus, we were told that the country through which the railway is to pass between Quebec and Winnipeg was a country of muskeg and stunted poplar. I am

advised upon authority which I deem to be the very best, that the investigations made by the surveyors who have gone through that country justify entirely different conclusions. The reports indicate the existence there of splendid pine forests, fertile agricultural lands, mineral fields of a great variety and richness, and a most important factor under modern conditions—water-powers of the greatest value. In a few weeks, I am advised, almost every foot of the line from Winnipeg to Moncton will be covered by surveying parties. Already a great portion of that territory has been traversed and the route for the railway ascertained. We were told that the eastern section of this railway was one which should not be built;—whatever advantage there might be in building the other portion of the Transcontinental Railway this eastern portion should not be undertaken. I am sure that, on reflection, hon. gentlemen who represent the western portion of Canada, animated as we know them to be quite as much as we who come from other portions of the Dominion, with a desire to make this a self-contained country, would not for one moment hesitate to declare that it will never do for our National Railway to be cut off for six months of the year from a connection through our own country with our own seaports; and I am sure that they will hear with satisfaction the information which I am in a position to say, is authentic, that the engineers who have been making the surveys from Quebec to Moncton have found not the slightest difficulty thus far in locating the line. The grades and other features are such as to assure the construction and operation of the line in that section under the most advantageous conditions. I am sure that the announcement will be received with satisfaction that the surveys are being vigorously prosecuted, and that it is believed that tenders for the construction of several sections may be invited during the present season. Because, as the days roll on, it will be found in the years to come, that this Transcontinental Railway will open up for us a new empire to the north, and that in ten or perhaps twenty years hence this parliament will be occupied in legislating for the inauguration of a new province in that northern country, the addition of another entity to this federation to which we belong.

The announcement that the government propose to send exhibits of our products to the exposition which is to be held in Belgium, is one which I am sure, in view of the success which has attended in the past the efforts of the Agricultural Department in that direction, will be received by the whole House with satisfaction. I did not have the opportunity, except from studying the various reports which have been made in regard to the great exhibition in St. Louis, of judging of the character of the Canadian exhibit, but I believe I am in the judgment of the House in saying that Canada did well there, that her exhibits were well set forth, and that the educative result of the efforts which were put forth on behalf of Canada, more than warrants the expenditure that has been made, and has given great satisfaction to those Canadians who visited that exhibition. I am sure that in the exhibition which will be held in the Low Countries, among a class of people to whom Canada should look with deep interest for immigration, a similar success will attend the efforts of the Agricultural Department, as has marked their efforts in the various other expositions where Canada has been represented.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to detain the House at any great length. But before I conclude, I would like to be permitted to recall one or two facts to the memory of the House. Sir, thirty-eight years ago there came to this House, in the first parliament of Canada, from the province from which I have the honour to come, seventeen out of the eighteen members who then represented Nova Scotia in this parliament, who objected that Nova Scotia had not been treated fairly in laying down the terms of confederation. Only one gentleman came from Nova Scotia who took the opposite view. That gentleman has played a great part in the history of Canada; he was prominent among hon. gentlemen opposite, and at one time he was their leader, as premier of this country. We have sent to this parliament in the intervening time other hon. gentlemen who have led our friends on the other side of the House, one of whom filled with distinction the important post of premier of this country; and we have also given our friends on the other side another hon. gentleman who has led them in opposition. But to-day we come to this parliament from Nova Scotia, animated by very much higher and nobler motives; we come here eighteeen strong, united behind the hon. gentlemen who fill the distinguished posts of Minister of Finance and Minister of Militia and Defence of this country; we come here unanimously supporting the greatest colonial statesman in the empire. We come here to support him who, for sixteen years, has led the great party to which we belong, who found it to some extent disorganized, but who has bound it together with the strongest ties of sentiment and patriotism, and have made it the greatest party Canada has yet seen; we come as followers of the right hon. gentleman who during the eight years he has been Prime Minister, has splendidly equipped the ship of state and guided her so magnificently along the glorious way she has gone, and to whom has once more been committed the direction of her destinies. Sir, animated by these feelings, we come to this House to support the right hon. gentleman in his pol-

icy of Canada first, Canada last, and Canada for ever. Those of us who have witnessed the improved conditions in the province by the sea, from which I come, during these latter years, join hands with those who come from the province by the sea on the other side of the continent, where there is a similar absence of a dissenting voice, and unanimously we offer our devotion to the great leader of our party. Mr. Speaker, in this, the first utterance which I have the opportunity of making in this House, I desire to be understood as speaking without prejudice and without partisanship, as speaking with a sincere desire that all of us, whether we come from the east or from the west or from any part of Canada, and whatever our party affiliations are may be animated during the time we sit in this House by a desire to do all we can towards building up this great heritage of ours so that those who come after us may feel that we have done our part in creating those conditions which will enable it to take its rightful place among the greatest nations of the world. Sir, I beg to move that a humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to the speech from the Throne.

Mr. GEORGE PARENT (Montmorency). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, for so many years past has modesty been the theme in opening such a speech as this, that I am rather at a loss to find some new turn for expressing my own feelings in this regard; and if I glance over those 'humble preliminaries' referred to by the academician whose words I quote incorrectly, it is that I realize my inability to adequately describe my own present state of mind. Fortunately for me, my part consists merely in seconding the proposal made by the hon. member for Pictou. His fine speech is a plea in favour of young men, a plea which should be of especial benefit to me, since it has elicited from amongst you a spirit of indulgence equally flattering to him, though required only as regards myself.

Indeed, you will have to be specially indulgent, if you do not wish to feel too painfully the lack of that power of oratory wielded by my predecessor in this House. For, if, on account of the merits of the policy I defended, and through the efforts of devoted supporters, I succeeded in capturing the county of Montmorency over the Hon. T. C. Casgrain, I did not succeed in wresting from him the secret of his eloquence.

Sir, for the young man who reverently knocks at the door of the temple of politics, desirous of grasping the principles that rule the art of statesmanship, it is only natural that the present condition of our country should appear unexceptionably good, and that not only the future, but the present, as well, should seem bright. Is not Canada, from east to west, washed, as it were, by a Pactolous, on whose shores untold of prosperity has settled, without there being any sign of approaching trouble ?

Of course, we should be thankful to Providence for these benefactions, but have we not the right, as a people, to congratulate ourselves, and is it not also our duty to thank those whose duty it was to make good use of the heavenly treasures and who have so thoroughly fulfilled their task?

That feeling of national pride finds a fit opportunity of asserting itself when the Canadian people is called upon, as it is to-day, to extend a most hearty welcome to the new representative of His Majesty King Edward VII. His Excellency the Governor General has lived in a British colony familiar with all the evils of bloody warfare and still prostrate under its terrible bereavements; while Canada rejoices in offering to Lord Grey the comforting spectacle of a happy people, all sections of which breathe the same spirit of loyalty and devotedness to the British crown, of a people proud and jealous of its freedom, no doubt, but equally proud of a state of dependency heretofore rendered agreeable through the noble spirit of its sovereign. Like his predecessor, Lord Minto, of whose sojourn here we have such a happy remembrance, Lord Grey will live peacefully here. Rideau Hall will be, in the course of his busy life, a place of rest, wherein he may witness the normal though vigorous growth of a nation capable of taking care of itself, but knowing also where to find a protector.

I shall not dilate, Mr. Speaker, over the unequivocal signs of this growth of the Canadian nation. However, as the outcome of the fray, I am the unworthy representative of a county, which not only borders on the St. Lawrence, but partly protrudes, as it were, into its channel. My constituents are largely navigators, and I would be amiss to my duty did I not communicate to the present government the message from Montmorency, a message of gratitude for the efforts made by this government towards improving the navigation of the river through the increase in the number of buoys and lights, and for its noble attempt at establishing winter navigation; a message also of prayer that the government may not stop half way, but that the insurance companies be deprived of all pretext for exacting any unjust extra charge, and that the difficult, responsible and trying conditions under which our sturdy pilots labour be improved. It is admitted, I think, that our industries cannot prosper, nor our trade increase, unless the government give to these questions their constant attention.

Sir, the speech from the Throne announces the conferring of provincial autonomy on the Northwest Territories. That is a very serious departure, which, to my mind, has a two-fold importance.

In itself, it is a question pregnant with consequences, on account of the difficulties which its settlement will give rise to, the

conflicts of opinion which its discussion will set forth, the principles of toleration and equal rights which should be sanctioned thereby.

It has been stated that 'Experience is a physician called in too late'; and I may not be wrong in thinking that the experience acquired of late years in the province of Manitoba has been of that kind. The young men of my generation, undoubtedly, have not wholly realized the painful ordeal which our country was made to undergo at a time when the cry of race and religion prevented the quiet discussion of the question of separate schools and of the use of the French language. We were not in the heat of that battle, wherein galling epithets and hateful words were most dangerous missiles; we did not smell the powder of that fanatical warfare. But its rumblings reached our ears; we heard its echo. It may be that owing to our lack of experience, we have taken a somewhat exaggerated view of the situation; but we could not help trembling at the sight of the turmoil into which that bitter struggle of uncompromising principles might have led our country, made up of various elements, had not the present government had the happy thought of negotiating a truce which will be some day final peace, let us hope. That result was effected, on the one hand, through the advice given to the Catholic minority from a quarter familiar to them, Rome, and, on the other hand, through the gentle promptings of diplomacy, whereby the Protestant majority were induced to take a stand making concessions easier all the time.

The young men of my age are witnesses to-day, as it were, of the aftermath only of the storm; but that hurricane of prejudice has left on its train enough ruins, it has hurled too violently one against the others the sons of beautiful France and those of noble England, born on Canadian soil to live side by side, it has caused too much pain, brought about too many quarrels; in a word, it has done too much harm to the Canadian nation for us not to concern ourselves with its possible recurrence. I am confident that the present government, in constituting these new provinces of the Dominion, will foresee all the consequences of the setting in motion of the administrative and legislative machinery which they intend to install, and will thus prevent the crisis, the terrible effects of which have been set forth by recent events.

But if I consider from another standpoint the conferring of provincial autonomy on the Territories, I cannot but rejoice at the thought of that fine page we are about to add to the history of Canada.

The entrance of a new province into the fold of the Dominion is always greeted with a hearty welcome. If that great and beautiful Northwest has reached manhood, so to speak, if it is mature for the grave function of self government, let, in the first place, all the other provinces offer their warmest congratulations, and let the country as a whole rejoice as well. For the birth of a new province within the Dominion is not merely an indication of our prosperity, is not only a vindication of the manner in which public affairs have been managed since 1896. It is, besides, a step forward, made by Canada, and above all it is the certain pledge that our dream of becoming a great nation will soon be carried out. The gap which almost separates the extreme west from the east of Canada is thereby filled; our country becomes almost homogeneous and one stride more is taken in our country's noble and rapid progress towards its great destiny.

Sir, if I may be allowed to express a hope, let it be this: when self government will have been conferred on western Canada, self government which we love so much because it is akin to liberty, when the majority of that country will be left to manage its affairs, may they turn their eyes towards the province, one of whose humble representatives I am here, and whence so many courageous missionaries have gone to these distant lands; may they not close their eyes to the examples of toleration and good will which our legislators give in their dealings with the minority; may the breezes from our mountains when gently passing over the wheat fields of Assiniboia and Alberta bring with them their perfume of kindliness and generosity.

If I feel at ease in thus greeting these provinces whose advent is announced in the speech from the Throne, it is because I recall the measures taken beforehand by the government on their behalf. The older provinces have extended a helping hand to that younger sister and to ensure her growth and normal development, the construction of a great railway is now ensured.

Now, Sir, it is not my intention to deal at any length with the advantages offered by the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme. All that could be said on that subject has, or at any rate, should have been said, and to agree with me, one need only recall the innumerable speeches delivered in the course of the recent electoral contest. If, nevertheless, I make a passing reference to this gigantic undertaking, if I recall the dream of general prosperity which its carrying out will suggest for the country as a whole, if I corroborate the gratitude of my western brethren with my own humble congratulations, it is because I already can see the heavy wheat trains steaming towards my native city, crossing the river at Quebec, over that marvellous bridge, whose construction was, in my childhood, so often represented to me as impossible; and in the completion of that bridge I recognize the reward due to the constant efforts, to the unrelenting, unceasing labour of which I was the witness in my father's home. And should such words seem presumptuous, please be indulgent towards a son who is the witness

as well of attacks of all sorts directed against his father.

Sir, unskilled as I am at dealing with political problems, having only my good will to offer for my country's service, I have not the right to claim your attention any longer; and as I must admit, I feel a certain fright at the mere sound of my voice in this House, I long, as you will understand, to resume my seat. My last thought, that which has inspired me a courage which seemed to fail me at times, and one which you will greet most warmly, is, as you surmise, for the man whom all here respect and admire, towards him who not only has won the esteem and love of his fellow countrymen of all parties, of all creeds, of all races, but who has set his striking individuality in such brilliant light, that from the banks of the Thames and from those of the Seine, rays of his glory are reflected on the Canadian home land.

My last thought, which is one of gratitude, goes to my representative, the right hon. Prime Minister, at whose feet I lay the homage of the most enthusiastic love of the Canadian youth. Of course, my testimony will not have much weight when compared with the almost unanimous acclamations which, from the maritime provinces to British Columbia, have hailed his name, a name which on the battle field was worth a flag. My testimony appears still more insignificant, if we recall the anguish shown throughout the country when, in the course of the last parliament, a terrible disease and out of which it was terribly sought to take advantage, struck the idol of the Canadian people. And lastly, my testimony would dwindle into nothingness when compared with the feelings of joy which harkened his return to health, had it not to touch the heart of the greatest amongst us, that feature of almost filial feeling, independent of noisy manifestations, that feature of inward reverence which makes of my words the sincere, though imperfect echo of the very feelings of the whole Canadian nation.

I second the motion.

Hon. G. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I think I shall be entirely within my rights if I ask the kindly indulgence of the House usually accorded to a new member on first rising to address this august assembly. It is not often that it falls to the lot of a new member to follow and in some degree to criticise the speeches of the new members who ordinarily move and second the reply to the address. Such, however, is my position to-day. In the first place, I congratulate very heartily the hon. gentlemen who have moved and seconded the address, in their maiden efforts in this House. The hon. gentleman who represents the county of Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) displayed an admirable confidence and a flow of words eloquent and copious, and his ideas, if they do not altogether run current with mine, certainly commended themselves to the attention of this House. Unfortunately, I was not able to follow as closely the remarks made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Parent) who seconded the address, but if I have a proper understanding, both of these speeches were exceedingly optimistic in their trend and eulogistic in their purpose. The country obtained a due share of the remarks, and attention of these hon. gentlemen and my right hon. friend who leads the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was not bereft of a becoming share, as well in their regards and their attentions. In both these respects the country is pleased to have the congratulations, my right hon. friend is pleased to have these renewed expressions of fidelity, and we on this side of the House have no fault to find with either. I, speaking for this side of the House, may at the outset say that we heartily agree with the hon. gentlemen who have spoken, in extending our warm congratulations to the distinguished gentleman who is our new Governor General. We welcome him as we have welcomed all Governors General to this Dominion of Canada. We welcome him especially as one of a long line of ancestors who have done grand service for the extension and government of this great empire to which we all belong, and I do not think even in this age with all the rights and privileges of self-government, that the over-seas dominions have and possess, and intend to maintain, that the field is at all closed for the exertion of similar influences, not of extension or of conquest, but of organization of development and the knitting together of all parts of the empire. Who does not know that the Canada of to-day exercises a very large influence on the policies and the tendencies of government in the British empire? Though no expression of opinion may be made in this House, though no expression of opinion may be officially tendered in anyway, yet there is the attentive heed paid to what are the tendencies and thoughts and wishes of the great dependencies beyond the seas, which have their influence in determining policies and in determining the trend and action of the British government itself. Is it not equally true that distinguished men, members of the empire, coming from the mother islands to the dependencies and over-seas dominions such as this, have also a very strong part to play and to fulfil in so knitting together, in so carrying out the idea of co-operation of sentiment and of effort, that this great, but yet to a large extent, unorganized world-wide empire may become more firmly and securely united than it is at the present time? So that our Governor General, welcomed here for himself and for his ancestry, is welcomed here also by us for the work which he has to do, and which we will welcome and co-operate with him in doing.

In reference to the speeches, we may say that the statements which have been made by the two hon. gentlemen who have moved and seconded the address, could be characterized

under three or four heads—we are here; the country is behind us; the country is prosperous. We do not find fault with that assertion. On this side of the House we stand to assert and to maintain that with equal strength and power with hon. gentlemen opposite. We may be pardoned, however, if we may have ideas differing from those hon. gentlemen opposite as to the reasons why this country is prosperous at the present time. When we take the great interests of this country and look at them separately, even though briefly, we may be pardoned the expression that though there is great prosperity in this country, it is quite possible that there might be still greater prosperity, and we are not of that kind, at least, who in these respects think it is best to let well enough alone. We never can be so prosperous in this country but that we must hope and aspire to still greater prosperity. Take, for instance, the great lumbering industries of this country; I do not think that hon. members opposite will maintain that the lumbering interests of this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific are in a very buoyant and prosperous condition at the present time. I think representations have been made to hon. gentlemen opposite as to the reasons why this great industry is not so prosperous as it might be. In this year of grace the mills and productive power in the lumber interests of this country are doing only part time where they might be doing more time, and the reason is not far to seek. It is because of the unequal and unfair competition which is imposed upon this industry from the country south of us. This then is the condition of one of the important industries or interests in this country which might be better than it is if the government had taken the proper steps to moderate that competition and bring it down to a fairer and sounder basis as between us and our neighbours to the south of us. Take again, the mineral interests of this country. They are great; they are important, but is it or is it not a fact that any single line of policy of hon. gentlemen opposite has contributed to make the mineral industries of this country more prosperous than they would otherwise have been ? Is there to-day a single thing which goes into the products of the miner which is got by him at less cost than in 1896? On the other hand, has the market for the minerals which are produced been widened or extended? With respect to that second great branch of the interest and industries of this country, the mineral or mining interests, things certainly have worked out in their own way, and no great claim can be made of their having been extraordinarily helped by hon. gentlemen opposite through any line of their policy.

Take again the great agricultural interests. They are prosperous in a part of our Dominion most certainly ; in other parts of our Dominion they are not so prosperous. The centre of agricultural prosperity to-day is to be found in the great Northwest ; in that land so lately opened, so richly endowed and so full of promise for the future.

Take the remaining great interest of Canada, the industrial interests of the country. Although these are to a certain extent prosperous, one seeks in vain for any very strong reason why they should have enjoyed that prosperity from any help or aid which has been given to them by hon. gentlemen opposite through their policy. Yes, the country is prosperous, but who laid the foundation of that prosperity ? One of my hon. friends who has spoken to us to-day declared that the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern were the great harbingers of the prosperity of the west. The prosperity of the west is due, outside of that country's own intrinsic richness, outside of its own great productive capacity and extent, to two things : It is due to the opening up and the proving up of that country. If hon. gentlemen go back in their minds to 1897, when they came into power actively, they will find that every system of transport into and out of that Northwest which exists to-day was at that time existent in the Northwest. By whose policy ? By whose action? If there has been any expansion of any transport system it has been by extension only, by extension in carrying out the system which was laid down, made possible, made existent under the guidance and by the aid of the Liberal-Conservative party of this country. The great Northwest had not only been opened up, but it has been proved up. There was the experimental stage. Time was necessary in order to prove to the world that however rich that country might be, and however broad its acres, its productivity was likely to be permanent and to be built up upon broad foundations. It was necessary to prove to the world the uniform and permanent productive power of that country ; that required a period of experimentation, and for eight, or ten, or twelve years the pioneers of that great Northwest country were busily engaged in that work of experimentation. The frosts had to be combated and studied, the conditions of climate had to be given attention to, the methods of cultivation, which were different in that country from those in the countries to the east, had to be studied and carefully noted, and through year after year of failure and experimentation in the course of ten or twelve years, proof has been given to the world, not only of the productivity of that country, but of its permanent and uniform productivity. These two things done; the permanent productivity of the country proved to the world and its transport system opened up, then prosperity began to show itself. Then people came into that country ; then production increased ten, twenty, one hundred, a thousand-fold ; and by men who wish to reason soundly or to come to just conclusions, these things must be taken into account. The chronicler has given us a brief and interest-

ing history of this Dominion of Canada for thirty-eight years. Did it occur to him in his self-jubilation that of that thirty-eight years twenty-five years were under the guidance of a Liberal-Conservative government and a Liberal-Conservative policy? Thus, though the country is prosperous—and we admit that prosperity, and maintain it, and rejoice in it—we must not come to the illiberal conclusion that that prosperity is to be attributed to the hon. gentlemen opposite, who came into power in 1896.

Another note is that the population is increasing. We are glad of that. The population is increasing by virtue of immigration, the attraction of those without; and population is also increasing by virtue of retention, that is, attraction of the people who are born within the country and who are kept within the country. There was no possibility of these two forces working to their full extent until that period of opening up and of proving up of the country was gone through with, so that confidence would be given, so that the productive power would become known and would be strong to draw people from abroad, and also to keep in this country its own sons, rather than have them go to foreign countries. These are things which we should bear in mind when we come to give reasons for the great progress and the great prosperity of this country. That hon. gentlemen opposite have done what in them lay in order to take advantage of these conditions and have, to the extent of their ability and in good faith, striven in order that this prosperity might have its constant and unchecked growth is to their credit, and we give them full credit for it, but it is quite another thing to make the policy which has been in force for eight or ten short years in this country the father and sponsor and creator of all the prosperity in this great, broad Dominion. But I can read in the smiling face of my hon. friend opposite, and in the smiling faces of the mover and seconder of the address the great idea that the country has endorsed them; that it has wiped out and condoned all their sins of the past, that it has given them a full mandate for the future. Well, whatever comfort there is in that let hon. gentlemen take it, let them enjoy it to the full. But sometimes it is possible that a great victory may cost too much, and may in the end prove too expensive—too expensive for the party itself and for the country as well. A victory gained by fair and reasonable argumnt, upon a representation of policies and principles, is a victory which is enduring; but a victory which is to be ascribed to other influences than these, may be, as I have said, too expensive and too costly.

The opposition had some things to contend with in the last election. It is strange, but it is absolutely true, I think, that prosperity tends to dull the critical faculty; and a government which goes to a country in a time of prosperity slips through with less of its sins of commission and omission scrutinized than it does under different and less auspicious circumstances; and hon. gentlemen opposite, in gauging their victory, must give a little credit for their fortunate escape to the prosperity of the country and the dulling of the critical faculty which results from that prosperity.

There are some things, though, that have been injected into the late contest and that have contributed to the late victory, which are not quite so pleasant to contemplate. I do not think that ever before in the history of this country was there a hard and fast co-partnership made between a government and an immense and widely extended corporation. Whether that is to the interest of the country, whether in the long run it be even to the interest of the corporation itself, is something which is well worth considering. In this last election an immense corporation actually adopted the party flag and the party shibboleths, and set itself with untiring and relentless force to elect the government through whom it proposed to get, and by whom it was promised one of the greatest and richest franchises that have ever been given to a corporation. Whether that is indicative of good conditions in the present, or of sound conditions in the future, or not, is a thing which I think may be well open to doubt, and which may well be given serious consideration. But I know from personal experience, as does almost every man sitting on either side of this House, that one of the most relentless forces against which His Majesty's loyal opposition had to strive in the last election, was the untiring, immense and widely extended influence and power of the corporation with which the government had allied itself. In every consituency where their power was felt, the suffrage was made to aid their purposes, the suffrage of their employees was thrown strongly, by all the influence that could be brought to bear, for the government and against the opposition—and generally for what purpose? For the immense franchises and gain and profit which promised to come to them if the government were sustained and the opposition were defeated.

Outside of that, am I right or wrong, Mr. Speaker, in saying—and I leave it to the country to decide—that there probably never was in the history of this country an election in which the argument of the material was more profusely and relentlessly used than in this last election. I acknowledge that it is a difficult thing in a young and growing country to entirely eliminate from the electorate the discussion and consideration of public works; but there is certainly a sane and decent limit by which this ought to be bounded; but in this last election, from one end of this country to the other, it did seem as if the great argument, the great consideration, the great point brought before the electorate was the dangled bribe of public works promised by the candidate

and endorsed of course by the letter or the word of mouth of the minister out of whose department the public work had to emanate. Everywhere this was so. My hon. friend said: Here is a solid Nova Scotia.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. In Heaven's name, why should it not be solid, if in one county alone sixty-six appropriations for public works were sent down and held up as the price of its support ? My right hon. friend possibly may recall the circumstances of a devoted follower of his, brought out under his own wing, launched upon his constituency by my right hon. friend himself at a great public gathering, who on a post-card—of larger size than usual, of course—went into an elaborate calculation of how many dollars per minute, per hour, per week, per month and per year he had got for his constituents during the short three years that he had sat in parliament; and after having spread this over the large-sized postcard, he declared : 'And this is only the first fruit, this is just the budding promise of what I will do for you if you send me back to support the government.' But is it not rather sad and rather bemeaning, that in this great country all decency in that respect should be thrown to the winds, and from the Prime Minister down to the latest acquisition to the cabinet we should have a crusade based on promises of public works? Why send a member of the opposition, who can do nothing for you? Send a supporter of the government; here is his promise, and here is the endorsement of the minister. Well, sir, I am not going to follow out what influence that has upon a country. It is not an ennobling influence; it does not raise the morals of public life. It may be treated with the light laugh and even the sneer by the practical politician; but I tell you that we shall reap the fruits in future years in a deadening of the public conscience and a decline of public morality in this country.

What else has been interjected into this contest? How brave these gentlemen were in that time, long, long ago, when they believed in theories. Now my hon. friend says the Liberal party has discarded theories. Very true, very true; but the time was, in the memory of men sitting on either side of this House, when hon. gentlemen opposite had theories. One of the theories my right hon. friend held then, and held very strongly, was that there should be no partnership between provincial governments and the Dominion government—that provincial affairs were provincial and should be kept by themselves, that Dominion affairs were for the Dominion and should be kept for themselves, and that the joining of the two only led to corruption and a lower public life. Yet to-day, in this broad Dominion, who has been a greater sinner in this respect than the right hon. gentleman opposite. In all the elections which have taken place, since this government has been in office, the patronage and the power of the Dominion government have been joined with every possible provincial government for a common end, with of course the full and perfect understanding that in the time of trial these provincial governments would in like manner come to the rescue of the federal administration. A Liberal of the old English school ! How often have we heard my right hon. friend use that phrase ? A Liberal of the old English school, standing in Liberal shoes and yet allowing what my right hon. friend allowed to be done in the province of Quebec in order to destroy the Liberal-Conservative party in the provincial election! In the pursuance of such tactics. long before the Quebec provincial parliament should have finished its legal existence, advantage was taken of the result of the Dominion elections and the consequent disorganization of the Conservative party in that province, to spring a dissolution on the people and put out of the way that strongest safeguard of our constitution and the political freedom of our people—a fair, reasonable, virile opposition. No English Liberal of the old Liberal school would, I am sure, have countenanced any such course. A similar course was followed in the province of Ontario. In that province the people in 1898, 1902, and since, have refused to give their endorsation to the provincial government and are to-day trying to rid themselves of a government they have denounced, which represents but a minority of the people, and has been 'in articulo mortis' for the last five years. Seeing the dire straits into which that government has fallen, the right hon. gentleman, I understand, has come to its rescue, and is about to invoke the organization and power of this government in its behalf, and has sent around to the leading men of the party the watchword 'save the Ontario government.' These partnerships are demoralizing, they do not tell for pure politics and honest administration ; and my hon. friend was badly advised when he saw fit to lend the power and patronage of this government to aid the local administration.

But there are still worse things being done. I do not know how well founded are the stories that are being told, but I do think that they merit the attention of this parliament; and I hope that at the proper time they will, if they have any foundation, be pressed to the very end, and that this parliament will do its duty. There are strange stories floating of the manipulation of the voters' lists in Manitoba, the Northwest and the Yukon. There are strange stories told of the doings of the enumerators in the far Yukon, where, I believe, the enumerators had to be hunted among the mountains in order that electors might obtain the lists which they had concealed about

them and which they refused to make public so as to prevent the voters from exercising their rights. There are circumstances and things still worse than any I have mentioned, and if they be true, I hope that they will be placed before this House and thoroughly ventilated. The bogus ballot boxes we will not discuss to-day. They are, however, but the outcome of a long series of malpractices which have developed into a political mechanism, the invention of fertile brains, in order to manipulate elections and prevent at the last moment the free expression of the people's will.

My hon. friend made an appeal for cordiality and good feeling and for the repression of race and creed issues. No one would join him more heartily in that appeal than myself. Have we not arrived at a stage in our existence as a people when we ought to be more manly, when we ought to have higher ideals and scorn to appeal to racial and creed issues and prejudices ? My hon. friend will join me in the expression of that wish, but is it not a fact that he owes the election to this House of some of his supporters to these very racial and creed cries ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FOSTER. We, I am sure, not only on this side but on that, deplore the absence from this House of my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain). He was a public man who did credit to his province and this parliament, and the fact that he is not in his seat to-day is not because his policy was not approved of by his constituency, not because his character was unworthy of their confidence, but because of race and creed cries which were raised against him.

Some hon. MEMBER. No, no.

Mr. FOSTER. Some hon. gentleman on the opposite side says 'no, no.' Well, I cite this case as an example which is indicative of a sentiment which in my humble way I am trying to show is not to the benefit of this country. Let us admit that this course was followed without the knowledge of the leaders of the party ; yet I submit that he does a public service to this country who brings out of the byeways and the lanes into full public notice political trickery of this kind. I believe that my hon. friend has, by a dexterous use of judgeships and senatorships, secured to himself an organizer in the province of Quebec. That gentleman is a senator, whose name I shall not mention here. But I believe that in the county of Montmagny there is a newspaper which is certainly controlled, if not owned, by that gentleman. What do I find published in that paper as an advice for the electors of that county ? Let me read the following which was published in it and sent broadcast to the electorate :

(Translation.)

Electors and fellow-countrymen of Montmagny, be on your guard !

In their 'mandement' their lordships the bishops say that it is our duty to vote for a man who is able to defend both our religious and national interests. Now, can you, in conscience, vote for a man like Harry Price, a mere clerk in his brother's employ, who does not speak French, an English-speaking protestant, holding the French Canadians in contempt ? Let us be spirited men. The Price concern import men from Great Britain to occupy the most important places in their offices. Why not do like them, chiefly when we are called upon to elect a member, and the fate of the Laurier government is at stake ?

Once more, let us be on our guard, and shame on the cowards and those who crouch on all fours before money, drink and the crusts of bread thrown by Price, the candidate.

Hurrah for Laurier !

Hurrah for Lavergne.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any need for an appeal like that in any county in any part of this Dominion of Canada? And was it with the knowledge of the Senatorial organizer of the elections in the district of Quebec? Was it known to my right hon. friend, and if it had not been known to either of these gentlemen, would it have been allowed ? Surely then, I am doing a public service in calling their attention to the fact that this was the kind of thing that was done to swell the majority of my right hon. friend. But something more. Here are interrogations in le Courrier :

(Translation.)

Do you speak English ? Such is the Conservative formula, this year.

October 27, 1904.

Does Mr. Price require from his followers that they should take the test, denounce the sacrifice of the mass and anathematize the Blessed Virgin and the Pope ?

Why was a question like that asked ? Was it in order to forward the trade policy of hon. gentlemen opposite ? Was it to carry the Grand Trunk Pacific ? And does my right hon. friend regard it as a lofty, noble canvass ? Is this the kind of thing that will join the people of Canada in bonds of amity and will make them a people whose sole aim in public affairs shall be the good of their country ? Is this the kind of appeal that will lead to the wide and proper toleration of every creed and every race among our people ?

(Translation.)

Is it true, Mr. Price, that you have promised the fanatics of Ontario, Sam. Hughes, Dr. Sproule, Mr. Barker, &c., that you would deliver over to them the splendid and patriotic county of Montmagny, with its population, all French-speaking and deeply Catholic?

October 31, 1904.

Who are these terrible monsters whose names have been invoked in order to swell

the majority of my right hon. friend ? And is he proud of a majority swelled by appeals of this kind ? And here is another extract :

(Translation.)

TO THE ELECTORS OF THE COUNTY OF MONTMAGNY.

The 'Courrier de Montmagny,' October 31, 1904.

Up to now I have been the Liberal candidate.

Was not that glory enough for one man to be the Liberal candidate ? It appears not.

(Translation.)

To-day, at the request of a large number of Conservatives, I become the nationalist candidate, that is to say, I take the field as the champion of French and Catholic Canada, and of its right to a fair representation at Ottawa. I am a Liberal, but before all, I am against imperialism, militarism and against Quebec being crushed under the heel of the Tories.

They will try to buy your votes, my friends, but think of your old flag, think of our dear province, remember our ancestors and our religion. The motto of Quebec is :

'I remember'

Do ye remember !

ARMAND LAVERGNE.

Now, I leave that as a side thought for my hon. friend, and I ask him does he approve of that method of canvass, and does he think that is one of the things that will bind this country together, will promote high public political ideas ? Taking all these things into consideration, there are some points, which serve, may be, to diminish the apparent value of the great victory of the third of November.

But, I have been too long upon these details, and I now wish to come to the speech. The speech from the Throne itself —well there is not much to come to in this speech. It seems to have sprung from barren and unfruitful soil. It looks to me like either the product of utter exhaustion—due, I suppose, to the great efforts of the election —or the product of a proud and superior carelessness, as though the hon. gentlemen opposite had earned a holiday and a good time, without thinking very much about the country. But there is one thing in the speech and that is the autonomy of the Northwest. We are not permitted to know what this measure will be. But it is a measure that has long been asked for by the people of the Northwest, a measure that has been supported by His Majesty's loyal opposition in the late parliament, as it is in this House, but which has been consistently and persistently denied by my right hon. friend and the government which he leads. In this speech, we have a promise of autonomy for the Northwest. Was that a late pre-election repentance? Was the letter that my right hon. friend wrote on the eve of the election promising that something should be done to this end wrung from him by the fear of antagonizing votes? Whatever the reason, there was a promise, and this time there is the fulfilment so far as the speech from the Throne goes. I hope that my right hon. friend, in bringing down this measure, will give to the new province a geographical area that will be sufficient. For myself, I am opposed to dividing this country up into small provinces with their burden of judical and administrative officers, duties and expenses. I hope also there will be no stinginess with reference to the resources with which the new province shall be endowed. I think it would be a mistake if it were left to come to this parliament year after year voicing its demands for means to meet what must be great expenses, and increasing expenses as the development of the province proceeds. I hope the powers to be given to that province will be so definite, so clear and so full that the measure will be satisfactory to the sturdy pioneers who are to make that province great, and will avoid grievances and recriminations of every sort. We have no jealousy of the great west. There is no rivalry between the west and the east. The east bought the patrimony of that country, the money of the east paid for it The brawn and brain of the east pioneered that great country and to-day our sons, our brothers and our fathers are the dominant race of the province that is to be. Every power which can be given to them should be given to enable them to lay the foundations of a province with an almost illimitable future and one that will justify the confidence which we had in it when we made it a part of this great Dominion, a confidence which every succeeding year has increased.

There is a further mild allusion made—no, there is no allusion made to that old-time indispensable market to the south of us. What has happened hon. gentlemen opposite? Have they discarded some more of their theories ? I know that it is impossible for heated steel always to retain its initial heat, but one would never have thought that that ardent party which called for commercial union, which vociferated its demands for unrestricted reciprocity, which reiterated its adhesion to the idea that the market to the south of us and its reciprocal enjoyment was worth more to us than the markets of all the world besides, should have lost all its intrinsic heat and warmth. Yet to-day the only paragraph we have in the speech that touches the country to the south of us, is that somewhat obscure one in which it is stated that an International Commission composed of three representatives from each country will be appointed

To investigate and report upon the conditions and uses of the waters adjacent to the boundary line between the United States and Canada.

What that may mean I do not know, but we will have to possess ourselves in patience until we find out the meaning of the clause. But for ever and for ever, it would seem, the old flag which was nailed to the top of the mast by my hon. friend, and of which he said that it would float there un-

til victory came or death to the gallant defenders, has now come down, the flag has been furled, and there is now only the mildest of all allusions to international arrangements between the United States and Canada. Well, sir, there are many things for which we would feel less like forgiving hon. gentlemen than for abandoning these theories and allowing them to drift into oblivion.

Nothing is said in the speech with reference to a commission to investigate the state of trade and to give us information with reference to tariff changes. I am not sure, but I think at the last session of parliament the Prime Minister promised a commission upon that important matter. Has that been given the go-by as well? Or is it of so little importance that it cannot claim a place in the speech from the Throne? There is an allusion to the trade of 1904 as being up to the high water mark. That is a pleasant assertion, we are glad to hear [redacted] There is another allusion which is not quite so pleasant, it is that for the last six months the revenue of the country is greater than that of the preceding six months. Now that may mean something which is not to the benefit of this country. The volume of trade is one thing, the currents of trade are quite a different thing, and should be looked after quite as much as the volume of trade. Now if this is correct—and I think it is correct—that from 1896 to 1903 the imports from Great Britain have increased seventy-eight per cent while the imports from the United States have increased about 140 per cent, there is food for reflection. If we are importing more heavily, and if the revenue for the last six months is increasing over the preceding six months, it is proof positive that we are importing more heavily, it may be true the bulk of our imports is from the United States and consists of goods which, in a great many lines, ought to be made in this country itself, employing Canadian labour and building up Canadian business. I hope my right hon. friend has not forgotten the promise of a commission, and that we shall hear later in the session that something at least is going to be done with reference to the tariff and its incidence upon the great commercial interests of this country.

There is no allusion either to a fast line service. Has that also evaporated? Are my hon. friends, for another year in addition to the previous years, compelled to apologize for not having a fast service, an adequate service between the old country and Canada? Is it a mere pretense? Are they lacking in spirit, or has there been any fair, reasonable and continued effort to realize that great boon for this country? Eight years ago, under conditions the most favourable, a contract was prepared with the co-operation of Great Britain herself, she giving a large amount of the subvention under which, if it had been carried out, we should to-day have a fast line of steamers running between the old country and the ports of this country, and we should have our mails and our passenger traffic, and a large amount of our freight traffic, going by this line, and we should have in addition the prestige, the almost incalculable prestige, which would accrue to Canada from the establishment of such an adequate service.

No mention is made of the Intercolonial Railway. Now I had fully expected some mention would have been made of that. My right hon. friend, speaking I think in Toronto during the progress of the last election, declared that the Intercolonial had been a loss to this country from the earliest time, and he expected it would always be a loss. He was not quite correct in his figures and facts. Facts are not always a strong point with my hon. friend, I know. It was not quite true that the two sides of the account never were brought close together. It is on the other hand quite true that for years, under other management, there was a surplus and not a deficit between the current accounts of the Intercolonial. But the point I am making is this: My right hon. friend told the people of this country that it was a loss, a dead loss, a burden on this country; and the reason was, not the fault of the men who managed the road, but the vicious system under which it was managed. Now will you look at that for a moment? A powerful government, a powerful premier acknowledging in the face of this country that a million of deficit, nearly—that much this year, if I correctly remember the figures—must be loaded upon the taxpayers of this country, in these years of prosperity, all because a vicious system is allowed to dominate in the management of the Intercolonial. Well, sir, the power to remedy that vicious system is in the hands of my right hon. friend, the statement that it is a vicious system came from his own lips; and the fact is before us that for all these years a vicious system has prevailed, under a weak ministry, and there is no proposition for a remedy. Why should that be in this country? It is not fair to the taxpayers of this country, it is not fair to the department itself, nor to the provinces through whose territory the road passes. And all this in years of progress, when almost every great railway in the United States, and almost every great railway in Canada, is showing by their returns, growing net receipts over and above all expenses, that, too, along with a capital and expenditure on the Intercolonial in the last five years greater than during any preceding five years since the Intercolonial was constructed. Surely some action should be taken to right that great wrong, and to delete that vicious system of management from one of the great departments of our country.

I had expected, too, that something would have been said in the speech with reference to the auditing and controlling of the accounts of this great Dominion. I will touch upon that point very briefly. It is quite possible

that the circumstances of this country have outgrown the limited form of audit which we provided years ago. It is true that one of the most able and one of the most capable officers that this country has ever had, not a political friend of this side of the House but appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite, after years of experience, has come to the conclusion, and has told ministers and told parliament that he was unable properly to perform his duties because of the inadequacy of the Act under which he was working. Now can there be anything more important than a proper supervision of the expenditures of this country—all of course within the lines of ministerial responsibility ? But within those lines can there be anything more important than having proper control, adequate and thoroughly competent, in order that the old and faithful officers of this parliament and country may see to it that moneys are paid only when they are voted, and that moneys are not paid when they have not been earned.

One point more I will touch upon, and that is with reference to the defence of this great country of ours. We have been told of our wonderful progress. We know our great resources, we have infinite faith in the future of this country. Are we doing what we ought to do in order to put this country in a fair state of defence against eventualities which lie all about us? Have we in this country to-day, with our six millions of people, with our million of happy homes, with all the strong material resources at our disposal, have we taken reasonable and proper precautions even for keeping for this country its inestimable possessions, and defending them if need be against any enemy who may come ?

Is there to-day in this country one single port of entry which has guns sufficient to guard it against the marauding gunboat of an enemy? Are there in this country enough rifles to be put into the hands of the strong and adaptable men who are willing to fight for the defence of their country, but who cannot if they have no weapons? Have we to-day in this country, if difficulties should arise, any facilities for manufacturing what would be necessary in the form of ammunition and the implements of warfare necessary for a fair and reasonable defence? Now, it is living in a fool's paradise, surely, if we do not as sensible men, knowing and feeling the worth of our country, knowing the virtue, the ability and the power of our citizens as individuals, place this country in some reasonable form for proper defence and the maintenance of its self-respect as well. I think it is time for this parliament to give this great question full and serious consideration. No one more heartily subscribes than myself to the idea that Canada has not been recreant in the building up of an important and strong part of this empire. Every step we have taken in our Dominion, every material development, every mile of our railways, every step that we have taken in material progress, has been a step towards strengthening the empire. We have been doing our duty in this respect and in this direction, but I think it is well to consider the question if the time has not come when something more can be done in order to maintain that sense of security, that proper feeling of self-respect which a country like this owes to itself, a country of so many homes and of such rich resources.

Mr. Speaker, I apologize to you and the members of this House, as a new, untried and untrained member, for the length of time I have taken and for my halting speech. By and by, I promise you that when I get more accustomed to the atmosphere of this House, and when I find my bearings a little more, I will probably be in a better shape to voice my ideas more pointedly and may be a little more pungently than I have this afternoon.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, it is with more than usual pleasure that I join my voice with the voice of my hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. Foster) on behalf of the opposition, to offer my congratulations and the congratulations of this side of the House to the two new colleagues of ours who have presented the address to be submitted by the House to His Excellency the Governor General in answer to the speech with which he has opened this parliament. When my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) rose to address this House he was not altogether a stranger among us, for, though it was the first time he had spoken on the floor of this parliament, his reputation had preceded him in it, a reputation earned by him in the legislature of a province which, during one hundred years or more, has produced many able men to do service for the state, and which during one hundred years or more has been a bulwark in the cause of Liberal principles, and whose record reached its culmination in the last struggle, in which my hon. friend bore no small a part in the redemption of the hitherto unredeemable county of Pictou. But whilst the reputation of my hon. friend from Pictou has preceded him in this House, it is obvious from the age of my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Parent) that his reputation could not have preceded him. The surprise is that one so young should have achieved a victory so signal as he did. But my hon. friend is a worthy son of a worthy sire, and he has proved once more that blood always tells. Now, perhaps I may be permitted also to offer my very sincere congratulations to the young member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). I am free to say, however, to my hon. friend and to the House that if the electors of North Toronto, or a majority of them, had been true patriots—patriots in the true sense of the word—they would not have elected my hon. friend, but they would have elected my esteemed friend the present mayor of Toronto (Mr. Urqu-

hart). Toronto is a very peculiar city. It is endowed with many gifts, but it has a fatal defect. It is an intellectual city, it is a cultured city, it is a most hospitable city, as I know myself personally. In matters literary, in matters military, in matters municipal, Toronto can always be depended upon to use wise discernment. In matters literary, in matters military, in matters municipal, Toronto always knows a good man and a good thing when she sees it or him, but in matters political the vision of Toronto is deformed. In matters political Toronto is always wrong, and that is why my hon. friend has been elected for North Toronto.

But, Sir, if North Toronto is to be represented on the floor of this House by one belonging to the Liberal-Conservative party so called, for my part I am quite satisfied and happy to see once more my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) upon the floor of this House, where, even on this side we can hope to have some benefit of his experience and talents. But I must say to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) that I was much disappointed after hearing him—for I am an old friend of my hon. friend—and will he be much surprised if I tell him that during the last four years when I looked on the vacant seat he used to adorn and which he again occupies, I often thought of him and I thought that he would profit by the time he was out of this House. I hoped that he would reflect and would change the tenor of his ways, his manner, his methods and his principles I am sorry to say after hearing him to-day that these four years that might have been years of profitable reflection have been absolutely lost on my hon. friend. He is a real Bourbon, he has learned nothing and forgotten nothing, and the speech he has delivered to-day is exactly the speech we heard from himself in the old parliament between 1896 and 1900. He has spoken of the prosperity of the country. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) who is strong on facts, —much stronger than I am,—had to admit that, he had to admit prosperity. We are told that if the country is prosperous it is due to the policy of the Conservative party. How often have we heard that speech from his lips from 1896 to 1900 ? Then I have only to say to him, it may be I will not dispute that point with him. I will say to him and to those behind him that if the prosperity of the country is attributable to the policy of the Liberal Conservative party it is no wonder the country would not again give control of its affairs into the hands of the Conservative party and restore the conditions existing prior to 1896, because then that policy meant ruin and now it means prosperity at our hands.

My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is evidently smarting under the defeat of his party. I shall not discuss at present the methods of the opposition and of the government. I will simply say a word or two as to the observations he has made. If, as he says, the Liberal party has won such a signal victory as that which it won on the third of November, owing to their alliance with a great corporation, which brought its influence to bear wherever there were employees of that corporation, and secured the votes of these employees for the government, it seems to me that he gauged the Liberal party by the Conservative party, and that he was still thinking of the old alliance as between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Conservative party. But, Sir, if my hon. friend will look about him he will find that the greatest victory which was won by the Liberal party in the last elections was won in the two extremities of Canada, in Nova Scotia and in British Columbia, and how many employees of the Grand Trunk are there in British Columbia and Nova Scotia ?

My hon. friend went a little further and opened a subject that I am very glad he mentioned as it will give me an opportunity once for all to dispel—I will not say wilful error—but an error as to the influences which have been brought to the Liberal party the victory which we have won in Quebec. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) says that the defeat of Mr. Casgrain who is a personal friend of mine, was due to appeals to racial and religious prejudice, and in support of that, he cited from a newspaper called the Courier de Montmagny. But, Sir, the Courier de Montmagny was not published in the constituency of my hon. friend Mr. Casgrain, but in the constituency of my hon. friend Mr. Lavergne, and I have only this to say—and I should not have to tell him this, because I presume from the extract which he read a moment ago, that he is a constant reader of the 'Courrier de Montmagny,' and if he is a constant reader of that journal he knows that it is not a very firm and staunch supporter of the present government, that it might almost be called a kicker in the traces of the Liberal party. My hon. friend will find if he will look at it with care some articles addressed to myself personally, taking me to task because I did not administer the party according to the views of the 'Courrier de Montmagny.' Therefore, I have only this to say, that it is altogether too late in the day to charge against the Liberal party in Quebec any appeal to race or religion. We have never won by these methods and we do not propose to win by them, and as one swallow does not make a summer so one newspaper in a country does not make a policy of a party. I shall not say more on this subject, but if my hon. friend chooses to discuss it at greater length I will be happy to go through it with him. At the present time, I have only to say that he has no cause to make the accusation which he made.

I shall now come more particularly to the speech from the Throne. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) said there was not much in it. I thought that that which was a demerit in

the eyes of my hon. friend would be a merit in the eyes of every one ; it has the merit of being concise and to the point. I believe my hon. friend rather rejoices in high and loud redundant sentences, and that the mere clatter of syllables has some charm for his ears, especially when the syllables fall from his own tongue. I remember a time when the speech was not so concise. In the olden days, it was rather prone to conceal the paucity of material under a verbosity of expression. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) should have realized that the people will not be fed upon words and wind, but prefer a bill of fare reduced to a single course if there is some substance in it. There is not much legislation in the speech because we do not propose to introduce much legislation. There is only one great measure which it is proposed to introduce and that is a Bill granting autonomy to the western territories. We think the time has come when the western territories should have full partnership in confederation, when we should admit them as members of the Canadian family as full provinces. My hon. friend alluded to the fact that for two or three years there has been an appeal from the territories for full autonomy. Some two years ago we received delegations and requests from the legislature and in some instances from the people also, to have the territories at once admitted as full provinces, but we represented to the people and to the legislature that the time was scarcely opportune to have this introduced, that we could not be very far from a general election and that at that time the representation of the territories in this House was small while after a general election there would be a larger representation. They had only four members in the last parliament, they have now ten and I think the wisdom of our judgment has now been justified. It is true that we found some doubting Thomases in the territories who thought that we would not implement our promises, but there is to-day in the speech from the Throne an indication and the certainty that on this occasion as on every occasion this government fulfils its pledges and carries out its promises. My hon friend (Mr. Foster) does not know the character of the legislation which we are about to introduce. I am sure my hon. friend does not expect that we shall tell him at this time the principal features of the Bill. We are working on it now ; it is far advanced, but in respect to three or four salient features we thought it better to wait for the representations of the Northwest government and also the advice of our friends on the floor of this House.

There is another suggestion in the speech upon which my hon. friend requires some information. He has not fully apprehended what is meant by our statement with regard to the commission which we have appointed to deal with the waterways between the United States and Canada. I am very glad to give my hon. friend and the House the information to which they are entitled on this point. It is within the knowledge of everybody that along a very great part of the boundary between Canada and the United States is the water system of the St. Lawrence. Now, I am sure that every one will admit that it is to the interest of Canada as well as the United States that the surface of the water should be kept at as high a level as possible. Some few years ago, when it was rumoured that the state of Illinois intended to connect the waters of Lake Michigan with the waters of the Mississippi river by means of a canal, there was an apprehension expressed, not only in this country but in the United States, that that work might have the effect of lowering the level of the waters of Lake Michigan and adjacent waters. As the event turned out, this fear was groundless, as the volume of water taken away by the canal is not sufficient to materially affect the level of the lakes. But if similar works were to be undertaken right and left, if the waters of Lake Erie and our system of waterways generally were to be tapped at different points, it is possible that the volume of water removed from the lakes would be so great that the level might be appreciably lowered. That is not all. In sections of the country where the boundary is not water, but land, there are streams and large rivers which have their sources in one country and which flow into the other. Complaint has been made by the United States that Canadians have constructed some works upon rivers which have their sources in Canada and which flow into the United States, and that these works affect the flow of the waters in their country. We also have made complaints to the United States that Americans have constructed upon some rivers, the St. John river, for instance, works which affect the flow of the waters in our country. It is, therefore, to the mutual interest and advantage of both countries to have this question properly investigated with the view of having concurrent legislation if such should be found necessary. From olden times it has been a principle of Roman law, which has been adopted by most civilized nations, that the riparian owner of any stream has the right to use the water of that stream for his own benefit, provided he does not impair the flow of the water beyond the boundary of his property. This is a principle of law which dominates in almost every country; but it is not possible to have this principle followed and carried out when the works are in one country and the boundary of the property is in another country. For these reasons we have thought it advisable to respond to the invitation of the United States to have this question investigated. We have agreed to a commission to be composed of six members, three to represent the government of the United

States and three to represent the government of Canada. The instructions to the commission shall be laid on the table at an early day ; but in the meantime, to give all the information to my hon. friend to which he is entitled, I may mention the names of the commissioners who are to represent the government of Canada—Mr. Maybee, K.C., an eminent lawyer of the city of Toronto; Mr. Louis Coste, of the Department of Public Works, an eminent hydraulic engineer, and Mr. King, the chief geographer of the Department of the Interior. These gentlemen are to represent Canada at the conference, and we have reason to hope that they will bring in a report which will be satisfactory. I may say that this commission has no power to decide anything. It is not to lay down the basis of a treaty. It is simply to study the conditions and to report whether it is possible to devise remedies to meet an existing evil.

My hon. friend has entered into a discussion of questions which I do not think it advisable for me to discuss at this moment. He has referred, for instance, to the defence of the country. This is a matter which may engage discussion later on, when my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence is in his seat. As to the question of the tariff and the question of the Audit Act, I can only say to my hon. friend that at this moment I do not propose to discuss these questions. They will be dealt with fully, and to his satisfaction, I hope—though perhaps this is too much to expect—when the Minister of Finance is in his seat. Unfortunately, he has been obliged to go to Europe for domestic reasons.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that we do not propose this session to have any very serious or important legislation beyond the Act with reference to the Northwest Territories. I agree to everything that has been said by my hon. friend as to the importance of that measure, though I would not subscribe to all his contentions. We propose, if possible, to have a short session. We have not been blessed with a short session for a long time. We have had a session of seven months and another session of five months; but I think, if my hon. friend will make a bargain with me, to make an effort to stop the flow of eloquence on both sides of the House, to keep within bounds, we may hope to see summer in the country, or spring by the time the sugar flows.

Mr. FOSTER. I will go to the sugaring-up with you.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We meet at this time under a combination of happy auspices. We have not only a new parliament, but a new Governor General. It has become a trite observation that Canada has been exceptionally fortunate in the character of those who have been entrusted with the high prerogative of representing the Crown in this the first of all the British dominions beyond the seas. Our present Governor General has been received with perhaps more favour than any of his predecessors, and there is cause for this. His Excellency has the good fortune to bear a name dear to all the friends of liberty and constitutional government in every part of the empire, and especially in Canada. The illustrious name of Grey recalls the name of the great man whose persistent energy wrung from unwilling peers and a reluctant king the measure of reform which changed the face of England, which averted a revolution, and which transferred the government from a class to the nation. The name of Grey also recalls to the people of this country the illustrious names of Durham and Elgin—the name of the man whose bold genius conceived and designed the policy which has revolutionized the colonial system of England by transferring the government of Canada from the hands of a grasping oligarchy to the people themselves ; and the name of the man whose strong courage carried that policy to a successful issue. Therefore, I say we meet under a combination of happy circumstances, and there is reason to hope and expect that the illustrious name of Grey will be associated with still further blessings to the people of Canada.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to continue the line of banter which has more or less characterized the preceding speeches. I intend just for a few moments to ask the attention of the House to some incidents of the recent election in this country. If there is one thing that may be taken as a lesson to us from that election, it is this—that in it there disappeared, especially in my own province of Ontario—a province which I am glad to say did not send a majority in favour of the present government, as was stated by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald)—a number of gentlemen who forgot why they had been sent to parliament. They had forgotten what representative institutions in this country mean. They had forgotten that they were sent here to represent the people. They thought they were sent here to represent the interests of great corporations, and their constituents found them out, and they have disappeared from the public life of this country.

Without presuming to give any advice to the new men in this House, I would say to them, no matter on what side they may be, that more and more is it becoming incumbent on the representatives of the people to give some concern to the interests of the people rather than the interests of corporations. Only the other day I met a very worthy friend of mine who occupied a seat in this House in the last parliament, who came from Ontario, and supported hon. gen-

tlemen opposite. I said to him: My good friend, you made a very good impression in this House, but you devoted too much of your time to standing well with your party here, and as far as I could gather there was a good cabinet timber in you; but you forgot just one thing—that you should have devoted your time in this House rather to cultivating your constituency than to promoting your standing in your own party. Had you done so, you would not have come to grief. Well, he replied, I have learned the lesson, but learned it too late.

. It is fitting on an occasion of this kind to review for a moment the trend of parliamentary institutions in this country. There was a statement made in the 'Saturday Review,' an English publication, only a few weeks ago, in dealing with the conditions in England, which applies equally well to Canada. The remark was this, that parliament, and especially the House of Commons, was growing more and more into a mere electoral college for the re-election of a cabinet which was to conduct public affairs and introduce and carry any legislation that was to be carried. It is becoming more and more evident every day, I regret to say, that the House of Commons, whether in England or Canada, is becoming simply an electoral college for the purpose of choosing a cabinet to conduct the affairs of this country. If that is the case, is it not more incumbent on us to see that we choose for that cabinet men of the highest standing, men who have some grasp of the new and progressive ideas which are animating the people? But in that we have up to the present failed. We do not select the best men, but we rather select men who represent the provinces and the interests of great corporations. Parliament is becoming the instrument of great corporations rather than the instrument of the people to realize their wishes. Parliament does not represent the opinions of the people. There are new questions before the people, and the people are thinking about them; but I am sorry to say that the views of these people are not voiced in this parliament. In the United States the same condition exists. There they have great economic problems, great problems of transportation to deal with, and the men appointed to deal with them are not dealing with them in the interests of the people. Take the question of transportation. We have often discussed that question, but what have our discussions amounted to? More and more have the powers of the corporation increased, more and more have the grievances of the public increased in corresponding ratio, and yet parliament seems to be powerless to apply a remedy. Parliament pays too much attention to the interests of the corporations and not enough to the grievances of the people. I take it to be my duty in this parliament, as I considered it to be my duty in the last, to keep prominent the fact that parliament is an instrument whereby the grievances of the public may be remedied, and to urge upon the government to give their attention to those grievances. There is no mention in the speech from the Throne of any intention to deal with the transportation question, yet that question is more of a grievance to-day than it ever was, and more in need of some official regulations by which the great corporations will be compelled to treat the public fairly. For fifty years we have had the Grand Trunk Railway running along the lake towns of Lake Ontario, yet the people are so disappointed that they are asking the Canadian Pacific Railway to build a rival line. Surely the Railway Commission ought to be able to do something to regulate their grievances, and give the people reasonable transportation, rather than compel them to incur the expenditure involved in maintaining a rival line. Even then the grievances will not be remedied, because there will be a merger. A great question such as that should receive more attention from this parliament, but apparently the whole attention of parliament is rather given to increasing the power of the corporations and placing the people more under their rule. Instead of freeing the people, we are giving the Grand Trunk Railway greater power, in spite of the fact that that company is exercising greater tyranny in Ontario and Quebec than it ever did before. Under the statutes of this country it is bound to carry the people from Toronto to Montreal for two cents a mile. When I put a question twice last session concerning this matter, the Minister of Justice was out of his place. There can be no doubt whatever as to the existence of the law, but that law is not enforced. We are paying immense sums for the maintenance of a Department of Justice and a Department of Railways, but it is the corporations and not the people who are benefiting by the expenditure. We are told that it is not the duty of either of these departments to remedy these wrongs, and the remedy is left to private citizens. We are referred to the Railway Commission, but the government will take no action itself. Take the telephone corporation, one of the worst monopolies which could exist, and which could be brought to book in five minutes by a letter from the government. But the government instead have done their best to strengthen that monopoly. The government could say to these gentlemen: Unless that contract between it and the big railways is repealed, we will have to step in. On Saturday night, speaking in South Ontario, I told the people that if the Hon. Mr. Dryden had been true to his constituents he would have told the Bell monopoly that if they did not remedy the grievance which existed in that constituency he and his government would repeal the legislation under which that monopoly worked in

Ontario. There are a hundred ways of putting an end to monopolies if we have men enough in office willing to do it, but neither the government nor the Liberal party are prepared to do anything. Neither will take the requisite steps to secure to the people travelling between Montreal and Toronto the two-cent rate to which they are entitled. These monopolies are the curse of parliament and the country. From time to time we have the doctrine laid down that parliament ought not to interfere. But I contend that it is the duty of parliament to regulate every one of these corporations, and give a warning to any corporation which is not treating the public fairly, that it must mend its ways or we will wipe it out of existence. Instead, however, of giving these corporations a warning, we give them additional concessions every time they ask for them, and the public are told to go into the courts and recover their rights if they can, but that they need expect no assistance from the Minister of Justice or the Minister of Railways.

There is another point to which attention has been called of late, and which is well worthy of attention, and that is that in the United States, whose institutions we sometimes think but little of, they have what is known as the grand jury, which is possessed of powers of inquiry at important stages. In this country it was left to a private citizen to investigate the shameful ballot-box frauds that were attempted in the recent election. We were told that the Minister of Justice was active in the matter but still it was left to a private citizen to expose the crime that had been attempted. Had we had a grand jury system as in the United States, the Crown Attorney could have issued a warrant and an investigation could have been held. And the same with other scandals in the recent election. But, as things are, there is no promise of an investigation there is no likelihood of the air being cleared through the action of any one identified with the government.

Returning for a moment to the position of railway corporations and their influence, we find that the greatest evil prevailing in the United States to-day in connection with railroading is the granting of discriminating rates in favour of certain corporations. There are great trusts in the United States, and these have been built up by railroad discriminations. The people of the United States are trying in some way to stop these discriminations. The plan that they have adopted is that of establishing a court such as our Railway Commission. But this plan has not succeeded. The president has been forced to take up the question. iBut the public there see more and more clearly that the only substantial cure is in government ownership of the railways. And that, I believe, is equally true of this country. It is true that hon. gentlemen opposite say they do not believe in government ownership. But government ownership is the new principle of this century of which the right hon. Prime Minister professes to be the exponent. He has not read aright the sentiment of the country if he thinks that government ownership is not the only cure of the grievances arising from the operation of railways in this country and in the United States. But, instead of proposing government ownership, the right hon. gentleman leaves us in doubt. As the hon, member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has pointed out, we are entitled to an explanation in regard to our state-owned railway, the Intercolonial. Is the rumour true that that railway is to be given over to the Grand Trunk ? We know that it is true that when the opportunity presented itself recently to couple up the Canada Atlantic with our state-owned road, the government failed to improve that opportunity, thereby injuring the interests of the people and of the people's railway. The government had the opportunity of strengthening the Intercolonial, but apparently their policy is to let that road run down and turn it over to the Grand Trunk Pacific. Such a policy is not in line, I believe, with the demand of the times. The people see that there is no cure for the transportation problems of this country except in government ownership. And if gentlemen opposite think they have a mandate from the people to destroy government ownership, I venture to tell them that they are mistaken. There is a party in this country, a national, a growing party, a party favoured by the young men of Canada, which holds that the best thing that could happen to this country would be the nationalization of the Grand Trunk Pacific. And the agitation to nationalize that railway at an early stage of its career will go on. The carrying out of that policy will give hope of relief to the people, and especially to the people of Ontario and Quebec. The grievances of these people against the Grand Trunk to-day are worse than ever they were. The grievances of Toronto and Montreal, the grievances of the manufacturers and the shippers and other people who live along that line are constantly increasing, and the feeling of these people is that state-ownership of that great railway is the only cure for those grievances.

Reference has been made to the promise of increased autonomy to the Northwest. It is high time that this idea should be carried out. I hope that the measure will be a wide one, and one that will allow for the growth and development of that country. But when we speak of increased autonomy for the Northwest, I think there is something to be said of the need of greater autonomy for the Dominion. The time has come when the bounds of our powers as a country should be widened. I am not afraid of the future and of the problems it will present for solution. I am not afraid to say that Canada should be more autonomous than she is to-day. I am not afraid to say that

the time will come when the Governor General will disappear, and Canada will be an independent state under the Crown of Great Britain, and when the parliament of Canada will make the constitution of Canada, instead of that constitution being made on the other side of the water. I am not afraid to say that I hope to see the day when our own Supreme Court will be the court of final appeal. I am not afraid to say that I hope to see the day when Canada will make her own commercial treaties under the British Crown. Nor am I afraid to say that questions like this should claim some of the time of members of this House. Mention has been made here to-day of our imperial relations, and I believe a proposal will be brought before this House dealing with that subject. My ideas are changed somewhat from what I see in the press. The trend of public thought, as I read the signs of the times is in the direction of establishing a British empire made up of free and independent states under the Crown of England and working, not through a great imperial council, but through negotiations betwen the governments of these free and independent states. Therefore, it becomes more and more necessary that the governments chosen by these electoral colleges that, I am sorry to say, parliaments are becoming, should be men of the highest character, men of the most progressive ideas, men who fairly and truly represent the people. The great thing in parliamentary life is to concentrate and devote oneself to carrying into effect the views of the people who send us here, keeping their interests in view and giving effect to new and progressive ideas. In the thirty-eight years of confederation we have made great progress. But there is greater progress to be made, there are new ideas in the minds of our people to be carried into effect. There are visions to be realized; some of these visions are almost facts to-day. I trust that the new members, especially the younger men among them, will devote some of their time and their consideration to these newer questions, and especially the question of regulating the rights and powers of the corporations that have been chartered in this country.

Now, every citizen must be struck with the great progress that Canada has made. Every citizen of this country will be glad to know that our banks are becoming more and more successful, and that nearly all of them are looking forward to increasing their capital. Bank after bank is now increasing its capital, bank after bank is in a position to say that its reserve fund is almost equal to its paid-up stock. I believe that the great prosperity of the banks of the Dominion is attributable to their management. But if the banks are developing their capital and are increasing their profits, as I believe they are, has not the time come when this nation ought to share in the great prosperity attending the banks, and that the issue of national notes should be increased at least in the same proportion as the banks are prosperous and are increasing their capital? It is true that the government took power two years ago to increase the issue of national notes and take over the $5 and $10 bill circulation. To my mind I think the sentiment of Canada to-day is in favour of $5 and $10 notes being national notes, and of no others passing current in this country. That would help to uphold our currency and our banking system, it would help to uphold it in the United States where they throw discredit on our bank bills. I believe the time has come when the government, and I mean especially the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), ought to form some advance policy in regard to that subject; and I trust when the Minister of Finance returns he will be able to give us some information in regard to it.

The right hon. gentleman to-day paid a great tribute to the new Governor General, and said that his ancestors had been identified with bringing about a change of government in England from a class government to a government by the people. The same thing ought to be done in this country to-day. We have not any longer a government of the people as we ought to have. We have to-day a government of corporations, aided and abetted by the Liberal party, and there is an outcry among the people against it; and the right hon. gentleman, with the great majority he has behind him, will be neglectful of his duty, will be recreant to Liberal principles, and recreant to these examples he has held up to us of what Liberals have done in the old country, if he does not try in some way to recover the rights of the people, to compel a respect for their rights on the part of this new oligarchy that has sprung up in this country, by which I mean a government by corporations. The people are crying out for their rights. To-day the press of Canada is not free. There was a time when there was hardly a corporation owned newspaper in this Canada; to-day corporations own most of the newspapers of this country, or at least control them and use them in order to paralyse public opinion in their own interest. Let any man who is a close observer look into the inner history of these newspapers and he will be more than surprised to learn that the press, supposed to be the guardians of the people, has passed under the control of great corporations. And there is this singular thing about it, that every one, or nearly every one, of those newspapers which have passed under the control of corporations are outspoken in their support of hon. gentlemen opposite. But whether the press is identified with one party or the other, this intimacy between the press and the corporations, this intimacy between the corporations and the public men of this country, is causing the people a considerable amount of alarm.

Mr. LOGAN. The hon. gentleman means the Tory press, does he not ?

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman can tell us more about that later on. I believe he has filed a declaration in connection with his election that will bring that out, he says he is possessed of the facts. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have only this to say, that I intend throughout this session, on every reasonable occasion, and within the decorum of the House, always to press upon the House the need of giving more attention to the grievances of the public instead of devoting so much of our attention to the aggrandizement of corporations. There are public grievances, they are evident to us all, and we have a great duty to assist the people in some way to recover their rights. I am sorry that the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) thinks it is not his duty to enforce the law unless its violation has been pointed out to him. He resembles the Attorney General of Ontario, Mr. Gibson, in his conception of his duty about enforcing the law. We have a Minister of Railways, yet there seems to be no endeavour on his part or on the part of the Minister of Justice to get things in order. We have a Railway Commission to-day, and it is almost broken down. Why is not the vacancy on that commission filled ? Why is not that commission running ? There has been no reference made to it to-day. That matter may be discussed later on altogether different lines. But the fact is that to-day that Railway Commission that was to do so much is not performing its duty, it is still without a chief ; and the people all through the west, as well as the people in my own constituency, are very much concerned about that Railway Commission. Why has it not its full quota of commissioners, and why are its judgments not being rendered ? The Minister of Justice and the Minister of Railways should have had that commission in running order immediately after the resignation of Mr. Blair. For some reason it is not in running order. An explanation, I hope, will be given later on. But it all comes down to this, that there is no movement on the part of the government or any of its members to do anything to rectify public wrongs; their efforts seem all to be directed towards strengthening the corporations in their tyranny over the public interests. Now, Mr. Speaker, the people are well aware that parliament is to-day fully seized of the power to remove every grievance that exists. For every legal wrong there is a legal remedy, and parliament is the instrumentality for accomplishing that end. As I said before, it is my intention this session, and as long as I hold a seat in parliament, to direct the attention of the House to these grievances; I should try in some way to get the members of this House to come back to the basic principle of representation, to convince them that we are here to rectify grievances, to rectify the wrongs of the people, especially when those grievances and those wrongs are greater than any constitutional grievances, that we have suffered from in the past. True they may be economical grievances, but an economic and physical grievance stands in as much need of rectification as any other. The Liberal party pride themselves on having done much to remove constitutional grievances, but the economic grievances of the people have never received their attention. They have theories for dealing with the trade question, and we have heard it stated here to-day that their theories have been abandoned. As with trade, so in regard to the other things I have mentioned here to-day, you cannot deal with them theoretically, you must deal with them by legislation, not in the interests of a selected class but in the interests of the whole people.

Motion agreed to.

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

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

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) moved :

That this House will on Tuesday next go into committee of the whole to consider of a supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) moved :

That this House will on Tuesday next go into a committee of the whole to consider of the ways and means for raising a supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.

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

That Charles Marcil, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Bonaventure be appointed chairman of the committees of the whole House.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Public Accounts of Canada for the year ending June 30, 1904.—Hon. Mr. Paterson.

Trade and Navigation Tables for the Dominion of Canada for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904.—Hon. Mr. Paterson.

Report of the Census, 1901, vol. 2, relating to natural products.—Hon. Mr. Fisher.

Report of the Department of Inland Revenue for the year ending June 30, 1904 : 1, excise; 2, weights and measures, gas and electric light.—Mr. Brodeur.

The Civil Service List of Canada.—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Before that motion is carried, I was going to ask my right hon. friend as to the state of these different reports. Probably the answer has already come down with reference to our mutual friend's report, although I think the Auditor General's Report has not yet appeared. Is it supposable that it will be ready in a short time ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Auditor General's Report has not to be laid on the table immediately on the assembling of the House. He has fourteen days in which to lay his report before the House. I have not a great deal of information, but I can hardly hope that the report of the Auditor General will be laid down inside of that day.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose my right hon. friend is hardly able to say at what period the real Bill of the session will be ready for us.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, I think I may say that the Bill will be presented at an early day, but I observed from the proceedings which have taken place in caucus recently that we are to have the leader of the opposition again with us, and I think it will be proper to wait until the new leader of the opposition is seated. It is an important measure.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope my right hon. friend will not abate any of his diligence in waiting for the new leader of the opposition. He will soon be here. I would not like my right hon. friend to have that excuse for delaying an important measure of that kind. What important business will be taken up to-morrow ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To-morrow, on the motion for the adjournment, I propose to give my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) the information he has sought for in regard to the filling of that vacancy on the commission.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that all ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, that is all for to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 6.05 p.m.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, January 17, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 5) respecting Census and Statistics.—Mr. Fisher.

INSPECTION AND SALE OF SEEDS.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, That it is expedient to pass an Act respecting the inspection and sale of seeds of cereals, grasses, clovers, or forage plants, sold for the purpose of seeding, containing the seeds of certain weeds ; establishing a standard of timothy, red clover, and alsike seeds, marked No. 1, or otherwise designated as being of first quality ; providing for the examination of such seeds, and providing penalties for contraventions of the Act.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be well if the hon. gentleman would explain briefly what he proposes to do. That will at least give the appearance of some business being before the House.

Mr. FISHER. For the benefit of the new member opposite, I shall be happy to repeat the explanation which I gave in the former parliament. This bill has been called for by reason of certain information obtained as a result of a careful investigation into the business of selling seeds to our farmers. The intention is to control and regulate that business in the view of securing pure seed. This result cannot be obtained under the ordinary methods of trade, and therefore it is not possible for the purchaser at present to judge the quality of the seeds he is buying. It has therefore been found advisable to establish a standard and prevent the selling of any seeds which contain the seeds of certain varieties of weeds. Some years ago my attention as minister was drawn to the quality of the seeds sold and to the great admixture which they contain of the seeds of bad weeds. Owing to this admixture the growth of certain kinds of weeds was promoted in localities where formerly such weeds were unknown. I caused an investigation to be made, and was startled by the results. It was shown clearly that a large proportion of the seeds sold to the farmers of Canada did contain a considerable admixture of the seeds of noxious weeds ; and in the majority of cases the farmer was not only not sowing what he thought he was, but was actually sowing the seeds of plants injurious to the crop he hoped to raise. The last parliament, in view of the facts disclosed, decided that some restriction or control should be exercised over the sale of seeds, and the prin-

ciple of a bill, such as the one I propose to introduce, was adopted on two different occasions. Owing, however, to the pressure of other business, these Bills did not become law; but I hope that in introducing the present measure at this early day of the session, it will become law before this session prorogues. The provisions of the Bill are not as stringent as many think advisable, but I do not wish to proceed too rapidly. There having been practically no supervision hitherto, I think that this measure will be a great step in advance and sufficient for the present, and will, I hope, lead to the complete elimination of the spreading of weeds in Canada through the seed purchased by our farmers. Briefly, the Bill provides for the absolute prohibition of the sale of seeds which contain certain well known widely spread weeds, and it provides further for a standard of seed which shall be sold as No. 1 or of extra quality. It provides further for the imposition of penalties to be imposed for contravention of the Act.

There are some details which, I think, it unnecessary to go into at this stage, but which I shall be glad to explain and discuss when the Bill is before the Committee of the Whole, as is the usual course. I am glad to say that, on former occasions, when the Bill was discussed, the principle of it was endorsed by gentlemen of all shades of political opinion in the House. It is true that some of the provisions were considered to be too stringent, and some to be difficult of enforcement. I have taken advantage of the discussion which took place and of the representations which have been made by members on both sides of the House, and have, to a certain slight extent, modified the former Bills; and I am now proposing what I believe to be a thoroughly practical and workable measure and one which will accomplish the object sought, so far as it can be accomplished at one step by legislation.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) please tell us from what quarter the opposition to the Bill mainly came?

Mr. FISHER. I would not like to say there was any real opposition to the Bill. There was criticism of the details, and there were objections on the part of some dealers in seeds who represented that they could not carry on their business under certain provisions of the Bill that was formerly introduced. It was also thought possible that there would be danger of hardship on the part of the people who, in good faith, sold seeds at second or third hand. I think that, in the Bill which I am now proposing, I have to a large extent met these objections. But I must say frankly that if this Bill did not interfere with some of the practices of the seed trade of to-day, the Bill would be useless and unnecessary. It is because interference with the practices of some of those engaged in the seed trade is necessary that I feel I must introduce the Bill.

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

Mr. FISHER moved the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I have taken some interest in this Bill in previous sessions. This is the third consecutive year when the matter has come before us. It is incumbent upon the minister to have the legislation passed and put in force. It is hardly worth while to take up the time of the House session after session with a discussion which ends in nothing. No object is to be gained by merely affirming a given principle three years in succession.

Mr. FISHER. I hope, with the co-operation of hon. members on both sides to carry out my purpose this session and make this Bill law. I shall be disappointed indeed if this cannot be effected. Of course, as I say, I can only do this with the co-operation of the members of the House, my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) included.

Resolution reported.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

The King's Regulations and Orders for the Militia of Canada.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Report of the Department of Labour for the year ending June 30, 1904.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Report of the Postmaster General for the year ending June 30, 1904.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Ordinances of the Yukon Territory for the year 1904.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Statement in pursuance of sec. 17 of the Civil Service Insurance Act, for the year ending June 30, 1904.—Hon. Mr. Paterson.

Report of the Commissioner of the Dominion Police for the year 1904.—Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick.

ADJOURNMENT—CHAIRMANSHIP OF THE RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I stated yesterday to my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) that I would make a statement with reference to the filling of the vacancy caused by the resignation of Hon. Mr. Blair of the chairmanship of the Railway Commission. My hon. friend made some remarks yesterday on what he seemed to consider the negligence of the government on leaving that vacancy unfilled. I feel sure that when I have laid before the House the circumstances and shown why the position has not yet been filled, he will agree with me that the government is not in any way to blame. I am aware that some serious in-

convenience has resulted from the fact that the Commission is now composed of only two members. A good deal of the business of the Commission has been discharged by the present members, Messrs. Bernier and Mills. But, unfortunately, on some very important questions, especially on some relating to the city of Toronto, the Commissioners do not agree. Inconvenience has been occasioned to certain citizens of Toronto owing to the fact that no decision of the questions on which there is a difference of opinion between the members of the Commission can be reached. The government is aware that such an important position should be filled at the earliest moment. After the resignation of Mr. Blair, as soon as the government could be assembled in Ottawa—the resignation having taken place during the election—the government sought to find some person who would be suitable for the position. They came to the conclusion that it would be well to offer the chairmanship of the Commission to an eminent member of the Supreme Court, a gentleman who, I believe, is qualified in every respect to discharge the important duties which would devolve upon him. However, we were told by the gentleman in question that it was not possible for him to contemplate the acceptance of this position at that moment or for some weeks, as he believed it would not be in accordance with the duties he is now performing to leave his present position at this time. He was engaged, in the consideration of several cases which had been heard by him and by the court in the previous term, and if he accepted our offer at the moment, the cases which he had heard could not be disposed of, and great inconvenience to suitors would result. But as the gentleman informed us he could not properly consider our application till after the first week of February, we thought it only fair and right to wait until the first week of February before we approached him again, when we hope that our offer will be accepted. I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

RESIGNATION OF MR. BLAIR.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I thought in connection with this matter the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) would have made some explanation to the House and to the country of the resignation of the late chairman of the Railway Commission. It was a very sudden resignation, and took place in the midst of a political fight, and requires, as I think, an explanation to the country. In fact, the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite from the 'Globe' down to the Montreal 'Witness' are on record as demanding an explanation of that circumstance; and I trusted that the explanation would be forthcoming to-day. Probably later on in the session, and in connection with the appointment of a successor to the late chairman of the Railway Commission, we will have that explanation. It is certainly due to the country, it is certainly due to the right hon. gentleman and his friends to make that statement at the present moment. But I will wait for what is to come; certainly an explanation ought to be forthcoming, and probably will be forthcoming. As to the statement of the right hon. gentleman in seeking elsewhere and in another court for a man competent to fill the position, he is not going to work in the right way. He is robbing Peter to pay Paul, he is unmanning the Supreme Court to man the Railway Commission, which is not good policy. I do not think that it is good policy to shift the highest judicial officers from one court to another, not that I lack confidence in the competence of any member of the Supreme Court to be chairman of the Railway Commission. But it is evident now that the Railway Commission is to remain unmanned for at last three weeks more, although the great commercial interests, the great railway interests are inconvenienced by the present condition of affairs. It also follows from what the right hon. gentleman said, that the Supreme Court will then for a long period remain unmanned, without its full quota of members to enable it to discharge the duties that we expect from it. So that on the whole the explanation made here to-day is in no wise satisfactory, and I trust that a much better explanation in several directions will be offered at a very early day.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. There is another point which has been raised with regard to which the right hon. gentleman might give us some information. It has been stated in the newspapers that some cases relating to the Northwest, for instance, which were heard by three commissioners before the resignation of Mr. Blair, will have to be reheard, and that there is no provision in the Act, no method by which these cases, having once been heard before the resignation of the chairman, can be adjudged by the remainder of the commission, or by the commission when it is filled by the appointment of another and third person. That of course would lead to a great deal of delay and a great deal of hardship. If that is so, something must be wrong with the Act; if it is not so, why, of course the public will be relieved of the apprehension which has been, I think, rather widespread.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am afraid the statement which has been made by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is only too true, and that the applications which were heard by three commissioners, but which were not disposed of when Mr. Blair resigned, may have to be heard again. A new commissioner must be appointed, and, of course, before these cases are disposed of he must hear the parties for himself. That rule applies in all courts under similar circumstances. One of the reasons why the gentleman we applied to refused to take the place on the

commission vacated by Mr. Blair was that he had already heard several cases in the Supreme Court, which would have to be reheard if he suddenly resigned his position. We thought it was inevitable that some parties should suffer, and that it was better that the cases he heard should be disposed of, so that no one might be inconvenienced by the change of officers. I do not agree with my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) that in offering the position to a judge of the Supreme Court we were robbing Peter to pay Paul. I think nothing could be more in accordance with the good administration of justice, and a proper administration of the Commission, than to select a gentleman such as we have selected, who has experience not only in legal matters but also experience to a large extent in railway matters. When the time comes to make the appointment, as it will come within a short period, I think the selection will meet the approval of even our hypercritical friends on the other side of the House. I am sorry also that I cannot gratify the—what shall I say ?—the rather fastidious curiosity of my hon. friend with regard to the manner of Mr. Blair's resignation. He expected me to give him information upon that. I may say to my hon. friend, and perhaps it is notorious to him, that I was not consulted with regard to that resignation, and I am at a loss to give him any explanation of it. But since we are in the way of making confessions, I rather expected that my hon. friend would be in a position to give us some information himself, because I have read a good deal of what I supposed to be information in a certain newspaper with which my hon. friend is connected. But if the hon. gentleman was only speaking from hearsay, that is another thing. If he has any information he can give it to us; for my part I have none.

Mr. MACLEAN. The House will pardon me a moment. The hon. gentleman's friends are in possession of a great deal of evidence. The Toronto 'Globe,' the Montreal 'Herald,' Senator Dandurand—if I may mention the name of a member of the other House—have offered explanations of that resignation, and in connection with their explanations, have occurred the names of cabinet ministers in this House, and very serious charges in connection with this matter. I think, therefore, it is incumbent on the right hon. gentleman, who is the custodian, the guardian of the honour of this House, and the guardian of the honour of the highest judicial office, at least the highest paid judicial office in this country, to defend the occupant of that office and to protect the honour of the office. It is up to him to make a statement, not to me.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I have only to say that I have never heard any charges made against any member, or against any minister.

An hon. MEMBER. This is the time and place to make them.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). Yes, come on now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Nobody has come forward.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Come right on.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSTER. May we know what important business will be taken up to-morrow ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To-morrow is not a government day, it is a private member's day.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the hon. gentleman if he proposes to lay the estimates on the table of the House very soon ? We are very anxious to get to work.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not more anxious than I am. To-morrow I will be able to gratify my hon. friend's desire for work ; to-morrow the estimates will be brought down.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, January 18, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—MAIN ESTIMATES.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows :

GREY.

Government House,
Ottawa, January 18, 1905.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending June 30, 1906, and in accordance with the provisions of the B. N. A., 1867, the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs) moved that the message of His Excellency and the estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 6) to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898—Mr. L. G. McCarthy—by Mr. A. Johnston.

QUESTION.

FREE TRANSPORTATION OF HAY ON I.C.R.

Mr. KEMP—by Mr. Foster—asked :

Did the government, previous to the third day of November, 1904, give instructions permitting hay to be transported over the Intercolonial Railway free of freight charges ? If so, at what date were such instructions given ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). Instructions were given on October 6, 1904, permitting certain municipalities, under certain conditions, to have hay carried free over the Intercolonial Railway.

PAY OF THE NORTHWEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved that on Friday next the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution :

1. That it is expedient to provide that the pay of the commissioner and other members of the Northwest Mounted Police shall not exceed the amounts following :—

Commissioner of police, per annum	$3,000 00
Assistant commissioners, per annum	2,000 00
Superintendents, per annum	1,800 00
Inspectors, per annum	1,400 00
Surgeons and assistant surgeons, per annum	1,800 00
Veterinary surgeons, per annum	1,400 00
Four staff sergeants, per diem	2 00
Other staff sergeants, per diem	1 75
Other non-commissioned officers, per diem	1 25
Constables, per diem	1 00
Special constables and scouts, per diem	1 50
Buglers under 18 years of age, per diem	0 50
Working pay to artisans, per diem	0 75

2. That the Governor in Council may authorize extra pay and allowances to be paid to members of the force serving in the Yukon Territory or the unorganized portions of the Northwest Territories.

He said : This resolution has been submitted to His Excellency the Governor General, and he approves the same and commends it to the attention of the House.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose that to-morrow we shall take up the estimates.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To-morrow is not a government day. But I suppose the business in the hands of private members can hardly be ready for consideration. In that case, we shall take up the estimates, considering first the civil service.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3.15 p.m.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, January 19, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

RAILWAY STATION IN CHARLOTTETOWN.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. Has the government decided on a site for the proposed railway station in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island ? If so, where is it to be placed ?

2. If a site has not been decided upon, is the Minister of Railways going to the province to decide as to the proper site, and when ?

3. If a site has been decided upon, are tenders for construction to be called for, and when ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. No.
2. Yes, at the earliest opportunity offering.
3. Answered by number one.

VOTERS' LISTS FOR MANITOBA CONSTITUENCIES.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE asked :

Where were the voters' lists for the respective constituencies of Marquette, Selkirk, Macdonald, Portage la Prairie, Provencher, Dauphin, Lisgar, Souris, Brandon and Winnipeg printed ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

Voters' lists for the constituencies of Marquette, Selkirk, Macdonald, Portage la Prairie, Provencher, Dauphin, Lisgar, Souris, Brandon and Winnipeg were printed by the King's Printer for Canada, at Ottawa, and his imprint is upon all he printed.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. HYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the report of the special committee appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose the select standing committees ordered by this House on Thursday, the twelfth instant, as follows:—

No. 1.—ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lapointe,
Barker,	Laurence,
Belcourt,	Lavergne (Montmagny),
Bennett,	Lemieux,
Bergeron,	Lennox,
Boyce,	Lewis,
Broder,	Logan,
Bureau,	Macdonald,
Carvell,	McCarthy (Simcoe),
Clarke (Essex),	McColl,
Dubeau,	McIsaac,
Dugas,	Monk,
Emmerson,	Mulock (Sir William),
Fitzpatrick,	Northrup,

Geoffrion,
German,
Gervais,
Grant,
Guthrie,
Haggart,
Hall,
Lancaster,
Piché,
Porter,
Pringle,
Rivet,
Sifton,
Stockton,
Tisdale,
Ward.—44.

No. 2.—ON EXPIRING LAWS.

Messieurs

Archambault,
Avery,
Barr,
Black,
Bland,
Bourbonnais,
Boyer,
Carney,
Chisholm,
Copp,
Dubeau,
Ethier,
Finlayson,
Gauvreau,
Herron,
Jackson (Elgin),
Lamont,
McCool,
Martin (Queen's, P.E.I),
Mayrand,
Morin,
Paquet,
Parent,
Seagram,
Talbot (Bellechasse),
Turgeon,
Wilson (Russell).—27.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Seven Members.

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

Messieurs

Adamson,
Alcorn,
Ames,
Archambault,
Armstrong,
Avery,
Barker,
Barr,
Beauparlant,
Béland,
Belcourt,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bickerdike,
Blain,
Bland,
Bole,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Bourassa,
Bourbonnais,
Boyer,
Brabazon,
Broder,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bruneau,
Bureau,
Burrows,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Campbell,
Carvell,
Chisholm,
Christie,
Clare,
Clarke (Essex),
Clarke (Toronto),
Clements,
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Conmee,
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne,
(Drum. & Arth.),
Lavergne
(Montmagny),
Law,
Lefurgey,
Lemieux,
Lennox,
Léonard,
Lewis,
Logan,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
Macdonell,
MacLaren,
Maclean
(Lunenburg),
Maclean (York, S.),
McCarthy
(Calgary),
McCarthy
(Simcoe,)
McColl,
McCool,
McIntyre,
McIsaac,
McKenzie
(C. Breton, N.),
McLean
(Queen's, P.E.I.),
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil
(Bonaventure),
Martin
(Queen's, P.E.I.),
Mayrand,
Miller,
Monk,
Morin,
Copp,
Costigan,
Crawford,
Crocket,
Daniel,
Delisle,
Derbyshire,
Desjardins,
Dubeau,
Dugas,
Dyment,
Elson,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fitzpatrick,
Forget,
Fortier,
Foster,
Fowler,
Gallery,
Galliher,
Ganong,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gervais,
Girard,
Gladu,
Gordon,
Grant,
Greenway,
Gunn,
Guthrie,
Haggart,
Hall,
Harty,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes,
(King's, P.E.I.),
Hughes (Victoria),
Hunt,
Hyman,
Ingram,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston
(Cape Breton, S.),
Johnston
(Lambton),
Kemp,
Kennedy,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lamont,
Lancaster,
Lanctot,
Lapointe,
Laurence,
Mulock
(Sir William),
Northrup,
Oliver,
Osler,
Parmelee,
Paquet,
Parent,
Perley,
Piché,
Porter,
Power,
Préfontaine,
Pringle,
Proulx,
Ratz,
Reid (Grenville),
Riley,
Rivet,
Roche (Halifax),
Roche (Marquette),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross
(Yale-Cariboo),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schell (Glengarry),
Schell (Oxford),
Scott,
Sifton,
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Sproule,
Staples,
Stewart,
Stockton,
Sutherland
(Oxford),
Talbot
(Bellechasse),
Talbot
(Strathcona),
Telford,
Thompson,
Tisdale,
Tobin,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Walsh,
Ward,
Watson,
White,
Wilmot,
Wilson
(Len'x & Adding.),
Wilson (Russell),
Worthington,
Wright (Muskoka),
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—186.

And that the Quorum of said Committee do do consist of Twenty-five Members.

No. 4.—ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs :

Alcorn,
Ames,
Avery,
Béland,
Belcourt,
Bennett,
Hunt,
Jackson (Elgin),
Jackson (Selkirk),
Kennedy,
Lake,
Lalor,

Black,
Bole,
Bourbonnais,
Boyce,
Brabazon,
Broder,
Brodeur,
Bruneau,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Chisholm,
Christie,
Clements,
Cochrane,
Conmee,
Crawford,
Crocket,
Cyr,
Daniel,
Desjardins,
Dugas,
Dyment,
Elson,
Ethier,
Fitzpatrick,
Galliher,
Gauvreau,
Girard,
Gladu,
Gordon,
Greenway,
Gunn,
Guthrie,
Harty,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),
Lavergne (Drummond & Arth.),
LeBlanc,
Lemieux,
Logan,
Macdonell,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Maclean (York S.),
McCool,
McIsaac,
McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Martin (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Martin (Wellington),
Meigs,
Monk,
Morin,
Farent,
Power,
Pringle,
Proulx,
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Schaffner,
Schell (Glengarry),
Scott,
Sloan,
Talbot (Bellechasse),
Thompson,
Tobin,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Walsh,
White,
Worthington—79.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of Ten members.

No. 5.—ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs :

Black,
Brabazon,
Brown,
Calvert,
Chisholm,
Clare,
Clements,
Copp,
Demers (St. John),
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fortier,
Gallery,
Galliher,
Grant,
Guthrie,
Hall,
Hughes (Victoria),
Ingram,
Lake,
Lamont,
Lancaster,
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne (Drummond & Arth.),
Lavergne (Montmagny),
Law,
Lefurgey,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,
McCarthy (Calgary),
McIntyre,
McIsaac,
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin (Wellington),
Meigs,
Morin,
Reid (Restigouche),
Roche (Halifax),
Roche (Marquette),
Ross (Rimouski),
Smith (Nanaimo),
Staples,
Stewart,
Thompson,
Turgeon,
White,
Wilmot,
Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Wright (Muskoka),
Wright (Renfrew)—50.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of Seven members.

No. 6.—ON PRINTING.

Messieurs

Bennett,
Bergeron,
Clarke (Toronto),
Cyr,
Dyment,
Gervais,
Henderson,
Hughes (Victoria),
Johnston (Cape Breton, South),
Johnston (Lambton),
Lavergne (Drummond & Arth.),
Maclean (York,South),
McColl,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Oliver,
Parmelee,
Piché,
Préfontaine,
Roche (Marquette),
Ross (Yale-Caribou),
Scott,
Sutherland (Oxford),
Taylor,
Tisdale.—24.

Mr. HYMAN.

No. 7.—ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs :

Adamson,
Ames,
Barker,
Belcourt,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bickerdike,
Blain,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Burrows,
Campbell,
Carney,
Cash,
Clare,
Clark (Essex),
Clarke (Toronto),
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Costigan,
Daniel,
Demers (St. John),
Desjardins,
Emmerson,
Fielding,
Fitzpatrick,
Foster,
Fowler,
Geoffrion,
German,
Greenway,
Haggart,
Henderson,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),
Hughes (Victoria),
Hyman,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Kemp,
Kennedy,
Lancaster,
Lapointe,
Laurence,
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Law,
LeBlanc,
Lennox,
Léonard,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
McColl,
McIsaac,
McKenzie (Bruce),
McKenzie (Cape Breton, North),
Monk,
Northrup,
Oliver,
Piché,
Pickup,
Porter,
Pringle,
Reid (Restigouche),
Riley,
Rivet,
Roche (Halifax),
Savoie,
Scott,
Sifton,
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Stewart,
Taylor,
Ward,
Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Zimmerman.—75.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of Twenty-one members.

No. 8.—ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs :

Adamson,
Ames,
Archambault,
Armstrong,
Avery,
Barker,
Barr,
Beauparlant,
Béland,
Belcourt,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bickerdike,
Blain,
Bole,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Bourassa,
Boyce,
Brown,
Hyman,
Ingram,
Johnston (Cape Breton, South),
Kemp,
Kidd,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lanctot,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lavergne (Drummond & Arth.),
Law,
Lefurgey,
Lemieux,
Lewis,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Macdonell,

Bruneau,
Bureau,
Burrows,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Campbell,
Carney,
Cash,
Clark (Essex),
Clarke (Toronto),
Clements,
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Conmee,
Copp,
Costigan,
Delisle,
Demers (Lévis),
Demers (St. John),
Derbyshire,
Dubeau,
Emmerson,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Forget,
Fortier,
Foster,
Fowler,
Gallery,
Galliher,
Ganong,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Gervais,
Gladu,
Gordon,
Grant,
Greenway,
Gunn,
Haggart,
Hall,
Harty,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.).
Hughes (Victoria),
McCarthy (Calgary),
McCarthy (Simcoe),
McIntyre,
McIsaac,
McKenzie (Bruce),
McLennan,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Mayrand,
Miller,
Monk,
Morin,
Osler,
Parmelee,
Paterson,
Perley,
Pickup,
Porter,
Power,
Préfontaine,
Ratz,
Reid (Grenville),
Reid (Restigouche),
Riley,
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Rimouski),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schell (Glengarry),
Sifton,
Sinclair,
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Stewart,
Stockton,
Sutherland (Oxford),
Talbot (Bellechasse),
Taylor,
Telford,
Thompson,
Tisdale,
Tobin,
Ward,
Wilmot,
Wilson (Lennox & Adding.),
Worthington,
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—129.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of Twenty-one members.

No. 9.—ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs

Adamson,
Archambault,
Armstrong,
Barr,
Beauparlant,
Béland,
Blain,
Bland,
Bourassa,
Bourbonnais,
Boyer,
Brabazon,
Broder,
Brown,
Bureau,
Burrows,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Carvell,
Cash,
Chisholm,
Christie,
Clare,
Clements,
Cochrane,
Conmee,
Copp,
Crawford,
Crocket,
Cyr,
Delisle,
Demers (Lévis),
Derbyshire,
Desjardins,
Dugas,
Elson,
Ethier,
Finlay,
Fisher,
Gauvreau,
Girard,
Gordon,
Gunn,
Guthrie,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I),
Hughes (Victoria),
Hunt,
Ingram,
Jackson (Elgin),
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston (Lambton),
Kennedy,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lamont,
Lanctot,
Laurence,
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne (Drum. & Arth.),
LeBlanc,
Lennox,
Léonard,
Lewis,
Logan,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
MacLaren,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
McColl,
McCool,
McIntyre,
McKenzie (Bruce),
McKenzie (Cape Breton, N.),
McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Martin (Wellington),
Meigs,
Miller,
Morin,
Mulock (Sir William),
Oliver,
Paquet,
Parent,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Ratz,
Reid (Grenville),
Roche (Marquette),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schaffner,
Schell (Glengarry),
Schell (Oxford),
Scott,
Seagram,
Sinclair,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Staples,
Talbot (Bellechasse),
Talbot (Strathcona),
Taylor,
Telford,
Thompson,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Walsh,
Watson,
White,
Wilmot,
Wilson (Len'x & Adding.),
Wilson (Russell),
Worthington,
Wright (Muskoka),
Wright (Renfrew).—122.

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

INSPECTION AND SALE OF SEEDS.

Resolution respecting the inspection and sale of seeds was read the first and second time and agreed to.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 7) respecting the inspection and sale of seeds.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—STEAMSHIP COMMUNICATION BETWEEN CANADA AND MEXICO.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. Before the House goes into Committee of Supply, there are two points upon which I would like to have information, if convenient to the ministers. I noticed in newspapers of a

late date a statement that the proposed steamship communication, with mutual subsidies I suppose, between Canada and Mexico, had run up against some difficulty. The minister who has had that matter in charge is in his place, and I would like to know how it stands at present.

Sir WM. MULOCK (Postmaster General). Last spring the Mexican government agreed with the Canadian government to grant a subsidy of $50,000 in gold towards establishing two lines of steamers between Canada and Mexico, one on the Pacific ocean and the other on the Atlantic. The Canadian government, in pursuance of that understanding, asked and obtained a vote from this parliament of $50,000 last session, and the Mexican government did the same. I understand that the Department of Trade and Commerce invited tenders for both services, and received tenders; but the tenders were quite in excess of the total sum of $100,000 gold voted by the two governments.

Mr. FOSTER. Were they monthly services?

Sir WM. MULOCK. Yes, monthly sailings. Negotiations I think, were entered into by the tenderers for the Pacific service—speaking from memory, I think the names were Weir & Co., of Glasgow—with a view of making some modifications in the specifications and details. A representative of that company, after consulting with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, left him, expressing his intention of proceeding to Mexico and presenting some request to the Mexican government. I am not aware if he has yet had this interview with the Mexican government. But when I was in Mexico in the month of December last, the Mexican government informed me that they were much disappointed at the amount of money demanded for the service on the Pacific; and without explaining to me what they had definitely in view, they did suggest that the proposition for completing that contract should stand over for a short time until Sir Weetman Pearson, a very eminent engineer, a man who is carrying on very large works in Mexico for the government, should reach Mexico, and then the government of that country would discuss the subject with him with a view to proceeding with the matter. They have no desire to withdraw from it, but they seem to think that perhaps they could make some arrangements through him that would be helpful to the scheme in view. But they expressed a willingness to grant at their approaching Congress another subsidy of $50,000 in gold, if we would do the same, for the establishment of a line on the Atlantic. That would mean that the Mexican government would contribute $100,000 in gold and we would contribute $100,000 in gold, by which we would get at least a monthly sailing on the Atlantic and on the Pacific. Therefore, as I understand it, there is nothing now in the way of our completing an arrangement for the Atlantic if we can get it within the subsidy; and the Mexican government think they will be able to arrange for the completion of a similar service on the Pacific. I think we may hopefully regard the prospects and that we may have both services in operation within a reasonable time.

ARBITRATION BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not happen to understand it myself, and on asking some of my fellow members I find them to be quite as much in the dark with reference to the subject as I am, but we see frequent references in the papers to an arbitration taking place between the Dominion Government Railways and the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Under what authority is that arbitration proceeding, and will the results, in so far as the evidence is concerned, be presented to the House when the arbitration is finished? Is it by commission or by virtue of the agreements themselves between the two parties?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). The arbitration in question is being held by agreement between the government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company. The question was submitted mutually to the arbitration of three gentlemen. This occurred in 1903—I think in the fall of 1903—and the arbitration has been continuing, but the question as to submitting the evidence to this House has not been considered by myself; it has not come before me at all yet. It is sub judice at the present time.

Mr. FOSTER. Then as I understand it this is something that has taken place by virtue of the action of this government?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand that there was a difference or dispute between the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway Company as to the carrying out of the contract entered into between the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. I understand that the government entered an action in reference to it. Is this arbitration being conducted by a committee or parties appointed by the Exchequer Court, or by any other court, for the purpose of taking evidence instead of leaving the question to the courts to decide?

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). This is an arbitration in respect of differences that have arisen between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the government under diverse contracts entered into at different times. One of them was

entered into in 1879 in connection with the purchase of the line of railway from Rivière du Loup to Point Lévis, and another has arisen out of the purchase of the extension of the line from Lévis to St. Hyacinthe. The contracts themselves provided for a reference to arbitrators of any disputes that might arise under the contracts. There has been no action entered by the Crown, but the Crown has had claims against the Grand Trunk Railway arising out of what they claim to be the non-fulfilment by the company of these contracts. I am speaking from memory but I think it would be better that I should bring down the references.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That would be more satisfactory because this occurred two years ago and I cannot recollect the particular terms of the references.

Mr. BARKER. I think that last session the hon. Minister of Justice did bring down several papers relating to these arbitrations.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not remember.

Mr. BARKER. Or perhaps the right hon. First Minister did, and in these papers I think there was a very considerable claim made by the government in respect to the diversion by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of traffic that ought to have been given by the Grand Trunk Railway Company to the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They arose out of the agreements in connection with the purchase of the Drummond County Railway.

PURCHASE OF THE CANADA ATLANTIC RAILWAY.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. I notice by the papers the alleged purchase by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of the Canada Atlantic Railway. I wish to know whether the government are parties to that contract, or if they have entered into any arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company for running Intercolonial Railway trains over that part of the Canada Atlantic Railway which has been purchased by the Grand Trunk Railway, or whether this is a transaction entirely between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Canada Atlantic Railway Company?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). As far as we know it is entirely between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Canada Atlantic Railway. The government has nothing to do with it.

Motion agreed to and House went into Committee of Supply.

Charges of management, $241,400.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. minister would be kind enough to leave item No. 1 as I should like to have the hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) here when it is taken up, and allow us to go on with No. 2, we may get through with that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Item No. 1 stands.

Civil government—Governor General's Secretary's office, salaries, $11,450.

Mr. FOSTER. What changes are there?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). There is an increase of $200.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is that?

Mr. PATERSON. Page eleven, I think.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Page eight.

Mr. FOSTER. I have the page, but I have not the names of the parties who are receiving the increases or the reasons why the increases are granted.

Mr. HAGGART. I would suggest that instead of passing them en bloc we follow the course we always pursue and pass every item separately.

Mr. PATERSON. There are four statutory increases. Does the hon. gentleman want to know the names?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, we are very anxious to have all the information.

Mr. PATERSON. The names have not been asked for before and the officer has not therefore asked for them but he can do so. These are four of the clerks who are employed there and who are getting statutory increases.

Mr. FOSTER. $50 each?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. To which they are entitled?

Mr. PATERSON. To which they are entitled.

Mr. FOSTER. Has there been a report from the chief of the branch on the matter?

Mr. PATERSON. The Governor General's secretary applied for the increases.

Clerical and other assistance, $2,000.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an increase of $100 in this and we should like to have some explanation of it.

Mr. PATERSON. My opinion is that some of the officers who are paid out of contingencies are getting an increase.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to be at all unreasonable but every department in asking for supplies should at least give a schedule of the changes in the votes so that the minister who has the estimates in charge will be able to give information.

Mr. PATERSON. I have no doubt that where a minister is at the head of the department that will be done.

Mr. FOSTER. Sometimes even the somewhat irresponsible departments have to be curbed a little.

Printing and stationery, $1,200; sundries, $12,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How much of the vote for sundries was spent last year?

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot tell that.

Mr. FOSTER. That is also a piece of information which sometimes is very valuable, for a department may perhaps be running along with $2,000 or $3,000 more in the estimates than they are using and this is a great temptation to extravagance.

Privy Council office—salaries, &c., $34,800.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall read a list of the officers who come under this vote. There is no explanation to give as to the chief clerk.

Mr. FOSTER. The same chief clerk Mr. McGee?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, the same, Mr. McGee. The assistant clerk, Mr. Boudreau, who is also acting as my chief private secretary receives a statutory increase of $50. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, Mr. Lamothe, I think is at the maximum of his class, $2,500. There are two chief clerks who receive statutory increases of $50 each. They are Mr. Bennetts, an old employee, and Mr. Foley, who acts as assistant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. There are two first-class clerks at $1,500. There is here a decrease of $350 owing to the fact that an entire change has been made. The chief clerks last year were Mr. Lelièvre, who has been transferred to the Senate, and I think Mr. Foley who has been promoted, and instead of giving the salaries that were paid last year we give $1,500 which is about the minimun. Of the second-class clerks two are at the maximum so there is no increase in their case but the other seven second-class clerks receive the statutory increase, and it is the same with the junior classes. The allowance for the private secretaries is the same. There are two messengers instead of four. It would appear that there is to be some economy here, but I am sorry to say I do not deserve any credit for that as there is no change in reality. I must say that I am not yet up to all the mysteries of the Civil Service Act, but I understand from Mr. McGee that the two junior messengers whom we have are not permanent and cannot be paid out of the general fund, but have to be paid out of the contingent fund so that although there is a decrease of $1,000 in this vote there is an increase of $1,000 in the contingencies. The Auditor General would not pay these officials out of the vote for last year.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has explained that these increases have been statutory increases. Is it the rule now that all clerks get their regular statutory increases if their duties have been reasonably well performed, until they reach their maximum?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I can only say that in my own department we have given statutory increases to all except one man whom we thought did not deserve the increase. The others who were satisfactory have received them.

Mr. FOSTER. That is in the right hon. gentleman's own department?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Contingencies, clerical and other assistance, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act, $4,000.

Mr. BARKER. What is covered in this case by that expression 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.'

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is to cover expenditures which have been going on for the last 15 years. Perhaps my hon. friend will remember that there is some clerical work being done in the Privy Council Department by parties who do not come technically within the rules of the Civil Service Act and they have not been disturbed.

Department of Justice—salaries, $41,415.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an increase of $400 in the item for chief clerks, but there are four chief clerks.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There are four chief clerks of whom two, Mr. Power and Mr. Fraser have got even beyond the maximum of their class, they are paid $2,800 under a special vote which I obtained a couple of years ago so that so far as these are concerned, there is no statutory increase. The other two Messrs. Hecker and Gisborne received the statutory increase. The statutory increases in my department are always granted upon the report of the deputy head of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. As to satisfactory service?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Nine first-class clerks, $14,975.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. These are Messrs. Leslie, Coté, Chisholm, Narraway, Clarke, Lane, Pownall, Mullin and Verret, each of whom receives the usual statutory increase of $50 except Mr. Leslie, who receives $25, which will bring him to the maximum of his class.

Five second-class clerks, $6,650.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. These are Messrs. Creighton, Burpee, Harris, Belanger and Miss Armstrong, who each receive $50 increase except Mr. Creighton, who gets $25, which will bring him up to the maximum of his class.

Three junior second-class clerks, $2,637.50.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. These are the same as before, except that each receives the statutory increase of $50.

Mr. FOSTER. Each of two, because the increase is only $100.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That must be a mistake.

Allowance for private secretary to the minister, $600.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is the usual amount.

Allowance for private secretary to the Solicitor General, $600.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the minister of that department ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The Minister of Justice is supposed to be the minister, but since the appointment of a Solicitor General, he has always been considered entitled to a private secretary.

Mr. FOSTER. So that the minister really has two.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, one private secretary to the Solicitor General and one to the minister.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the Solicitor General now ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The Hon. Mr. Lemieux.

Two messengers, $1,340.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. These are Messrs. Morse and Picken, with the usual statutory increase of $50 each.

Department of Justice, contingencies—clerical and other assistance, $2,500.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This is to provide for payment of extra clerks and messengers and for copying or other work which may be required in emergencies, such as press of work, vacations and sickness of the regular staff, &c. The amount expended in 1903-4 was $1,953.26.

Department of Justice, contingencies—printing and stationery, $4,200.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This is to cover stationery, printing and binding of statutes, books, forms, &c., used by the department. The amount expended in 1903-4 was $6,-117.49.

Mr. FOSTER. How does the minister defend the expenditure of more than the vote ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That I cannot explain.

Mr. FOSTER. Where did you get the money ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend can explain how it was got in the old days.

Mr. FOSTER. We have a new regime now. Will the minister make a note of that ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will.

Department of Justice, contingencies—sundries, $5,700.

Mr. FOSTER. What of that was expended ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The principal payments are for travelling expenses, telegrams, postage, newspapers, telephone messages, cab-hire and other petty expenses. The amount expended in 1903-04 was $5,-136.32.

Mr. FOSTER. May be you cribbed a little of that.

Department of the Secretary of State—two chief clerks, $4,500.

Mr. FOSTER. Is one of these at the maximum ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, and the other has the statutory increase.

Seven first-class clerks, $12,650.

Mr. FOSTER. There must have been some changes here ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, one of the first-class has been promoted to a chief clerkship.

Mr. FOSTER. How did the vacancy come in the chief clerkship ?

Mr. PATERSON. By the retirement of Mr. Audet, the keeper of the records, who was superannuated.

Mr. FOSTER. At what age ?

Mr. PATERSON. Over 60.

Mr. FOSTER. Was he in good health or how came it that he was superannuated ?

Mr. PATERSON. He asked for superannuation some time ago on account of ill-health.

Mr. FOSTER. And a first-class clerk was put into the vacancy ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, and of course at a lower salary.

Mr. FOSTER. Who was the first-class clerk ?

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Colson.

Eight second-class clerks, $11,225.

Mr. FOSTER. What are these ?

Mr. PATERSON. The promotion of course left a vacancy to which a second-class clerk went up at a lower salary.

Mr. FOSTER. Who was promoted ?

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Roy.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the practice of this department as regards statutory in-

creases ? Are they given on the recommendation of the deputy ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes. All who were entitled to the increase were granted it.

Seven junior second-class clerks, $6,500.

Mr. FOSTER. There is one clerk less here.

Mr. PATERSON. We are able to dispense with one.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a good example.

Contingencies, Secretary of State's Department—clerical assistance, $2,655.

Mr. FOSTER. We are not out of the woods yet. Here comes an increase.

Mr. PATERSON. That is caused by the appointment of an extra clerk who gets $600 with the statutory increase, and there has been one clerk dropped.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this just for the year, or will it be permanent ?

Mr. PATERSON. It will probably continue.

Mr. FOSTER. It is paid under Civil Service Rules ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, he has passed the examination.

Board of Civil Service Examiners and other expenses under the Civil Service Act, including $400 for the secretary and $150 for a clerk, all of which sums may be paid notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $3,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Who are the examiners now ?

Mr. PATERSON. There has been no change in ten years.

Mr. FOSTER. How many applicants are now on the list ?

Mr. PATERSON. I am told there were 900 applicants this year for examination.

Mr. FOSTER. Did they all get through ?

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot say. The examiners' report will show that.

Mr. BERGERON. I happened to go through the Library and found there an interesting book called the 'Royal Tour in Canada', in 1901, describing the tour of their Royal Highnesses, the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York, by Mr. Joseph Pope, C.M.G. I asked for a French copy, but there was none to be had. I suppose that books of that kind are sent around to different libraries. I was anxious to have a French copy——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not understanding English ?

Mr. BERGERON. Not altogether for that reason. I found that the work had been translated into French a couple of years ago, but the French edition is not yet printed. Why has not this been done and the book put in form so that it may be sent around to the different libraries, as has been done with the English copy ?

Mr. PATERSON. The Printing Bureau had so much to do with the voters' lists and other work that this work was held over, but the intention is to have it done as soon as possible.

Department of Public Printing and Stationery—salaries, $40,700.

Mr. BARKER. Are you creating another second-class clerk ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. Have you followed the procedure prescribed by the Act ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. Has the deputy minister reported on the necessity of this clerkship ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. And has that report been approved by the minister ?

Mr. PATERSON. Undoubtedly.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an increase in the item of junior second-class clerks.

Mr. PATERSON. One messenger has been made a junior clerk.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it is proposed to do with one messenger less ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Department of Public Printing, &c.—cleaning, $2,500.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an increase. What has happened that they require so much more cleaning up ?

Mr. PATERSON. It is not that there is more cleaning up required, but that there has been an increase in the pay given to the charwomen of from 50 cents to 75 cents a day.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the increase made just before the elections ?

Mr. PATERSON. It was a general advance. It was not confined to this department.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it looks suspicious to see a large increase just before the elections.

Mr. PATERSON. It was about six months ago.

Mr. FOSTER. Just about the time preparations for the elections were being made.

Mr. PATERSON. The next is the Department of the Interior, but we cannot go on with that, as the minister (Mr. Sifton) is not here.

Mr. FOSTER. When is the minister expected to be home ?

Mr. PATERSON. About the 28th, I am told.

Office of the Auditor General—salaries, $51,787.50.

Mr. BERGERON. There is an increase here.

Mr. PATERSON. Provision is made for an additional chief clerk.

Mr. BARKER. I suppose that this chief clerk was added in the regular way ?

Mr. PATERSON. I have no doubt that the Auditor General would see to it that it was done in the regular way.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the meaning of the change ?

Mr. PATERSON. I will give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) the explanation that the Auditor General has given me. There is provision for an additional chief clerk, that is the one we are discussing now. He is expected to do work in connection with payments for the transcontinental railway. We need to have an additional officer in connection with the auditing of those accounts. There is also provision for eleven third-class clerks, who are not, however, to be new employees, they are now temporary, and are not to have their pay increased. Those eleven are in the service now, but he thinks it would be more desirable to place them upon the permanent list.

Mr. FOSTER. But that explanation requires a modification, because you see that the eleven third-class clerks are to cost at first $6,050 ; there is a reduction of only $4,000 in clerical and other assistance. Now are those third-class clerks ? They must be, when they are put in the clerical list, or they must be getting a larger salary than they did last year. Have you the names of those ?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I think probably you had better let that stand and get full information.

Mr. PATERSON. He told me he would be here, but he is not.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose we are to conclude that all this great interest in auditing is due to the Grand Trunk Pacific ?

Mr. PATERSON. No, not entirely.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is to be the new chief clerk ?

Mr. PATERSON. The Auditor General has full power to appoint him. I have given all the information the auditor seemed to think was necessary.

Mr. FOSTER. I think this item had better stand.

Mr. PATERSON. Then we will take Northwest Mounted Police.

Item allowed to stand.

Office of the Comptroller of the Northwest Mounted Police — salaries and contingencies, $16,225.

Mr. FOSTER. The same comptroller ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The same comptroller, Mr. Fred. White. The chief clerk is the same, first-class clerk is the same—there are no changes except in the statutory increases.

Department of Finance and Treasury Board—salaries, $57,865.

Mr. FOSTER. Is Mr. Courtney the deputy minister yet ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood that he was expressing a desire to be relieved.

Mr. PATERSON. He is still deputy minister.

Mr. FOSTER. There was some one who went in there and went out again.

Mr. PATERSON. There was a Mr. Ross who was in there for a time. There are five chief clerks; two increases, I suppose they are statutory increases.

Mr. FOSTER. Who are the chief clerks now ?

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Fowler, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Boville, Mr. Treadwell and Mr. Low.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an increase of $600 in first-class clerks— what is the explanation ?

Mr. PATERSON. I have not an explanation before me that is satisfactory to myself. The department is satisfied there is no increase asked for except the statutory increase. But I cannot explain that now, we will get it for you later.

Mr. FOSTER. Better let it stand. I am sure it is not the fault of the Minister of Finance, it is the fault of the minister who is in charge. Then there are two messengers, showing an increase of $100. Clerical and other assistance, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $5,000. What is done with that ?

Mr. PATERSON. These two messengers have not passed their civil service examination.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we had better let that stand, as the minister has not an explanation.

Item allowed to stand.

Department of Customs—salaries, $67,385.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the assistant commissioner ?

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Bain. Three chief clerks, one at $2,250, one at $2,050 and one at $2,000. They are statutory increases.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the policy of the hon. minister in his department as to statutory increases ?

Mr. PATERSON. Statutory increases are given to all this year. They have all been very deserving, and all who are not at the maximum have been given their statutory increases.

Eight first-class clerks, two at $1,900, one at $1,700, one at $1,600, four at $1,550, $13,300.

Mr. PATERSON. Messrs. Saunders, Bliss, Watson, Bristol, Gleeson and Frost.

Fifteen second-class clerks, three at $1,500 one at $1,450, three at $1,350, two at $1,300, three at $1,250, three at $1,200, $19,950.

Mr. FOSTER. Here is a large increase in high class clerks.

Mr. PATERSON. These are the second-class clerks. This is to provide for statutory increases to Messrs. Ackers, Campbell, Grafton, Roper and Rorke, $50 each. Then there are statutory increases from the first of January to three clerks, Messrs. Russell, Courtney and Dunlevie, of $25 each. There is a statutory increase of $50 to Mr. Lafontaine, and in addition there is $25 to cover a short estimate for this clerk in 1904-5. His salary was estimated in 1904-5 for an increase from the 1st of January, while the increase actually took place from the 1st of July. The salaries of the remaining two old clerks, Messrs. Goodspeed and Telford, were estimated in 1904-5 at $1,250 in error, as their salaries were only $1,200, so that the statutory increases for 1905-6 are provided by leaving the estimates for their salaries the same as they were in 1904-5. All the clerks in this class are to receive their statutory increases. Then I am making provision for four additional second-class clerks, three at $1,200 and one at $1,250, making an increase of $4,850.

Mr. BARKER. Did Mr. McDougald report the necessity for that additional number of second-class clerks ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, Mr. McDougald prepared this himself.

Mr. BARKER. I mean did Mr. McDougald make a formal report under the statute? Did he make a formal report that the department needed four additional second-class clerks ?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know whether he put it in writing or not, but he made a full report. He prepared this himself.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman knows what the statute says. There may be no steps taken without his report.

Mr. PATERSON. He prepares these recommendations in his own writing, and brings them in.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not make any difference.

Mr. PATERSON.

Mr. HAGGART. There is more than that required. You require not only the report of the deputy head, but the approval of Council, before you can bring that estimate down.

Mr. PATERSON. It is prepared by the deputy head and approved by Council.

Mr. HAGGART. Has that been done ?

Mr. PATERSON. Certainly ; these estimates have to pass Council.

Mr. HAGGART. But the hon. minister knows better than that. First of all, before your estimates are prepared you have to get the consent of Council to the addition, and you must have the report of the deputy head saying that this addition is required. Has that been done ? And what is the report ?

Mr. BARKER. Section 19 of the Act relating to the civil service is this :

A second-class clerkship shall only be created by Order in Council passed on the report of the deputy head, concurred in by the head of the department, setting forth the reasons for creating the office, and after the salary has been voted by parliament.

Mr. PATERSON. After the salary is voted by parliament that will be done.

Mr. BARKER. Yes, but I understood the hon. minister to say that the offices had been created and the men appointed.

Mr. PATERSON. No. The deputy recommends this.

Mr. BARKER. Do I understand that Mr. McDougald, the deputy, has not reported recommending this increase ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, he has recommended it for submission, and what the hon. gentleman is reading now as being required after the salaries are voted will be complied with. That provision of the law is to be complied with after the salaries are voted.

Mr. BARKER. I asked the hon. gentleman a few moments ago whether Mr. McDougald had reported in favour of these increases, and I understood the hon. minister to say that he had. Now it turns out that he has not.

Mr. PATERSON. Certainly he has. He prepared the estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. PATERSON. We had all this debated last year.

Mr. FOSTER. There may have been many things up last year which will be up again. The hon. minister himself was up last year many times, and I apprehend that before he is through on the 1st of May he will be up many times again. But the hon. minister is asking for a certain amount of money. He says that certain formulas

have been complied with, and that if you will give us the money we will proceed and put on the clerks. That is all very good, but the representatives hold the purse strings, and when he comes to have them unloosened to the extent of four second-class clerks, the hon. minister has to give some reasonable reason why four second-class clerks are necessary.

Mr. PATERSON. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. Why are they necessary ?

Mr. PATERSON. That is right, there is no doubt ; but that is not the point that my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) was examining. I may say in a general way that owing to the provisions of what is known familiarly as the Dumping Clause Act, and the regulations that we have had to make, and the steps we have had to take, in order to ensure compliance with the law, additions to the staff have been necessitated. We feel sure that we cannot get along with less than this number if the work is to be done efficiently, as no doubt it is desired to be done. Therefore, we propose to transfer, if the committee sanctions this expenditure that we are asking for, from the outside staff of the Board of Customs four officers. The Board of Customs is connected with and is paid for out of the outside vote, the reason being because the work which is done here now in Ottawa in the central office is really outside work that used to be done at the ports in days gone by. But when it was thought desirable to get out a statement of exports and imports and of the general trade and commerce of the country once a month, and it could only be accomplished by bringing those who were engaged in the work of the outside ports to Ottawa and having all the information furnished here, it was decided to make that change. Therefore, there are men in the office who are well qualified for the inside service for the checking of invoices and so on, and that work will now be done more thoroughly than heretofore, and it has been thought desirable to bring some of the gentlemen who have had experience in dealing with these matters from the outside to the inside service.

Mr. FOSTER. These four men you propose to transfer ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes ; they have been engaged in this work for some time past. They have been engaged here doing the work, but they have been paid out of the vote for outside work. As this work may properly be considered to be inside work, I think it would be more regular that we should ask that they be placed on the permanent list in the inside service, and that they should be paid from the inside vote, and therefore we come before parliament with this vote. The gentlemen we propose to transfer from the outside staff of the Board of Customs and whose salaries we propose shall be paid from the vote of the inside service are Messrs. Heintz, McCaffrey, Richards and Ross. Mr. Heintz entered the service in Winnipeg in June, 1882. Mr. McCaffrey entered the service at Montreal in September, 1884. Mr. Richards entered the service at Fredericton in 1878, and Mr. Ross at Rossland in July, 1898. As I was explaining to the hon. gentleman, we established the statistical branch here. These gentlemen had been engaged in compiling the statistics at the various ports I have mentioned. When we transferred all of this work to the statistical office at Ottawa we brought here the officers who were doing the work at these different ports, as they were not required at the ports, and having had large experience, we have assigned them to important work in the check department.

Mr. FOSTER. What salaries do they receive ?

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Heintz, and Mr. McCaffrey receive $1,200, Mr. Richards $1,200, and Mr. Ross $1,250.

Mr. FOSTER. Do they start here with the same salary as they had outside ?

Mr. PATERSON. I think they do. Coming into the inside service they will get the statutory increase, which does not apply to the outside service.

Mr. FOSTER. What kind of work is imposed on them by the dumping clause ? Are they dumping up in Winnipeg ?

Mr. PATERSON. No. It has always been the law of Canada since confederation, that the duties should be levied upon the value of the articles in the country of export at the time of export. It is our duty to see that that is done. An improvement, as I consider it, was made a few years ago. The old system was that a person buying goods from a foreign country and importing them had to have affixed to the invoice a certificate made by the party from whom he purchased the goods, certifying that the price given was correct. The seller might sell the goods at from ten to twenty per cent below the current market price to the Canadian customer, and that being a bona fide transaction between himself and the buyer he could quite honestly attach the certificate because it was correct as to the transaction between the two individuals, and we of course never questioned the right of a man to sell his goods at any price he chose, but the law imposes on the department the duty of saying that the duty must be levied upon the value of the goods as sold in the country of export. Therefore that certificate was changed and it was required that the exporter should certify that the prices mentioned were the prices at which the goods were sold in the country of export, and if there was any variation in that regard it was noted in the

margin. That helped us a good deal to secure the duties that were required under the law better than they had been secured before that time. But, when parliament adopted as additional taxation 50 per cent of the amount of cutting if you allow that expression, it became even more important than before that we should secure all information that would not harass trade, but would enable us to carry out the law as it was intended. We have therefore required under the new regulations more than one invoice. Hitherto two copies of the invoice came to this country. The merchant kept one himself and the law required that one should be furnished the customs and should be left at the port of entry. The entry was all that reached the department here. The entry would be scrutinized by the check department, and if they thought from anything in the descriptions that the local officer had not been able to ascertain the correct value for duty, the port had to be written to to forward the invoice, which then had to be examined here by the check clerk, and if it was found that an error had been made the importer would be written to.

Mr. FOSTER. An error in what way ?

Mr. PATERSON. For instance if the port officer had allowed articles to pass at a certain value which was an honest value as between buyer and seller but was not the value required by law on which the duty should be paid. When an error of this kind was discovered, a call would be made upon the importer who had made the entry in good faith to amend the entry and pay the difference. That entailed time and a good deal of irritation on the part of merchants because when an error occurred at a distant point, a good deal of time was lost in correspondence and by the time the demand was made for the additional duty, the merchant might have marked the goods and sold them, allowing for duty at the lower rate. We therefore thought that it was desirable to ask for two copies of the invoice. This of course caused a little irritation at the time as all customs changes do, but I myself thought that this change was required long ago. One copy of the invoice is kept at the port of entry as before, but the other copy comes to the central office, so that day by day we have the entries to scrutinize, whereas previously we had to write to the port for each individual entry when required. If any failure to appreciate the requirements of the law on the part of the local collector is discovered we can notify him quickly, and in this way we have done away with a great deal of the irritation that was caused by asking a man to amend an entry perhaps two weeks after it was made. In order to do this we have required additional help and the staff has been increased in that way. I think that parliament will see that the trade and commerce of the country and the revenue warrant us in asking this additional help.

Mr. PATERSON.

Mr. FOSTER. But you will require people in the places of those whom you have transferred to Ottawa, Mr. Heintz for instance who was transferred from Winnipeg.

Mr. PATERSON. No. Before the statistical branch was established four or five years ago, Mr. Heintz was engaged in compiling these statistics at Winnipeg. Now they are compiled here, his work is done here, and we brought him from Winnipeg here to do the same work. Now, that we have taken him from the statistical branch and placed him in the check department, we have had to fill his place in the statistical department. We consider that the checking branch is more important inasmuch as revenue is involved in its work, and we desire to have experienced men in it ; we can better place the new men in the statistical department.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the point I wish to make, that you have filled their places. Suppose that goods are brought in say at Shelburne, in Nova Scotia. One invoice is displayed there, the local officer passes upon it and collects the duty. Then a duplicate of the invoice and the entry is sent to Ottawa. All this supposes two things, that the local man in Shelburne shall have a knowledge of the current sale prices, say in Austria or Birmingham, or wherever the goods are bought. The difficulty seems to be how he is to know whether the prices that are on the invoice are simply the dealing prices between the seller and the buyer or the current prices at which the goods are sold in the market where they are bought. Does the local man, in Shelburne, or Guysboro', or anywhere else in this country, have a sufficient knowledge to adjudicate in a matter of that kind ? If so, how does he get it ? I suppose that here in Ottawa you are better armed and equipped ; the men here do know. Have they an ubiquitous intuition as to the current prices of the goods in the country from which they are imported ? There must be a great deal of haphazard in the matter, and delay and dissatisfaction. After all, does not the hon. gentleman find a great deal of difficulty of getting at these current prices, and what machinery has he for doing it ?

Mr. PATERSON. There is difficulty, of course, even in our larger offices, where our regular appraisers are very well posted. The way the matter is attended to is this : One of our new regulations, which I omitted to mention before, is the one that was complained of a little in Great Britain. English merchants, who are accustomed to free trade and who are not hampered with any customs regulations, did not seem to see the necessity of it. Under the new system, if there is any change in the price, we not only require the exporter to note it on the margin of the certificate, but we have double columns in which we require him to

enter the price at which the goods are sold in the country of export and the price at which they are sold to the Canadian importer. They said: What is the use of filling out the second column when the prices are the same ? Our reason for that is this : Hitherto they had to make a declaration that there was no change in the prices. That was apt sometimes to be performed in a perfunctory manner by a careless house, which would put its stamp on the declaration ; but greater care is likely to be exercised when the price of each item has to be entered in two columns, and the exporter has to make a declaration that these entries are true and correct. If he puts down prices that are not correct, he is, of course, liable to all the penalties under the customs law, which are very severe. So that all the collectors now have invoices with these double columns, in which are entered opposite each item the price at which the goods are sold in the country of export, and the price at which they are sold to the Canadian consumer. Where there is a difference between the two, the collector adds the difference to the duty, but not exceeding fifty per cent of the duty on the article. I do not think it is a hardship. I think the English merchants who expressed some vexation with it, have realized that our regulations must be general in their nature, and that exceptions cannot be made in favour of one country over another. I think the department has succeeded in establishing pretty safe checks, which, when the system is understood and in practice for a time, will be found not to be harassing at all, either to exporter or importer. The collector relies necessarily on the invoice being bona fide in the first place. Our staff, I may say, has been increased, for we have thought it necessary to establish, in the country to the south of us, special agents, whose duty it is to ascertain and to put forward to the department here, the values of all leading articles. We have these agents at New York, Chicago, Boston, Seattle and Cleveland. These cities are their headquarters, but they cover the whole country among them. What is called the cutting of prices is more in vogue on the other side of the line than in England. The information in regard to leading lines is coming to us daily, and is sent by circular to the different local officers. This, in a general way, is, I think, the information the hon. gentleman wants. That we are deceived sometimes is possible; it is impossible that it can be otherwise; but we have taken all the precautions that we thought necessary. If any one passes a wrong entry, either designedly or in error, the matter does not end with the passing of the entry. There is no limit to the time that we can follow the importers for the duty itself; but we can follow them for three years for the penalties, which in the extreme amount to the forfeiture of the goods. Therefore, people will be careful, at any rate, houses with a reputation and standing, both importers and exporters, to make proper entries.

Mr. FOSTER. All this makes me very reflective. I could not help thinking, when I was following the hon. minister's, I must say, clear and thorough explanation, how many of his old lessons he must have had to put behind him.

Mr. PATERSON. I have learned something.

Mr. FOSTER. He who has sat at the feet, not of Gamaliel, but of Sir Richard Cartwright, who in some matters is far ahead of Gamaliel, who has heard him talk of the virtues of free trade and how delightful and necessary it was that you should buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest—after all you have done, by one-sided preferential trade and the like, to encourage colonial and imperial favouritism and goodwill to each other, you absolutely make it impossible that an Englishman should sell to a poor Canadian at a lower price than to a German. If he wants to give a Canadian a good bargain, you prevent him. You will not let him sell to a Canadian at a cent less than to one of his own fellow-Englishmen or to a foreigner. What a large amount of conversion must have been going on in the mind of the hon. gentleman to cause him to adopt any such policy.

Mr. PATERSON. There has been no conversion because under our policy, if you can suppose an English merchant selling to a Canadian at less than he does to others, we simply charge an extra tariff and give a portion of the benefit to the treasury. But if the hon. gentleman had his way, he would double the duty against the Englishman and make it impossible for him to sell to us at all. We only collect an extra duty when the English merchants are able to sell at a lower rate. The duty of 30 per cent might become a duty of 35 per cent, but the hon. gentleman would make it fifty per cent. With us when the prices are so cheap, instead of the consumer getting the whole benefit, the treasury gets a portion and we are able to reduce taxation in another direction.

Mr. FOSTER. You will be a pretty good protectionist shortly.

Department of Customs—junior second-class clerks, one at $1,100, one at $1,050, three at $1,000, one at $950, five at $900, six at $850, two at $800, $17,300.

Mr. BARKER. I wish to call the attention of the minister again to the statute with reference to this item. The minister knows it is not a new question. We have had it up during several sessions, and I have not yet been able to convince the hon. gentleman or any of his colleagues that

they ought to comply with the statute regarding these increases. I presume that the Civil Service Act was passed with some definite object. The clear intent of the statute was to put the responsibility for these increases upon, not the minister, but the permanent heads of the departments, as being the ones who know to what extent such increases are necessary. The permanent head of the department is required to make a report, that report has to be approved by the minister himself, then parliament votes the money; and after all that is done, an Order in Council is passed creating the new clerkship. If you take section 15 of the Act, you cannot have any doubt as to the intention of parliament. Section 15 relates to the chief clerkships, and all the other sections follow in the same words, though not divided in the same way. That section provides that a new clerkship in any department shall only be created by Order in Council, to be passed after certain procedure has been followed. Three things must first be done. The deputy head must first report that such an officer is necessary for the proper performance of the public business in the department interested and must state the reasons on which he has arrived at that conclusion. That surely does not mean that the deputy or permanent head of the department must simply look at the item and not express any dissent. He is expected to make a formal report to the minister giving the reasons for the increase. That being done, the minister must approve of his report or it can go no further. Having given his approval, the money must be voted by parliament, but what does the minister do? He reverses all that. He first comes to parliament and asks for a vote. But how ridiculous would it not be for parliament to vote the money and then have the permanent head refuse to take the responsibility of recommending that the extra clerks are essential to the working of the department. The procedure required by the Act is however reversed, and we are told that because the deputy minister has seen the item and has not objected to it, that is a sufficient compliance with the Act. Surely the minister will not pretend that that is a compliance with the statute. I would like the Minister of Justice to say whether he thinks it is? Here we have a $12,000 increase in these two items in the Customs Department, and we are entitled to ask the Minister of Justice whether the Minister of Customs has complied with the law?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This question was up for consideration several times during the previous session, being raised by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker). At the time, it appeared to me that the statute was perfectly clear? As I understand it, in the first place, the minister comes to parliament for a money vote to enable him to create a clerkship, of whatever class it may be. If parliament approves the suggestion of the minister and supplies the money, it is upon the condition that the deputy head—the permanent head, as my hon. friend calls him—shall make his report, and that report, confirmed by Council will be the justification for the minister to apply the money voted by parliament. This, it seems to me, is the clear meaning of the section. But, at the time the point was raised, in view of the argument put forward by my hon. friend, I thought it well to consult the deputy Minister of Justice, who has been in charge of the department for many years—ever since 1890 or 1891, I think. And he told me that this was the practise that had been invariably followed.

Mr. BARKER. But it does not follow that it is right.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And the deputy minister, excellent lawyer that he is, says that the section does not admit of any doubt, in his opinion.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the meaning of the seven new clerks?

Mr. PATERSON. That is the transfer of seven clerks from the outside staff of the Customs to the inside staff, at the following salaries: 1 at $1,050; 2 at $1,000; 2 at $900 and 2 at $850.

Mr. FOSTER. And you have diminished the number of third-class clerks by four. Where have they disappeared to?

Mr. PATERSON. One, Mme. Jolivet, has been transferred to Quebec; two have been promoted to junior seconds, and one clerkship for which a vote was taken last year was not filled.

Mr. FOSTER. Who was promoted?

Mr. PATERSON. Let me give the increases as summarized for me by the accountant;—Statutory increases, $425; additional clerks by transfer, $6,550, total $6,975. In addition we are providing for the promotion of Miss Sixsmith and Miss Mason from third clerkships to junior second class, at the minimum salary of $800 each, vice provision in old estimates for salary of R. Telford, $950, who was promoted, and R. H. Moir, at $825, transferred to the outside service.

Four third-class clerks, one at $675, one at $635, one at $575, and one at $550, $2,435.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there any increases here?

Mr. PATERSON. Four statutory increases: Miss Low, Miss Burt, Miss Cram and Mr. F. Lessard.

Allowance for private secretaries and assistants, $600.

Mr. FOSTER. More than one. What kind of arrangement is this?

Mr. PATERSON. Miss Dawes and Miss Cram are assistants to the private secretary.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister no private secretary? And, if so, where is his salary?

Mr. PATERSON. He is assistant commissioner, and does any private secretary duties that I require, but takes no part of the allowance.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman divides the allowance of $600.

Mr. PATERSON. Not the whole of it. Miss Dawes gets $150 and Miss Cram $100. The balance is not used.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the hon. minister had better strike out the balance. That $150 laying around may be a great temptation—

Mr. PATERSON. This covers a period ending eighteen months from now, and I may need it by that time.

Department of Inland Revenue—seven first class clerks—one assistant accountant at $1,900, one assistant secretary at $1,900, one at $1,850, one at $1,750, one at $1,700, and two at $1,600, $13,500.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Inland Revenue). There is an increase here of $250, which is to pay statutory increases to five first-class clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the policy adopted as to statutory increases?

Mr. BRODEUR. They are given to all those who have reached the maximum of their class.

Mr. FOSTER. You have one less senior second-class clerk, how is that?

Mr. BRODEUR. I increased the number of junior second-class clerks. There was no one there last year.

Mr. FOSTER. You had a vote that you did not utilize?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Is $800 the minimum of a junior second-class?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. These are statutory increases—four at $900 and three at $800.

Mr. BRODEUR. Two have reached the maximum of their class, Mr. Chateauvert and Mr. Gervais.

Mr. FOSTER. The difference is $350, you are making an increase in the item to that extent. You have only four clerks to get the statutory increase, which would only make $200.

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Gervais is a new appointment in the third class. He was in the temporary service, and instead of coming in at the lowest salary of the class, we give him $700 in virtue of the law passed two years ago that those who were in the civil service as temporary clerks were entitled to come in as third-class clerks at the salary they were receiving as temporary clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. Up to the limit?

Mr. BRODEUR. Up to the limit, $700.

Mr. FOSTER. In printing and stationery, what regulation is there as to the price you have to pay?

Mr. BRODEUR. The stationery department fix the price themselves.

Mr. FOSTER. Do they attempt to make any profit for the department, or do they make their prices at cost?

Mr. BRODEUR. I never inquired whether the Printing and Stationery Department are making money out of it, perhaps they do.

Office of the Auditor General—salaries, $51,787.50; contingencies, $10,200.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman asked a question with regard to this department—the Auditor General has now come in.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is proposed to be made the new chief clerk?

Mr. PATERSON. The Auditor General says he can't say anything about it until he gets the money.

Mr. BARKER. That is not at all inconsistent with the statute. Mr. McDougall has probably made a formal report recommending this. That is what the other gentleman should have done.

Mr. PATERSON. Three juniors are made second-class clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the reason for making them second-class clerks? Do they become spryer? Have they been at the maximum of their class?

Mr. PATERSON. They passed the examination, and the auditor thought they were entitled to the promotion.

Mr. FOSTER. Another point we wanted to know was, why are eleven first-class clerks necessary, all new? Then as to the disparity between the amount dropped off from clerical and other assistance and the sum put in here for first-class clerks, if they are simply transfers.

Mr. PATERSON. While the Auditor General is asking for the eleven to be placed on the permanent list they are now in the employ of the department and have been paid out of the vote for clerical assistance and contingencies. He now makes them permanent. The question asked is: why the amount for clerical and other assistance is not reduced by the amount involved by the transfer of the eleven to the permanent list. While the Auditor General quite recognizes

that he has not been able to reduce his estimate for clerical assistance, because he anticipates that he will require more help in that direction, and in fact, he would like the committee to understand that even with what he is asking for now it may be possible that he will have to ask parliament to sanction a larger amount for the payment of other officers, but he will feel himself in a better position to know how he stands in that respect when the supplementary estimates are brought down, because the interval will give him probably six weeks time during which he will more fully appreciate the duties which will be entailed upon him by the new Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. How long have these transferees been in the employ of the department ?

Mr. PATERSON. From two to four years.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they going in as first-class clerks at the same salaries as they are getting ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, barring the statutory increase.

Mr. BERGERON. Has the government surrendered to the demand which the Auditor General has been making for some time?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mutual concessions.

Mr. PATERSON. The government certainly want to give him all the help he requires.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. All the help he wants.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection at all to the Auditor General's office being thoroughly equipped. The Auditor General has a very important work to do, and I imagine that hon. gentlemen opposite are troublesome enough to make his office more burdensome than it used to be, but any amount of help we can give him here that will enable him to search out the expenditures of hon. gentlemen opposite we are willing to give.

Department of Agriculture, deputy head, $3,800.

Mr. FOSTER. Here is an increase.

Mr. FISHER. That is the statutory increase.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the deputy head ?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. O'Halloran.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that the maximum?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Six chief clerks, two at $2,500, one at $2,412.50, one at $2,300, one at $1,962.50, $13,625.

Mr. FISHER. There has been a misprint in omission of one clerk at $1,950, the insertion of which will make the total right. If my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will look at the item he will see that the printed line only shows the salaries of five, whereas there are six and that the printer has left out one at $1,950. The amount however is included in the total of $13,625.

Eight first-class clerks : four at $1,900, one at $1,750, one at $1,650, one at $1,600, one at $1,525, $14,125.

Mr. BERGERON. There is one added.

Mr. FISHER. There was a necessity for a technical officer in the copyright department. There was no clerk except the chief clerk who could undertake the work. The chief clerk has been in ill-health, he has been absent a good deal, and I felt it necessary to appoint a technical officer.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that a new appointment ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Who has been appointed ?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Ritchie.

Mr. FOSTER. Where from ?

Mr. FISHER. Toronto.

Mr. BERGERON. He was not in the service before ?

Mr. FISHER. He was not in the service, but he had been doing work in my department in another capacity and was recommended by the deputy minister for this position.

Mr. FOSTER. What is his work ?

Mr. FISHER. He is in the copyright branch under the chief clerk.

Mr. FOSTER. Is he a lawyer ?

Mr. FISHER. He is a lawyer by profession.

Fifteen second-class clerks : one at $1,500, two at $1,450, two at $1,400, four at $1,350, three at $1,300, one at $1,287.50, two at $1,275, $20, 337.50.

Mr. FISHER. These are all the same excepting statutory increases.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. minister give statutory increases to all deserving clerks ?

Mr. FISHER. To all those who have no report against them.

Twenty-five second-class clerks : eleven at $1,100, one at $1,050, two at $950, seven at $900, two at $887.50, two at $850, $24,825.

Mr. FOSTER. Statutory ?

Mr. FISHER. Statutory increases only.

Three third-class clerks : one at $667.50, one at $600, one at $550, $1,817.50.

Mr. BERGERON. Same reason ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Department of Agriculture, contingencies—clerical and other assistance, $11,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How much of it was spent last year ?

Mr. FISHER. $10,992.50.

Printing and stationery, $4,500.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that pretty well spent too ?

Mr. FISHER. I think about ; I have not the exact figures.

Sundries, $3,250.

Mr. FOSTER. Was any part of that 'sundries' spent in trying to find out the lost members of the Free Christian Baptist Church in New Brunswick ?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. It should have been.

Mr. FISHER. There is another vote for that.

Mr. FOSTER. There never was a greater outrage perpetrated than that, and we will hear more about it before we get through.

Mr. FISHER. With pleasure.

Mr. FOSTER. Trying to suppress a denomination.

Mr. FISHER. Oh, no, giving it all due credit.

Department of Railways and Canals—secretary of department and chief clerk, office of deputy minister and chief engineer, $2,500.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the secretary now ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Jones.

First-class clerks, salaries, $17,250.

Mr. EMMERSON. You will notice a typographical error there. It reads three at $1,000; that should be $1,900. There is a decrease of $50 owing to the superannuation of Mr. Filteau. He was receiving $1,900, but whoever takes his place will commence with $1,500, making a saving of $400. The difference is explained by the statutory increases.

Mr. FOSTER. How old was Mr. Filteau ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know his age exactly, but he had been in the department a great many years. He became incapacitated because of his eyes and his throat.

Second-class clerks, salaries, $8,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. These are all statutory increases. There will be a saving of $100 with respect to one of these clerkships. One clerk unfortunately was drowned during the past season and his successor will begin at $1,200. He was in receipt of $1,300.

Junior second-class clerks, salaries, $8,075.

Mr. EMMERSON. Four of these received the statutory increase of $50, and three received six months' increases of $25. There is a recommendation for an additional clerk at a salary of $800.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the necessity for that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The deputy minister reports that in consequence of the additional work in the department it will be necessary to appoint another junior second class clerk.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the new clerk will be employed to look after the increased deficit ? This will require a smart man.

Mr. EMMERSON. The report of the deputy minister will explain that; we will speak of the deficit a little later.

Contingencies, $5,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How much of this was spent last year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Up to January 1, $3,000 had been expended.

Public Works—Chief engineer, salary, $3,400.

Mr. BERGERON. Has Mr. Lafleur been appointed chief engineer of the department ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, Mr. Lafleur has been appointed chief engineer. He was acting engineer of the department for, I think, six or seven years, and upon the report of the deputy, Mr. Lafleur has been appointed chief engineer by Order in Council in the usual way. It is only fair to explain to the House, that Mr. Lafleur has been appointed at a salary of $3,500, but as these estimates have been printed there is only $3,400, so I shall have to ask for $100 extra in the supplementary estimates for Mr. Lafleur.

Second-class clerks, salaries, $17,800.

Mr. HYMAN. There is an increase of one second-class clerk by promotion from the junior second to the second-class of Mr. H. J. Guppy, in accordance with the report of the deputy minister. Mr. Guppy has been 22 years in the service. An amount was taken for this purpose last year.

Mr. BERGERON. Is he at the minimum of his class ?

Mr. HYMAN. He was appointed at the minimum.

Mr. BERGERON. And was he at the maximum of his class before ?

Mr. HYMAN. He was after 22 years service.

Three junior second-class clerks, $2,600.

Mr. BERGERON. Was he taken from that class ?

Mr. HYMAN. He was taken from that class. That explains why there is one less.

Department of Public Works—contingencies, $15,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How much did you spend last year ?

Mr. HYMAN. $14,430.

Post Office Department—$362,189.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the minister's policy now with regard to statutory increases ?

Sir WILLAM MULOCK. I give effect to every recommendation from the deputy within the law. All the increases here are statutory.

Five messengers, $3,524.25.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the maximum salary for a messenger ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. $700.

Mr. BERGERON. I see one here at $724.25.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not understand that. If my hon. friend will let the item pass, I will get the information on another day.

Provisional allowance, $1,850.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the object of that ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Some years ago we established some dead letter branches outside of the city of Ottawa, in Winnipeg and the west; and the clerks in these offices are paid provisional allowances on account of the extra cost of living, in accordance with the policy laid down by our predecessors, which we have carried out.

Mr. BERGERON. This is a lump sum to cover the different places, I suppose ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. This is the total sum paid on a certain fixed scale, established by an Order in Council.

Post Office Department—contingencies, $41,710.

Mr. BERGERON. I see here some words respecting letter carriers' boots. Do I understand that the government supply boots to all the letter carriers all over the country?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes. We do not make them here. They are made in different cities; but before they are issued, they are all inspected by one man here. We furnish the letter carriers with uniforms, including boots.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it done by contract ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Tenders are obtained in different cities. Circulars are sent out inviting tenders from a number of manufacturers in each place.

Mr. FOSTER. Always of the right persuasion ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I would not inquire into a minor matter of that kind.

Mr. FOSTER. The supposition is that a Conservative cannot make good boots, I suppose ?

Mr. HYMAN.

Mr. BERGERON. Who is the contractor in Montreal ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I cannot give that information now. I will give it on the outside estimates for my department.

Mr. FOSTER. Are all the boots inspected by one man ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Every pair. Not a single boot escapes his eye.

Balancing and summarizing depositors' accounts at the close of the year ending June 30, 1905, $3,710.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there any special clerk for that ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is done by the clerks in the department after hours, and an extra allowance is made for work done after hours.

Mr. FOSTER. You pick out the proper clerks ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The head of the branch picks them out.

Department of Trade and Commerce, $28,950.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is now responsible for this department ?

Mr. PATERSON. Sir Richard Cartwright is the head.

Mr. FOSTER. Is he to administer it from the Senate ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Chief clerk and accountant, $1,900.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a new appointment?

Mr. PATERSON. No. Mr. Code was for years assistant accountant in the Customs Department and has been replaced in that department by another. There is a great deal of extra work thrown on the Trade and Commerce Department owing to the payment of bounties on iron and coal oil.

Second-class clerks, $1,200.

Mr. FOSTER. What became of the other second-class clerk ?

Mr. PATERSON. He was promoted to be first-class clerk.

Contingencies, clerical and other assistance, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $2,000.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an increase here of $500.

Mr. PATERSON. That is due to the fact that they are getting out weekly reports, containing the reports of the commercial agents, which are distributed throughout Canada. Heretofore they were published in the monthly report.

Some resolutions reported.

Motion agreed to without discussion.

Copy of the original list of the electors of Marquette supplied the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery; also a copy of the list as sent to the returning officer; and for copies of the lists supplied by the returning officer to the various deputy returning officers.—Mr. W. J. Roche.

ADJOURNMENT—AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the motion is put, I desire to call attention to the fact, that we have not received the public accounts, nor have we the Auditor General's Report. Probably the First Minister will be able to tell us when the Auditor General's Report will be down. We have gone on with the Civil Service Estimates, but we cannot go much further without the public accounts—

Mr. PATERSON. The Public Accounts have been distributed.

Mr. FOSTER. I think not. A copy was laid on the table, but members of the House have not received copies. And, with reference to the Auditor General's Report, the First Minister will see that we cannot go much further with the estimates until we have received that report.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I can hold out little hope of an early distribution of the Auditor General's Report. The last account I had of it was two or three days ago. There were then in the hands of the Auditor General proofs for about 160 pages ; but there are about 300 pages of manuscript yet to come.

Mr. BERGERON. We are paying for eleven more clerks which ought to facilitate the work.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We are not paying those clerks yet but shall begin to pay them next July. That may expedite matters, but in the meantime, the position is that a good deal of the manuscript is not yet in the hands of the printer.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the fault of the departments. If they have not got the work forward, he cannot do it. The Auditor General does not prepare the manuscript——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly, he prepares the manuscript of his own report. The fault is not with the departments so far as I know. I will see the Auditor General, and perhaps I can give the House more information to-morrow. But I cannot hold out any hope of an early presentation of the Report of the Auditor General.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, January 20, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

VACANCY—WRIGHT COUNTY.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following communication :

To the Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons :

Sir,—I have the honour to hereby tender my resignation as a member of the House of Commons for the electoral district of Wright, in the province of Quebec, having elected to sit for the electoral district of Quebec East.

Given under my hand and seal at Ottawa this 20th day of January, 1905.

(Sgd.) WILFRID LAURIER.

Witnesses :
(Sgd.) Sydney Fisher,
C. Fitzpatrick.

VACANCY—CARLETON.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have received a further communication to the following effect :

To the Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons :

Sir,—I, Edward Kidd, of North Gower village, in the county of Carleton, farmer and manufacturer, who was duly elected a member of the said House of Commons for the electoral district of the county of Carleton, hereby declare my intention to resign my seat as said member in this said House of Commons and I do hereby resign the same.

In witness whereof I have hereto before two witnesses set my hand and seal this 19th day of January in the year 1905.

(Sgd.) EDWARD KIDD.

Witnesses :
(Sgd.) Samuel Barker, M.P.,
John W. Daniel, M.P.

I beg to inform the House that I have issued my warrant in each of these cases for a new election.

Mr. HAGGART. A warrant for both ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

PAY OF NORTHWEST MOUNTED POLICE.

House in committee to consider proposed resolutions respecting the pay of the Northwest Mounted Police.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

On section 1,

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the pay of the commissioner and other members of the Northwest Mounted Police shall not exceed the amounts following :—

Commissioner of police, per annum ..	$3,000 00
Assistant commissioners, per annum..	2,000 00
Superintendents, per annum	1,800 00
Inspectors, per annum	1,400 00
Surgeons and assistant surgeons, per annum	1,800 00
Veterinary surgeons, per annum	1,400 00
Four staff sergeants, per diem	2 00
Other staff sergeants, per diem	1 75

Other non-commissioned officers, per diem	$ 1 25
Constables, per diem	1 00
Special constables and scouts, per diem	1 50
Buglers under 18 years of age, per diem	0 50
Working pay to artisans, per diem	0 75

Mr. HAGGART. What are the changes ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This resolution was introduced in consequence of the representations which have been made to the government on the floor of this House on both sides, from time to time, advising that the pay of the Northwest Mounted Police should be increased. This matter has been under consideration, and I think we are meeting the public demand and the exigencies of the case in providing for the salaries now set forth in this resolution. The increases are as follows :

Officer.	Present Pay.	Proposed Pay.
	$	$
Commissioner	2,600	3,000
Assistant commissioners	1,600	2,000
Superintendents	1,400	1,800
Inspectors	1,000	1,400
Surgeons and assistant surgeons	1,400	1,800
Veterinary surgeons	1,000	1,400

We have four staff sergeants to whom we give $2 a day. Other staff sergeants receive $1.50 a day, and we propose to give them $1.75 a day, an increase of 25 cents a day. Non-commissioned officers receive $1 a day, and we propose to give them $1.25 a day. Constables receive 75 cents a day, and we propose to give them $1 a day. Special constables and scouts we have no right to pay for particularly, but we have paid them from 75 cents to $1.25 a day. We propose to give them $1.50 a day. Buglers under 18 years of age receive 40 cents a day, and we propose to give them 50 cents a day. Working artisans receive 50 cents a day, and we propose to give them 75 cents a day. It is calculated that this will increase the pay of the force by $50,000.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the strength of the force ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot say what the strength of the force is at the present time. There are 300 in the Yukon, but I cannot say how many in the Northwest Territories. I think there are 600, but perhaps I am mistaken as to that. The force costs $1,000,000 in round numbers, and we will add by this resolution $50,000 to the cost.

Mr. HAGGART. Under your resolution you take the power to increase the pay if you like. Is it the intention of the government to increase it up to this sum ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Up to this maximum. We do not propose to make the increase in a bulk sum at once, but to gradually increase the pay. We take power to reach the maximum and no more.

On section 2,

Resolved, That the Governor in Council may authorize extra pay and allowances to be paid to members of the force serving in the Yukon Territory or the unorganized portions of the Northwest Territories.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the amount of the extra pay in the Yukon?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think it is either 25 cents or 50 cents a day; I forget at the moment. That amount is paid to the constables, and the officers have been given a certain proportion of additional pay which I will be able to state at the next stage.

Mr. HAGGART. Would it not be better to have the amount stated in the resolution ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. Because at the present time we are simply carrying out what has been in force in the Yukon for three or four years. When we sent men to the Yukon it would have been just to give the staff we required the same rate of pay as was given in other sections of the country and we increased the rate generally; we now propose to maintain that same rate.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know under what authority you gave increased pay to the constables in the Yukon.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We did it by taking an appropriation for it every year.

Resolutions reported.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Department of Labour, Civil Government, salaries and contingencies, $20,100.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the reason of the increase?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). I will explain all the increases. The total increases in salaries are $2,450. The vote last year was $16,400. This year it is proposed to ask for salaries, $18,850 an increase of $2,450. This increase is made up as follows: $100 increase to the deputy minister; that is under the statute; the deputies go up by $100. Five second-class clerks receive increases of $50 each, which make $250. Provision is made for the promotion of two third-class clerks to junior second-class clerkships, involving an increase of $100, which makes $200. It is proposed to make provision for the appointment

of a new chief clerk as secretary of the department at $1,900. That makes $2,450. All these increases are in the ordinary course excepting the one involved in the appointment of a new officer. The deputy minister is frequently required to be absent from the department in connection with various outside matters, and the work of the department is such that it is necessary to have some person who will be a responsible head of the department in his absence. During the past few years he has been called away to deal with important questions, and during his absence the department is more or less handicapped. No appointment has as yet been decided upon but if parliament passes the vote for the additional clerkship then we will endeavour to appoint a suitable person, a man who will be quite competent to act as deputy during the absence of the deputy himself, and who, whilst the deputy is on duty, will render valuable assistance in carrying on the increasing work of the department.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the new chief clerk to be an officer in the department?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, it will be an additional appointment to the service.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose you have an Order in Council for the change of the classification of the officer on the report of the deputy?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, we comply strictly with the Act; a report and recommendation from the deputy which is approved by the head of the department and decided by Council.

Mr. HAGGART. It would be well always to submit these reports to the House, before the estimates are passed as they would give the reasons of the department for the change.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I have no doubt that we follow the regular practice, but I do not think it has ever been the practice to bring these reports to the House. I cannot recall any such practice in my experience, but of course there is no objection whatever to it.

Mr. WHITE. I see a foot-note that this $18,850 or any portion of it may be paid notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act. What is the meaning of that?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is an error. The deputy says it was there in former years before this classification, and has been repeated by the printer; but it is not necessary, and may be struck out.

Administration of Justice—Miscellaneous expenditure, including Northwest Territories, $65,000.

Mr. HAGGART. We have no objection to voting any of the ordinary items in the civil service expenditure; but in regard to all other matters we have a right to have the Auditor General's Report before passing the votes.

Mr. FTZPATRICK. My hon. friend knows that the Auditor General never criticises the Department of Justice, and it is not at all likely that there will be any reference to my department in the report. However, I am of the opinion that the objection taken, if presisted in, is a good one.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I may say that on Monday there will be placed upon the table a preliminary report of the Auditor General, which will embrace the Audit Department, the Customs Department, the Geological Survey, the office of the Governor General's secretary, the Indian Department, the Justice Department, Legislation, the Militia Department, the Post Office Department, the Department of Printing and Stationery, the Privy Council and the Secretary of State.

Mr. HAGGART. Then we shall be in a position to consider these items on Tuesday, after we have had an opportunity of seeing the report.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—eight technical officers, $13,300.

Mr. HAGGART. There are eight technical officers instead of seven.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We moved up one.

Mr. HAGGART. What was the necessity of moving him up?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. A technical officer, Mr. Cunningham, was put in the outside service. That is how the change took place.

Mr. HAGGART. What reason did the deputy assign for a new officer of that rank? It is not sufficient to say that a man is at the maximum of his class, and is removed to this position. We must have a report showing the necessity for an increase of that kind.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. All these proceedings were taken. The deputy minister gave the necessary certificate on account of the increased work of the department. The work has increased considerably during two years, and when that technical officer was removed to the outside service, the deputy minister reported that it was necessary to replace him, and consequently it was done.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you the report of the deputy at hand?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is on record and I can place it on the table.

Mr. HAGGART. Where there is a change in an office of that kind, you should have the report giving the reasons for the change, especially when the statute requires that to be done.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not know that the statute requires that this statement should be put on the table of the House. It requires that the report should be had from the deputy minister, and that was done. As regards depositing it on the table of the House, I am prepared to do so.

Mr. HAGGART. Surely the House is entitled to as much information as Council in reference to the reasons for making this increase.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not deny that, but I do not know that it has been customary to place these reports of the deputies on the table of the House. Of course, I have no objection at all to doing so.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand from the minister that this technical officer was put on the outside service. If so, why are we voting money for the outside service in this vote ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We are not voting money for the outside service.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister said the technical officer was required for the outside service.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Not at all. I said that we had taken a man from the inside service and placed him in the outside service, and that it was on the report of the deputy minister that this new officer was required.

Mr. HAGGART. It is the very opposite that you are doing. You are not taking a party from the inside service and putting him on the outside, but you are taking one from the outside service and putting him on the inside.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That is what I said.

Mr. HAGGART. You said the reverse. Has there been a recommendation from the department for the statutory increases, and has every one got the increase who was recommended for it ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Last year there were twelve first-class clerks, and now there are eleven in the estimates. I understood the Minister of Justice to say that one of the twelve had been made a technical officer. But the Minister of Marine and Fisheries told us that the technical officer was brought in from outside.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. An additional officer has been added to the technical branch. We have to make provision for one additional technical officer, and there is one first-class clerk less. The estimate is for one more technical officer and for one less first-class clerk.

Mr. TAYLOR. But that is not what the minister of the department told us. He said that the technical officer had been brought from the outside and not from the inside service.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think he said that Cunningham had been transferred to the outside service, but did not say whence he had been taken. As to the construction to be put on the statute, I take issue with my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart). The minister comes to parliament and asks parliament to vote an appropriation for an additional officer. The condition upon which parliament votes the appropriation is that full information be given by the minister to the House ; and after parliament has voted the item, it is necessary for the permanent head of the department to make a report to the effect that an additional officer is required, and that the person recommended has the necessary qualifications. But that is not a condition precedent.

Mr. HAGGART. I have not looked at the statutes lately, but the practice used to be entirely different. First of all, the deputy head reported what his department required. Then the minister had to get the consent of the Council for the appointment asked for. The voting of the money by parliament was not a condition precedent at all. The power of appointing rests with the Crown. The Crown may appoint, but cannot pay. In the past, when a change was required in the cadre of a department, the report of the deputy head required the sanction of the minister, and then its adoption by the Council. If the Council approved, an estimate was submitted to meet the expenditure. The minister should always be ready in the House to give the reasons which he submitted to the Governor General in Council for the new appointment. As to the other question, the explanation of the Minister of Justice is entirely different from that of the Minister of Fisheries. The latter told us that he took this technical officer from the outside and not from the inside service. What was the need of another technical officer if you had him already in the department as first-class clerk ? Who was the first-class clerk promoted ? Evidently the minister desired to give additional pay to some first-class clerk who had reached the maximum of his grade, and he took this means of doing it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the Minister of Marine and Fisheries inform me if it was one of the twelve gentlemen who were in the first-class list last year who was promoted to the position of technical officer ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend knows well that no promotion could take place until authorized by parliament. All we are doing is giving authority to the minister to do this in the future.

Mr. TAYLOR. What does the minister intend doing ? Does he intend taking one of these twelve first-class clerks and making him a technical officer ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I cannot say at present, but will do for the best.

Mr. TAYLOR. We ought to know before we vote the money. Last year we provided for twelve first-class clerks, and now are only providing for eleven. Who was the one who was promoted and made a technical officer ?

Mr. HAGGART. The House does not authorize appointments or promotions at all. That is the function of the Governor General in Council. What the House does is vote the money, and the minister makes the appointment on the approval of the Governor General in Council. Will the minister be kind enough to tell us who the officer is whom he intends to recommend for promotion to the technical branch ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It will be one of the first-class clerks, but, I regret to say, I cannot now state whom I will recommend.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—contingencies—clerical and other assistance, including the payment of $2.25 per day to M. Lamouche, $650 per annum to W. L. Charbonneau and $550 to Henry O'Brien, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $3,000.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the meaning of this?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Last year there was only one of the persons—Charbonneau—mentioned in connection with this vote, as hon. gentlemen will see on referring to last year's estimates. The other two were being paid out of the same vote, though their names were not mentioned. Mrs. Lamouche has been employed in the department since 1879, and, before that she was employed in the Finance Department. She had always been paid out of contingencies. Last year the appropriation was exhausted before the end of the fiscal year, so she could not receive her salary, causing her great inconvenience. It was decided that hereafter her name should be mentioned in the estimates. She keeps the establishment book and also despatches the notices to mariners. Charbonneau is a messenger to whom we pay the same salary as last year. Since the redistribution of the rooms by the department, another messenger is necessary. The officers of the Marine Department were formerly all on one flat, but now, with the increased work carried on, we have offices on another flat, and we have O'Brien as messenger there.

Mr. TAYLOR. And has the money voted last year been expended?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. And the minister tells us that the money could not be drawn by certain of these officers because their names were not mentioned. Then, the vote lapsed and the unexpended money should have gone back into the treasury.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The vote was over expended.

Mr. HAGGART. I cannot understand that, and it is impossible to understand it with the explanation the minister gives. How could the vote be over expended ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The vote was $3,000 and it was exceeded by $2,000.

Mr. HAGGART. There is an increase of $3,000 in the next item of contingencies, that for printing and stationery. We should have an opportunity of consulting the Auditor General's Report in order to understand how the money has been expended.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This vote will stand.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House. He said: On Tuesday I propose to finish the item of civil government. We have the High Commissioner's office and the Departments of Justice, Interior and Militia. The Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) will be here on Tuesday, and I will have somebody to take the estimates for the Department of the Interior.

Motion agreed to and House adjourned at 3.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, January 23, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

Mr. ANGUS A. McLEAN asked :

1. What was the total expenditure in connection with the Murray Harbour Branch of the Prince Edward Island Railway up to 1st January, 1905.

2. How much has been expended on Hillsboro' Bridge for all purposes connected with the construction thereof up to 1st January, 1905 ?

3. What were the legal expenses in connection with the above public works since 30th April, 1904 ; and separately to whom paid, and the amount paid to each person ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Total expenditure in connection with Murray Harbour Branch Railway to January 1, 1905, is $1,018,711.93.

2. Total expenditure on Hillsboro Bridge to January 1, 1905, is $1,220,968.32.

3. The legal expenses in connection with these public works since April 30, 1904, up to January 1, 1905, is $261.30, made up as follows :

F. L. Haszard..	$180 16
S. Blanchard..	26 09
G. S. Inman..	55 05
	$261 30

I. C. R.—STATION AGENT AT FREDERICTON.

Mr. CROCKET asked :

1. Has Odbur White, station agent of the Intercolonial Railway at Fredericton, N.B., been notified that his services as such agent are to be dispensed with on the twenty-fourth day of January, inst. ?
2. If so, when was he so notified, and for what reason ?
3. Have any complaints been made against him in reference to the performance or non-performance of his duties, or otherwise ?
4. If any such complaints have been made, by whom were they made ; were they made in writing, and have they been investigated ?
5. What was Mr. White's salary ?
6. Has any other person been appointed or notified of appointment as Mr. White's successor ?
7. If so, who, and at what salary ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Yes.
2. January 10, 1905.
3. Yes.
4. Mr. Tiffin, General Traffic Manager, and Mr. J. E. Price, General Superintendent, reported him as not qualified for the position.
5. $65 per month.
6. Yes, temporarily.
7. R. Z. Walker. Salary $85 per month.

CORNWALL CANAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. PRINGLE asked :

1. How many extra men were employed on the Cornwall Canal during the months of October and November, 1904 ?
2. At whose request and on whose recommendation were these men placed at work ?
3. What was the nature of their employment?
4. What was their remuneration per day ?
5. When were they discharged ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. There were 25 more men employed on the Cornwall Canal in October and 21 in November, than in the preceding month of September, 1904.

2. Nobody requested extra men to be employed during these months, but in the ordinary course the works for which parliamentary appropriations were made, were undertaken during the working season. The superintendent of the canal requiring men for these works of repairs took the men recommended by Mr. Robert Smith.

3. They were employed rebuilding pier below lock No. 19, cleaning out ditch at upper entrance, and repairing scow, also levelling ground at lock No. 17.

4. Labourers $1.50 per day. Foremen $2 per day. Masons and caulkers $3 per day. Man and team $3 per day.

5. The work having been completed, most of the men were discharged on November 17, 1904, and the last four men on December 3, 1904.

P. E. I. TELEGRAPH RATES.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. How much yearly increase in subsidy was given to the Anglo-American Telegraph Company for the service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland ?
2. What are the services required to be performed, in detail, (a) rates now chargeable on regular messages of ten words and extra on additional words above ten, between Prince Edward Island and the following places : Maritime Provinces, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Northwest Territories and British Columbia ; (b) rates to United Kingdom ; (c) night rates; (d) times for opening and closing offices on Prince Edward Island, and in Sackville, N.B.?
3. Over what period of time is this arrangement binding on the company and government ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. $5,000.

2. (a). By the present agreement the company has reduced its former rates on messages from points on Prince Edward Island to the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario, from 50 cents for 10 words, with free address, and 3 cents for each additional word, to 30 cents for 10 words, with free address, and 2 cents for each additional word. A proportionate reduction is to be made for press messages.

(b). Rates to Manitoba, Northwest Territories, British Columbia and United States of North America are also reduced from 50 cents and 3 cents to 25 and 2 cents, to which the rates of connecting lines must be added.

(c). There are no night rates between points in eastern and central Canada, but connecting lines allow night rates to northwestern Canada and the United States.

(d). Under the new agreement an all-night service is given at Charlottetown, P.E.I., and Sackville, N.B., and an extended service at Summerside, which places had formerly been deprived of such privileges ; the Sunday service has also been made similar to that prevailing in Western Union offices in the maritime provinces.

3. The present agreement is binding for a period of five years.

FREE TRANSPORTATION OF HAY ON I. C. R.

Mr. WILMOT—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked :

1. Is the Order in Council still in force authorizing hay to be carried on the Intercolonial Railway free of freight charges ?
2. Is any hay now being carried on the Intercolonial Railway free under such authority ?

3. How long does the government intend to continue the shipment of hay free ?

4. If the said Order in Council has been cancelled, when was it cancelled ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. The Order in Council limited the time for free transportation of hay over the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways to the 31st of December, 1904, except for such as had been bona fide ordered between the 6th of October and the 31st of December, 1904, and for which cars could not be provided during that period, may be carried free after that date.

2. Yes.

3. Answered by No. 1.

4. The Order in Council has not been cancelled.

MOTION AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a statement showing the amount of money spent by the government, or any department thereof, in the parish of Chateau-Richer, county of Montmorency, for building wharfs, piers, docks, breakwaters, &c., or for removing boulders or rocks from the beach in front of the said parish, or for any other public works, from the 1st of September, 1904, to the 15th of November of the same year.—Mr. Morin.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Partial report of the Auditor General for the year ending June 30, 1904.—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

On the order :

Second reading of Bill No. 4, An Act to amend the Railway Act, 1903.—Mr. W. F. Maclean. E.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Might I ask, in connection with the Orders of the Day, why my bill has not been called ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is not printed in both languages.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. You take advantage of that ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is not taking advantage. Some member may call attention to the fact ; but if no member objects, the bill may be proceeded with.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The House is too thin to-day for such an important subject.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. When will it be thicker ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Perhaps next week.

PAY OF NORTHWEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Resolutions respecting the Northwest Mounted Police reported from the Committee of the Whole, read the first and the second time, and agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 8) to amend the Mounted Police Act, 1894.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is nothing now before the House except the voting of supply, and I understood from my hon. friend the other day that before going on he wanted to have the Auditor General's Report. We have furnished something on which we can take supply to-morrow. I now beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, January 24, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of Arthur Lachance, Esquire, for the electoral district of Quebec Centre.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

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

That the report of the special committee to strike the Standing Committees of this House, presented to this House on Thursday the 19th inst., be amended, and that the name of Mr. Macpherson, member for the electoral district of Vancouver city, and of Mr. Boyce, member for the electoral district of Algoma West, be added to the Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, and that the name of Mr. Macpherson, member for Vancouver, be substituted for the name of Mr. Marcil on the Committee on Printing.

Mr. FOSTER. That adds one each to the Committee on Railways and Canals ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose Mr. Haggart had cognizance of it ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I notified Mr. Haggart.

Motion agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I beg to move:

That the report of the special committee appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed lists of members to compose the select standing committees of this House dur-

ing the present session, as amended, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours that this House will unite with them in the formation of a joint committee of both Houses on the subject of the printing of parliament, and that the members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing, viz.: Messrs. Bennett, Bergeron, Clarke (Toronto), Cyr, Dyment, Gervais, Henderson, Hughes (Victoria), Johnston (Cape Breton), Johnston (Lambton), Lavergne (Drummond and Arthabaska), Maclean (South York), McColl, Macpherson, Oliver, Parmelee, Piche, Prefontaine, Roche (Marquette), Ross (Yale and Cariboo), Scott, Sutherland (Oxford), Taylor and Tisdale, will act as members, on the part of this House, on the said joint committee on the printing of parliament.

Motion agreed to.

LIBRARY COMMITTEE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That a select committee composed of Messrs. Bourassa, Bergeron, Brodeur, Calvert, Demers (St. John and Iberville), Johnston (Lambton), Hyman, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Scott, Grant, Smith (Nanaimo), Foster, Stockton, Clarke (Toronto) and Monk, be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the library of Parliament, so far as the interests of this House are concerned, and to act as members of a joint committee of both Houses on the Library ; and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours therewith.

Motion agreed to.

DEBATES COMMITTEE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That the select committee be appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of this House during the present session, with power to report from time to time, be composed of Messrs. Bureau, Guthrie, Gervais, Clark (Essex), Ethier, Johnston (Cape Breton), Logan, Scott, Macpherson, Bergeron, Clarke (Toronto), McCarthy (Calgary), Schaffner, Roche (Marquette) and Taylor.

Motion agreed to.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Arthur Lachance, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Quebec Centre introduced by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Hon. Chas. Fitzpatrick.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Annual report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the year ended June 30, 1904.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Annual report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the year ended June 30, 1904.—Hon. R. Préfontaine.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Civil government—Department of Militia and Defence—salaries, $48,350.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The first item for the deputy head requires no explanation. The second item, that of chief clerks, shows a decrease of one by the superannuation of Major Benoit. Instead of five chief clerks, there will be four.

Mr. FOSTER. How old was Mr. Benoit ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He must have been thirty years in the service and about sixty years of age.

Mr. FOSTER. Why was he superannuated ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Because of very serious and chronic bad health. In the first-class clerks, there is an increase of one owing to the promotion of Mr. Chesley.

Mr. FOSTER. Were all the vacancies filled last year ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, there are two vacancies which we do not intend to fill. In the second class there were eight last year, and only six this year.

Mr. FOSTER. Are all of the six clerkships unfilled ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They are all filled.

Mr. FOSTER. So that the reduction is simply an apparent one, because the full number was not filled last year.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We might have found people to fill them, but resisted the temptation.

Mr. FOSTER. Has my right hon. friend any idea as to the outcome of that Martineau business ? He will remember that there was a serious lache in the Militia Department, and that there was a suit of some kind in which Martineau gave evidence. Did that evidence implicate others, and what is the position of Martineau now ?

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). He is in the penitentiary at Kingston now. I think his sentence was for seven years. So far as the civil remedy is concerned, the government have taken action against the Bank of Montreal to recover the money paid out on these cheques, and the case is somewhat complicated by the fact that the Bank of Montreal has taken action against the other banks through which the cheques were passed. The suit is now waiting judgment by Mr. Justice Anglin.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems rather extraordinary that such defalcations could have taken place in a well organized and super-

vised department. As I understand, cheques were drawn in a very loose way and were signed only by one person. The whole transaction seemed to show something wrong in the supervision and checking of that kind of work. One finds it difficult to understand how a raw, new clerk could have had such facilities free of check or supervision. Have any steps been taken to render such defalcations more difficult ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is almost impossible for any individual or government to protect itself absolutely against fraud. The practice in the departments requires that all cheques be signed by two officials. In addition, when the cheques were returned to the department, the practice was to have them compared with the bank list by two of the officials, the one independent altogether of the other. It would appear that there was some remissness in that respect.

Mr. FOSTER. The same man who drew the cheques, checked off the list ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, but instead of having two officials go over the cheques and compare them with the bank list at the end of the month, only one did the work. It appears to me that when at the end of the month the bank returned its statement of the amounts paid over, the cheques should have been in the hands of an official of the department and there ought to have been some method of ascertaining what had been going on during the month. We are in the habit of criticising very severely, on both sides, the action of the officials of the department, and we are told that there are practices in the department which would not be tolerated in any private institution. It would appear that some of the cheques in question were paid with only one signature attached. That was not the fault of the department, but of the bank that paid the amount. In fact, I understand, that some of the cheques bore no signature at all—simply the official cheque filled in. So, this is not a case of laxness or remissness exclusively on the part of public officials.

Mr. FOWLER. Have any steps been taken to collect the guarantee bond which this man Martineau put up when he was appointed ? I suppose he did put up a guarantee bond ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Nothing was done with respect to the guarantee bonds. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) will bear me out when I say that it would not be the part of prudence to take steps against the guarantor until we have settled the question of liability. Our contention is that there is no liability, that the cheques being bogus cheques, the bank was not authorized to make payment to Martineau.

Mr. FOWLER. The government are still fighting that question ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We have it tried. It is sub-judice.

Mr. FOSTER. Who are the guarantors ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not the names under my hand.

Mr. STOCKTON. Do I understand the minister to say that the government repudiate the liability on cheques paid by the bank that were not properly signed ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. STOCKTON. And that stands for judgment ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Civil government—Department of the Interior —salaries,$166,254.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is an increase of $25 for the chief clerk—law clerk—which takes him to this maximum. The increase to the secretary is also the statutory increase. The same with the chief clerk, timber and mines, the clerk of patents —taking him to his maximum—the chief clerk of the registration branch, the accountant, and the chief clerk of the Dominion lands, patent branch. In fact there are none but statutory increases. There is one sub-item of this vote which calls for some explanation :

Two surveyors at $2,300 each, J. J. McArthur and C. A. Bigger, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.

Mr. McArthur is an old employee of the department, having first joined the staff in 1897, I believe. He has been employed ever since in one work or another under the department, and always as a surveyor.. For the last two or three years he has been paid out of the Alaska boundary appropriation. Mr. Bigger is also a land surveyor. He was employed in the department from 1882 to 1887, when he resigned. He was taken into the department again in 1901. Since then, he has been employed in marking again the boundary between the state of New York and the province of Quebec, being paid out of a special vote. It is now proposed to put these gentlemen under the regular staff of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these middle aged men ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. McArthur is perhaps, 54 or 55. I do not know Mr. Bigger's age.

Mr. FOSTER. The Prime Minister has not finished his explanation I think. There are some extra junior clerks.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are two second-class clerks and one third-class. The engagement of these is made necessary by the growth of the work of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. All these clerks are in the department here ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask for information if the Prime Minister has it, concerning the change or proposed change in the deputy head. I see it stated in the newspapers that the deputy has resigned or intends to resign. He is a man in the prime of life, and, I have understood, a very efficient man. What are the reasons for giving up such a 'good sit ?'

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Smart has given up the service. There is no reason, so far as I now know, except that he thinks that he can better his circumstances by going into business himself. He has not been superannuated so far as I know.

Mr. FOSTER. Who has been appointed in his place ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Cory.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is Mr. Cory ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He was inspector of offices in the Yukon Territory.

Mr. FOSTER. How long was he there ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. From July, 1901.

Mr. FOSTER. What are his special qualifications ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He has done good service in the work with which he was intrusted. Mr. Smart, who, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) says was an efficient man, had not been connected with the service until he came here. Mr. Cory has had experience in a post that was very difficult to fill, where he gave satisfaction. We hope he will be as efficient as Mr. Smart has been.

Mr. FOSTER. The deputy head of a department, especially in such a department as the Interior, has a multiplicity of branches to supervise and a great variety of work to do. It struck me when I read of the appointment that the mere fact that a man had shown efficiency in the Yukon where there is no great variety, but only a special branch of work, might not, imply the general qualifications necessary to the permanent head of the department.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not agree with my hon. friend. I think that a man that has been in the service in the Yukon for five years and has given satisfaction must be a very good man. I understand that, before joining the service he was for eleven years in the office of the Attorney General for Manitoba.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose I need not ask if he belongs to the party of the leader of the House ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know. But I should be sorry if he did not.

Civil government—Department of the Interior—contingencies, $27,185.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is a decrease of $20,000 there because there is no vote for salaries and expenses of the mines branch. I do not wish to gain undeserved credit. My hon. friend will find the item again, in No. 216, Dominion Lands.

Civil government — Department of Indian Affairs—salaries, $66,382.50.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is only one item there which I think requires explanation. We ask an appropriation for six chief clerks instead of five. The reason is that Mr. Bray has been promoted to a chief clerkship. Mr. Bray has been in the department as a first-class clerk since 1884, and he has simply got promotion.

Mr. FOSTER. The fact that a man has been promoted is scarcely a reason why you should establish an additional chief clerkship. When you establish an additional chief clerkship for a good reason, then of course a man is either promoted to it or another one appointed. What was the reason for adding to the chief clerkships?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The reason is that Mr. Bray, as I understand, is a very efficient officer who has been in the service since 1884; he had reached the top of his class, and I think it is only reasonable that he should be promoted one step higher as a reward for good service. My hon. friend will agree to that.

Mr. FOSTER. But that must always have a limitation, because on that principle you will be constantly increasing the number of chief clerks.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But when you have a man like Mr. Bray who has been twenty years in the service and has reached the maximum of his class, and who cannot therefore get any further statutory increase, I think it is a good practice and a good principle, in order to encourage the civil servants, to reward them in some way, and that is the only way in which Mr. Bray can be rewarded.

Mr. BERGERON. How old is he now ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Fifty-nine.

Mr. BERGERON. Could you not increase his salary in an indirect way, by giving him a pension ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is the only way it can be done. There is a statutory increase of $50 a year given until a man has reached the maximum of his class. Mr. Bray was in the first class, and he could not go any higher. He might serve twenty years more without having an addition to his salary. He could not get the $50 a year which everybody else gets until he reaches the maximum. So in order to give him an incentive, and encourage the

civil servants generally, he has been promoted.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that the general practice, or is this a special case ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is a general practice that a man who has reached the maximum of his class, and has been long in the service is promoted.

Mr. FOSTER. I have nothing to say against Mr. Bray at all; he may be an excellent officer, I do not know him personally. If the right hon. gentleman says he is an excellent officer, I do not cavil at that. But I am saying that the principle upon which the right hon. gentleman is basing an addition to the chief clerkships is a very dangerous principle and, to my mind, is one which we have certainly not acted upon heretofore in the civil service. There is a theoretical civil service which requires a certain number of classes of clerks, and when it is determined how many of each class is required for efficiently carrying on that service, then the staff is completed with the required number. If the argument is to be taken that whenever a man comes up to the top of a lower class and is a deserving clerk, therefore you are to raise him to a higher class in order to give him promotion, I do not think that is ground on which you can possibly stand. Because if we go through the civil service here I am quite sure you will find there are scores, may be hundreds, of deserving clerks who are at the maximum of their class and have been for years, and yet they are not put into the class above, because they are met with the answer as to the theoretical organization and are told: We consider that we have already a sufficient number of chief clerks, and you are in the first-class list and are at the maximum of your class ; but because you are at the maximum of your class we cannot therefore add to the number of the next higher class in order simply to promote you. If you do that the House will easily see into what the practice would drift. The theory is, and I think the practice has been up to this time, that we do not want any more chief clerks than the theoretical organization requires for the proper working of the department. If a man in a class below gets to the top as to salary and can get no more salary under that, then he may be told : There is no vacancy in the superior class, but when that vacancy occurs for any reason a deserving man in a lower class will go into that higher class. But if the theory of my right hon. friend is correct you will have immediately to extend every class of clerkships above the third-class, and if that is to be the recognized principle you will have deserving men coming up from every one of your departments and saying, I have been years at the head of my class and cannot get any further increase, I have reached my maximum, you must make a clerkship in the next class for me. If that is the principle upon which you are going to act, you can see the difficulty you are getting into. I say the principle is not right. When the work of a department is such that an additional chief clerk is absolutely necessary, and when you come to the House and ask for an additional chief clerk, then you are on good ground; then you look around among your men in the class below and you may take the most deserving man who is at the maximum. I think my right hon. friend will see that he is not going on the right basis, and probably he will revise his basis of claim.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not see why I should revise it. I think I have been following the practice which has been invariably followed ever since I can remember. There is no department in the service in which the number of officers is limited, beyond which number we cannot go. I agree with my hon. friend that the reason I stated would not be sufficient as a general principle, to promote a man from a lower class; but I think that the minister in every department, when he sees that he has a good man working steadily to the front, a man who has been in the service for twenty years, and has given full satisfaction—I think he is justified in promoting him to a higher class in order to reward him. I think under the circumstances the proposition is quite defensible.

Mr. FOSTER. If another chief clerkship is necesary for the work, then of course that follows.

Civil government—Department of Finance and Treasury Board, $57,865.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is an increase in this department of $1,963.50, and I will give my hon. friend the detailed estimate of it :

Chief clerks—		
Two statutory increases of $50 each.. ... .$	100 00	
		$ 100 00
First class—		
Two increases at $25 each..$	50 00	
Five increases at $50	250 00	
Two special increases, 1904-5, at $100 each and increases, 1905-6, $50..	300 00	
		600 00
Second class—		
Five increases at $25..	125 00	
Four increases at $50	200 00	
Short estimated, 1904-5, ...	12 50	
One proposed promotion from junior second class	1,200 00	
	$1,537 50	
Less difference between one new appointment at $1,200, and one vacant at $1,475..	275 00	
		1,262 50

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the junior second-class clerk who is to be promoted ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That has not been decided.

Junior second class—		
Seven increases at $50	$ 350 00	
Three short estimated, 1904-5, at $12.50	37 50	
One new appointment..	1,000 00	
Two new appointments at $800 each	1,600 00	
	$2,987 50	
Less one superannuation, $1,075.		
One dropped at $1,075, one at $937.50	3,087 50	
		$ 100 00
Decrease..		$100 00

Mr. FOSTER. Who has been superannuated ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Tasker has been superannuated.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the only superannuation that has taken place ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes. Amongst the messengers there are two increases of $50 each, making the total increases $1,963.50.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there a vacancy provided for in the estimates of the coming year that is to be filled outside of the promotion of a junior second-class clerk ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is a vacancy to be filled.

Mr. FOSTER. In what class ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In the junior second class.

Mr. FOSTER. When did that vacancy occur ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is a promotion to take place, and that will create a vacancy.

Mr. FOSTER. How does the promotion take place ? Is there a vacancy in the grade above ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This estimate provides for the vacancy and promotion.

Mr. BERGERON. The promotion of a clerk from the second class to the first class ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No ; from the junior to the second class.

Mr. BERGERON. No, but I understood that the promotion was to take place to a vacancy in the first class.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, to a vacancy in the second class.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the vacancy caused by the reason which we found to exist a few moments ago in the Indian Department ; that is, by rewarding a clerk by putting him in the first class ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Civil government—Department of Finance and Treasury Board—contingencies, $12,000.

Mr. BERGERON. What is that for ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The item of—

Clerical and other assistance, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act. $5,000.

is to provide for two messengers who have not passed the civil service examination. There is nothing new in that. Then there are seven extra clerks at $640 each, five at $550 each, making $2,750 ; one at $500 and two messengers at $1,100, making a total of $4,990. The estimate is $5,000. Then, for printing and stationery the estimate is $3,200.59 and for sundries $3,177.

Mr. BERGERON. Who controls the expenditures in that department ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In the Finance Department ?

Mr. BERGERON. Any department. Who controls the expenditures for stationery and sundries ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I can only say that so far as my own department is concerned, these expenditures, which reach the same amount nearly every year, are controlled by the Clerk of the Privy Council, and I suppose it is very much the same in other departments. These matters are controlled by the deputy heads.

Civil government—High Commissioner's office, London—salaries, $10,300.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have to make a motion there to drop one first-class clerk at $1,900. We only have one clerk. I therefore beg to move :

That this item be reduced from $3,750 to $1,850, and that it be made to read as follows : one first-class clerk at $1,850.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the secretary now?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The secretary is Mr. Griffith, and then we have Mr. Taylor, Mr. Luke, Mr. Allin and Mr. Churchouse. There has been no change in the department since my hon. friend's time, except that Mr. Reynolds has been superannuated, Mr. Churchouse has been added and Mr. Griffith has taken the place of Mr. Colmer.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there no salary attached to the office of High Commissioner ? I do not see any salary provided for him.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is regulated by statute, if I remember rightly.

Mr. FOSTER. The High Commissioner does not take any salary.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, I think he spends more than he takes.

Mr. BERGERON. I remember that some years ago the government of Canada bought a house in London for the High Commissioner.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand that Lord Strathcona does not live in that house, but that he lives in his own house. Who occupies the house that belongs to the government ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My belief is that we sold that house years ago.

Departments generally—contingencies—care and cleaning of departmental buildings, including amount of $100 required to pay for firing noon gun, which amount may be paid to a member of the Civil Service, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $35,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is not that gun very nearly worn out ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, it is still doing good service once a day. The increased expenditure there goes to the charwomen.

Mr. FOSTER. On what basis is that service now carried on ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think the same system as that which formerly prevailed. There is a superintendent, Mr. Conroy.

Mr. FOSTER. The same superintendent?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And what are they paid ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think they have an increase of 25 cents a day, they get 75 cents a day now.

Mr. FOSTER. What did they get before?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think it was 50 cents, some got 50 cents and some 75 cents.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you going on the uniform principle now that all are equally good ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, it is like the Scripture, the last comer is entitled to the same pay as the first.

Mr. FOSTER. When was the increase given ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Last year.

Mr. FOSTER. About what time ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend should not put that question ; none of them have votes, I can assure my hon. friend. My friend Mr. Fraser does not know the date and I do not know either ; it was during the year 1904 and previous to October.

Mr. FOSTER. About that time ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Perhaps.

Mr. FOSTER. That is, taking the small and the great, the autonomy for the Northwest and the increase to the charwomen are given for the same reason just before the election.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is a good reason all round.

Geological Survey—civil government, $64,155.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is a decrease there of $500 in the salary of the deputy head and director. I could not give any explanation as to that ; I have been unable to get the information yet. If my hon. friend will pass the item I shall get the information.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will make a point to give that explanation we shall pass it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall give the explanation when we come to concurrence.

Administration of Justice—miscellaneous, including Northwest Territories, $65,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Why is this any longer required ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It will not be any longer required if the Territories are erected into provinces, but in the interval we have to make provision for the conditions existing at the present time.

Mr. FOSTER. You have not full faith that you are going to carry it ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, we have absolute faith, but at the same time we are dealing with conditions as they exist and this provision is therefore made.

Mr. FOSTER. What comes under that miscellaneous expenditure ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This amount is estimated to be spent for the maintenance of prisoners at police posts in the Northwest Territories, for the transportation of prisoners from place to place in the Territories and from the posts to Stony Mountain penitentiary, Crown prosecutors, legal services, jury and witness fees, coroners' inquests, and fees of sheriffs and clerks of courts. I can give the amounts expended last year. Maintenance of prisoners, $19,363.80 ; transport of prisoners, $12,847.46 ; crown prosecutors $9,333.26.

Mr. FOSTER. Who appoints the Crown prosecutors ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We appoint them here.

Mr. FOSTER. By this government ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. By this government. Jury and witness fees, $18,000 ; coroner's inquests $2,000 ; Sheriff's fees $956 ; clerk of the court fees $1,700 ; extradition cases $588 ; copies of evidence $210 ; sundries $866.68.

Travelling allowances and expenses of judges in Manitoba, British Columbia and the Northwest Territories, $20,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Why is there that increase in the travelling expenses ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Because of the increase in the number of circuits. Two circuits have been added in Manitoba and this provides for the increased expenditure involved by the increased number of circuits.

Mr. FOWLER. Do the judges receive the same allowance there as in the other provinces ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In Manitoba the allowance is not fixed by statute, it is fixed by Order in Council. In Manitoba the judges are allowed actual moving expenses and $5 per day, in British Columbia necessary and reasonable disbursements for travelling and living accommodation and $6 per day. There has been frequent complaint on the part of the judges that the $5 per day is not sufficient to pay for their accommodation. The Order in Council for Manitoba was passed on the 27th of October, 1882, and that for British Columbia in 1878.

Mr. FOWLER. I think the minister should make a change in that respect. It seems rather infra dig on the part of a judge to have to keep an account of his travelling expenses and disbursements like an ordinary clerk. I think there should be a lump allowance made to the judges there as in the other provinces, sufficient to cover their expenses.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman. It ought to be made a matter of statute for the newer provinces as well as for the older. If the question of the remuneration of the judges comes up this session, this matter of expenses should be dealt with at the same time.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. If a new district is created, is it the intention of the government to appoint a new judge for it ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If a new district is created, it is customary for the government to appoint a judge for that district, but that is only applicable to county court judges. The travelling allowances we are dealing with in the first instance are those payable to the judges of the high courts who go from Winnipeg on these circuits.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The particular circuit you are speaking of has been covered in the past by some of the present judges.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not if it is a new circuit. A county court judge may be appointed.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the Chief Justice of the Northwest Territories ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Hon. Arthur Sifton.

Mr. FOSTER. Any relation to the Minister of the Interior ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not examined the baptismal certificate, but I understand that he is his brother.

Mr. FOSTER. How many judges are there in the Northwest ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think six.

Mr. FOSTER. Is Judge Richardson still a judge there ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, he retired last year. He had reached that period of service which entitled him to retire on his full salary.

Mr. FOSTER. Who has now his place ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Sifton.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Is there any rule with reference to those judges who can retire and draw an allowance from this government ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is a statute which regulates the amount of the retiring allowance. After fifteen years' service a judge is entitled to retire on a two-thirds pension. If he has reached the age of eighty he receives his full salary. If he has served thirty years he goes out on his full salary. If he has reached the age of seventy-five, and has served twenty-five years, he retires on his full salary.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. They can engage in any other occupation afterwards ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Very few of them do, I think.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Some of them engage in political work.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am afraid we can find one of them, at all events, in the Senate.

To supplement the salary of the judge of the county court for district No. 7, Nova Scotia, $600.

Mr. FOWLER. Why is that ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. A few years ago provision was made for the payment of this additional amount to Judge Dodd, of Sydney. I understand that it was the desire of parliament to place him somewhat on the same footing as the judge of the county court at Halifax, who received an amount above what the other judges received, owing to the amount of his work being very large.

Mr. FOWLER. Why not make that a statutory allowance ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think that ought to be done, not only in this case, but in the cases of the judges of the divorce and matrimonial courts as well. But this has been the long usage of parliament, and we have not made the change.

Court room and offices at Prince Albert, $840.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is no court room at Prince Albert, and this accommodation has to be provided. The present arrangement involves payment for the rental of the sheriff's office at the rate of $15 a

month and for the court room and chambers, including heating, lighting, &c., at the rate of $55 a month, making in all $840 per annum.

To be paid the government of the Northwest Territories, on account of remuneration and expense of stenographers provided by that government for the Supreme Court of the Northwest Territories, $3,000.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This is under an arrangement which we have entered into with the Attorney General of the Territories, whereby stenographers provided for the Supreme Court of the Territories are paid for by us, we utilizing their services at criminal courts.

Supreme Court of Canada, $28,040.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. These estimates provide merely for the usual increase recommended for the staff. All the officials received their annual increase of $50 each. There is an increase of $1,000 in the item of printing and distributing. That is due to the increase in subscriptions and involves of course an increase in the receipts. I am now negotiating with a law book publishing company to deal with our reports as they are dealt with in Ontario. A great deal of delay at present occurs in the printing and distribution. At times judgments have been rendered three months before they are printed and distributed. I might mention, as showing the evil of this, that a case came up before the Supreme Court in which a decision had been rendered, which would not have been given by the provincial judges had they known of a judgment on a similar question which had been rendered by the Supreme Court. I hope to be able to bring about as early a distribution of the reports as is had in Ontario, where the distribution is made with very great expedition and also considerable economy.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the meaning of the item of $60.75 for 'trams' which appears in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I suppose that would be for the car fares of messengers and other officials. Frequently the judges remain at their own houses and require to have law books brought down.

Exchequer Court, $11,690.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The only increase is $200 given to Mr. Duncan Clarke, who has been promoted from the junior second-class to the second-class. He has been in the service over ten years and is a most faithful, reliable and able officer. He has charge of the docket, acts as stenographer for the registrar, looks after the sales of law stamps, and does all the work of accountant.

Mr. STOCKTON. I would like to call attention to what appears to me an inequality between the Registrar and Marshall of the Admiralty Court at Quebec and similar officials in other provinces. A salary, in addition to the fees, under the admiralty rules of 1893, is given these officers in Quebec, but no salary is given similar officials in the other provinces. All they get are the fees. I am not objecting to the salary given the Registrar in Admiralty at Quebec, but I think that a salary should be given to all the registrars and the fees abolished entirely. It is hardly the proper thing to have the registrar tax his own fees. In that case the fees now given by means of stamps could go into the revenue of Canada.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend will understand how tenacious we are all, particularly at the bar, of our ancient privileges and rights. The reason for the distinction to which he refers is that formerly we had an Admiralty Court at Quebec which was an imperial court. At that time we had a judge and a registrar. The registrar was appointed under the Admiralty Act; and when the old court became a branch of the Exchequer Court, we took over the old officials. Mr. Dunbar, the registrar at Quebec, was one of the officials we took over, and consequently has been paid under the new system the same salary which was paid him when the court was an imperial court.

Mr. STOCKTON. But the same thing applies to the province of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. There the Vice Admiralty Courts were imperial courts and were abolished precisely as in the province of Quebec.

Mr FITZPATRICK. But are the present registrars those who were officials under the old Act?

Mr. STOCKTON. Not now, but the old registrars continued after the abolition of the Vice Admiralty Court.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The intention was to continue to the old officials the salaries they were receiving.

Mr. FOSTER. And when these go out?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The new rule will prevail.

Yukon Territory—travelling allowances of judges, $1,500.

Mr. BERGERON. How many judges?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Three. They are all High Court judges. There are no county court judges. Mr. Justice Macaulay, in addition to being a judge of the High Court, performs the duties of police magistrate.

Mr. BERGERON. Who is the sheriff ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Eilbeck.

Mr. BERGERON. Is he a young man ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He can hardly be, for, on looking over my list, I see the name of J. M. Eilbeck as deputy sheriff. He is the son of the sheriff.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Eilbeck had a long leave of absence, had not he ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, he did not get it.

Mr. FOWLER. In this vote there is an item of living allowance of judges at $5,000 each. This question was up last session, and the minister said that the allowance would be done away with. At least, in answer to criticism of mine he said it was unnecessary and ought to be done away with. The expense of living in the Yukon is not so high as it used to be, and not so high in comparison with other places as to justify so large a sum being paid by the country for living expenses. Judges in other parts of the country pay their own living expenses. If the salaries paid judges in the Yukon are not sufficient, let them be increased instead of giving a living allowance.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The judges in the Yukon are paid $5,000 a year, the same as the judges in the High Court in Ontario and Quebec, and are also paid $5,000 each as a living allowance. My objection to adding anything to the salary is that it may be found inadvisable to have three judges there, while one may be needed elsewhere in the Northwest Territories. If the salaries were at a larger rate than at present, and we wanted to move one of the judges of the Yukon to fill the new place, a grievance would arise if his salary was not continued at the same rate. When a judge is appointed at a certain salary it is very inconvenient to lower that salary.

Mr. FOWLER. Is the salary attached to the judge or to the position ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. To the position.

Mr. FOWLER. Then, if a judge is no longer judge of the Yukon, he would no longer receive the salary of judge of the Yukon. If he were transferred to Ontario he would receive the salary of a judge of the same rank in Ontario.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It might be considered to be, to some extent, an interference with the independence of a judge if, being appointed at a fixed salary, he were liable to be removed to another place at a smaller salary. He would hardly be in the position of a man who felt himself independent of parliament in regard to his salary.

Mr. FOWLER. Would not the same apply to his living expenses ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, that might vary according to the locality.

Mr. STOCKTON. That would be a yearly allowance ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, a yearly allowance voted by parliament each year. If the conditions change so as to make the vote unnecessary, there is no reason why it should be continued.

Mr. BERGERON. These judges, I imagine, would not be changed without their own consent ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Mr. BERGERON. And I suppose they would not consent to a change, because I think they are receiving higher salaries than any other judges. When this allowance was given, years ago, I thought it quite reasonable. But I am told that the expense of living in the Yukon is not nearly so high as it was, and so this living allowance is a great deal too much.

Mr. FOWLER. There is not the slightest doubt that the expense of living in the Yukon has greatly decreased. Last session we had a discussion, and this fact was admitted, and no reasonable excuse was given for this allowance. As I understand it, they have all the comforts of civilization in the Yukon, and there is little difference in the cost of living between the Yukon and the Northwest Territories. I do not think there would be any difficulty in finding gentlemen to fill the positions of judges if this allowance for living expenses were cut out altogether.

Mr. MONK. What is the rule which prevails in regards to living allowances ? I see that the judges get as much for living allowance as for salary ? I understand that they live in Dawson City and that there is not circuit work.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course the expense for circuit work would be under the head of travelling allowance.

Mr. MONK. It seems strange that they should get as much for living allowance as for salary, and the rule seems to apply to the other officers of the court—each officer has a living allowance. The sheriff gets $4,000, as does the clerk of the court, and each has a living allowance. So have the deputy sheriffs, assistant clerks, police magistrate and stenographers of the territorial court. And the Crown prosecutor—besides very considerable remuneration—I think that last year he received between $7,000 and $8,000—has an allowance for expenses.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not a living allowance.

Mr. MONK. I suppose that under the conditions that prevail in the beginning an allowance is necessary. But what is the rule now ? Is the same thing allowed for the stenographer or for the sheriff as for the judge ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, the living allowance for the sheriff, police magistrate,

clerks of the court, and stenographers, is $1,800 each.

Mr. MONK. There is no distinction between the sheriff and the stenographers of the territorial court. But the allowance for the stenographers in the police court is not fixed at the same rate.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The stenographer for the police court gets $1,200 salary and $1,800 for living allowance.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Does this practice prevail in the other departments with reference to the living allowances of officials in the Yukon ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I understand in all the departments. But I know that so far as the Yukon is concerned, a living allowance was granted to all the officials of the other departments.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I understand that in the province of Manitoba the officials are allowed so much for their general expenses, but not a regular living allowance. They are allowed a salary and all expenses, but they have to produce vouchers for every expenditure. It is different in the Yukon, where they are allowed so much, whatever the expenditure may be.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the minister say how much jurors are paid in the Yukon ? Are jurors and sheriffs paid in a different manner from the other provinces ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not got the information with respect to that, but I can easily procure it if the hon. gentleman wishes.

Mr. FOWLER. About Crown prosecutors, how are the fees regulated ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We pay Crown prosecutors in the Yukon exactly as we do all the other counsel employed by the department. When a Crown counsel has rendered a service he sends in his bill, which is taxed in the department in the regular way. Of course I may say that we allow parties something more in the Yukon than we do in the older provinces ; but the bills are taxed in the regular way.

Mr. FOWLER. And the only fees he gets are what he gets from the department here ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I cannot say as to that, but not in connection with his work as Crown prosecutor. He is supposed to receive nothing at all as Crown prosecutor except what he receives from the department. It would be a grave breach of propriety on his part to take fees from any one else in cases in which he is retained by the government.

Mr. FOWLER. But he is allowed to practice besides ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. How much was paid to the Crown prosecutor last year as fees ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not got that, I have only the Manitoba fees.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Pattullo was paid last year $7,000.95 ; Mr. Noel received $666. I think the minister ought hardly to dismiss this matter so easily. There is evidently something wrong in one or two particulars. This scale of living allowance was fixed when there was really a great difference in the cost between the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, for instance, and British Columbia. But everybody knows that that scale of living has been greatly reduced since then. Take the scale of living of a Northwest judge, for instance, you allow him nothing for his living, you give him a salary. Yet you give $5,000 in the Yukon in addition to what it costs a judge to live in the Northwest Territories. It is paying a man for something which does not cost him the amount, whilst the idea under which it is paid is that it is to cover an actual expense. It is not a right principle, as my hon. friend knows, to pay a man something as a solatium or salary under the guise of paying it as a necessary expense. Now if this practice runs through all the other departments, as I suppose it does, then it is a very large item, besides being an unfair item and it is well worth inquiring into. I think some steps ought to be taken to reduce it to a fair scale. It is unjust to the police magistrate, who has just as good an appetite and eats just as much food, and as good food, as a stenographer, that the stenographer gets $1,800 and the police magistrate only gets $1,200. Why make that difference between them? The police magistrate ought to eat more, because the stenographer's work is lighter, but there is discrimination in the living allowance. I have no doubt this living allowance really becomes part of the salary, because the difference in expenses does not at all mount up to the allowance which is given here for the purpose of living expenses. I think my hon. friend ought to look into that matter. I noticed in the newspapers that a reign of economy has been inaugurated in the Yukon, and that many officials are being dispensed with. Probably the economies are taking place because there is less work. The other ministers also seem to be getting in a little work in this respect in their departments. I think it is unfair to discriminate, and a bad principle, to give to officials under the guise of a necessary expense what is really an addition to their salary.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I quite agree that it is proper that we should have a certain specified sum for a salary, and that the sum paid should be the remuneration for services rendered by the individual to the government. Then in addition to that, if anything further is required, it ought to be

in view of conditions existing, which may vary from time to time. But I quite agree that we should not, under cover of granting a living allowance, enable a man to eke out an addition to his salary, that is improper. When this matter came up for consideration I made inquiry as to the conditions existing in the Yukon. My information is—my hon. friend may have better information—that since 1900 there has been no appreciable variation in the cost of living in the Yukon. The conditions now are about the same as they were at that time. I can see no good reason why they should vary. We must consider that almost everything that is needed must now be brought into the country at a considerable cost, which would add to the original cost of living. Then the cost of transport, I apprehend, would remain the same now as it was about that time. However, I may say to my hon. friend that I took the trouble, when George McCaulay was in the east, to send for him to come to Ottawa and explain what the conditions were. And I received from him the assurance that the conditions were the same, that the cost of living was practically the same as in 1900, and that of the additional sum of $5,000, very little could be saved. That is the information I have. While I agree with my hon. friend in the principle he laid down, I have given him the information on which I have acted, and I appreciate the necessity of giving this additional remuneration.

Mr. FOWLER. Did the minister ask the sheriff whether he required $5,000 more to live in the Yukon than a judge requires in the Northwest Territories of Manitoba? That is the very point.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Here is the position. I questioned him with respect to the difference in the increase in house rent, in the general increase in living, and the cost of ordinary necessities of life, whether or not it cost more to procure these ordinary necessities than it did here. I was told that it did, and is was on that information that I based my estimate.

Mr. FOWLER. There is no dobut it would cost more in the Yukon than it would either in the Northwest Territories or in the east. But the point I make is that it does not cost $5,000 more, the difference is too great in the living expenses. The fairer way to get at it would be to attach to the office of the judge of the Yukon a certain salary, and if we give $5,000 in this country, give him say, $7,000 there, and let him pay his own living expenses. For it does not seem to be the right thing to make a certain scale for judge, a certain scale for a police magistrate and another scale for a stenographer; you are drawing distinctions that should not be drawn in a matter like this where one man is supposed to be as good as another, and considerably better sometimes. For that reason I object to giving the extra salary. Give an increased salary, but don't say that the sheriff shall receive $1,800, a judge $5,000, a stenographer $1,000. I do not think that is right at all.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not object to increasing the salary, I think the Minister of Justice is right in saying that the salary having been increased once, it would be difficult to change it. But I think the allowance should be reduced. I may mention that a day or two ago I saw a gentleman from Dawson, a political friend of hon. gentlemen opposite, and he told me that the cost of living up there was very much reduced, in fact it was much the same as it is here, for the reason that the population has greatly decreased in Dawson; instead of being 40,000, it is now about 12,000. There are now ample provisions there, and rents are reduced. I think the living allowance should be reduced without touching the salary. Let the judge have $5,000 a year and reduce the living allowance. It is not a right principle to make this difference between the living allowance of the judge and the stenographer, or any other employee.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I may say to my hon. friends opposite that all the departments are considering the question of living allowances, and if there is any objection to allowing the item to pass, I am willing it should stand until such time as we have made a rule applicable to all the departments, and which will be consistent with the altered conditions in the Yukon. So far as I am personally concerned, I am prepared to allow the item to stand for a day or two until I can get better information. I know where I can get it.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the same question will come up in other departments. I think it ought to be looked into.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, with respect to all the departments. What my hon. friend has said is applicable not only to the Department of Justice, but to all the departments which have officials in the Yukon.

Mr. BERGERON. There ought not to be discrimination anyway.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not agree that there is discrimination. I made a mistake when I said that Sheriff Eilbeck was in the Yukon. That gentleman is now in a hospital in San Francisco where he has undergone an operation.

Living allowances of sheriff, deputy sheriff, clerk of court, assistant clerks, police magistrate and stenographers of territorial court at $1,800 each, $14,400.

Mr. SPROULE. How will your determination in reference to these salaries be affected by the fact that these votes have passed the House?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We are not obliged to pay them. We only get authority to pay

them, and if the House attaches the condition that the authority is given upon the assurance given by the Minister of Justice that this money will not be paid except after an investigation, then, of course, whoever comes here next year and seeks to put justice estimates through will have to be responsible for the performance of that condition. It is immaterial to me. I am willing to allow it to stand over, get the information and come back to the House after the other ministers have come to a conclusion about it.

Mr. FOWLER. What are the salaries of a police court judge and stenographer ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The police court stenographer gets $1,200.

Mr. FOWLER. Salary ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. And you have a police court judge ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Justice Macaulay was originally appointed police magistrate for the Yukon Territory, but after he went to that territory it was found that it would be necessary to add to the strength of the high court. We thought that the better plan would be to confer upon Mr. Justice Macaulay the jurisdiction of a high court judge, leaving it to him to continue to perform the duties of police magistrate.

Mr. FOWLER. And he just gets the salary of a police magistrate ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He gets the salary of a High Court Judge.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the reason the police court stenographer does not get the same salary as the stenographer in the other court ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Because he is not so competent. We have a stenographer in the high court who can take depositions in French and English. It is very hard to get men who are competent to take depositions in French and English, and it is much more difficult to get men to report evidence in the high court than in the police court, where practically a man can take it under dictation. In jury cases, as my hon. friend doubtless knows it is sometimes very difficult work for the stenographer to report accurately.

Mr. BERGERON. And you have two of that kind ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, and very competent men.

Mr. FOWLER. Do these judges go on circuit, or only sit in Dawson ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, they go on circuit.

Mr. FOWLER. What circuits have they?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not think there is much circuit work done. I think there are only two circuits.

Mr. FOWLER. I suppose Judge Macaulay only sits as police magistrate, and then sits in the court of appeal en banc.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I believe he does considerable amount of high court work. Our experience, at least since I have been in the department, has been that judges very frequently in the winter time come out; in fact, almost every third year one of them comes out, so that when one is away the others have to perform the duties.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the Governor of the Yukon ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I cannot say. I think there is no commissioner appointed permanently, but that the officer in charge of the mounted police is performing the duties.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the former commissioner resign before he ran ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I apprehend he was obliged to do that.

Mr. FOSTER. A bona fide resignation ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. I think that Major Wood of the mounted police now performs the duties.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose it would be possible for the ministers to have this matter taken up, and before the end of the session be able to inform parliament what conclusion they have come to in reference to it. It ought not to be difficult to come to a conclusion in regard to it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think so. In view of the fact that we have here now Mr. Cory, who has been acting as inspector of public offices in the Yukon for some years past, I think we ought to be able to get reliable information—information of such a nature as to enable us to determine what we ought to do.

Mr. FOSTER. And then we have another reliable source of information—the man who is to speak for the Yukon, who will be here in a little while, and who will be able to give my hon. friend very reliable information.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And I have no doubt it will be perfectly impartial.

Mr. FOSTER. It will be truthful.

Mr. BERGERON. He will know what he is talking about, anyway.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I hope there is no insinuation contained in that.

Mr. BERGERON. Oh, no, not here.

Maintenance of prisoners, $25,000.

Mr. BERGERON. How many prisoners are there there ? Are they living like the judges ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We do our best for them. The prisoners in the Yukon are kept in the guard-room, and we allow the mounted police $2 per diem for each prisoner.

Mr. FOSTER. For his keep ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. How many are there ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not the figures.

Mr. BERGERON. How many are there generally ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I could not tell you.

Mr. BERGERON. Twenty-five thousand dollars would pay for a good many.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It occurred to me that we ought to be able to reduce that amount, and I asked the official why we could not reduce it. For the information of the House, I shall read the report which he makes.

Probably this could be reduced to $20,000 without any inconvenience as desired by the minister, but it was thought that a good margin should be left, as the rate being $2 per diem, each prisoner costs $730 and it would only take ten additional prisoners to cost $7,300 more.

Last year, of course, we did not spend the amount we estimated.

Mr. FOSTER. Two dollars is a pretty high rate.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Everything appears to come high in the Yukon. We pay 60 cents in the Northwest Territories to the Mounted Police. That has been the rate established for some years, and the rate is $2 in the Yukon.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice in the present contest in Toronto—to bring in an extraneous matter—that a document was sent around which represents a scientific man there as saying that it is possible to get up a good food and to keep people for three cents or so a day. My hon. friend might get a supply of that food, and it would be a tremendous economy.

Fees and expenses of witnesses, jurors and interpreters in criminal trials, $15,000.

Mr. BERGERON. How many terms of the criminal court have they there ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The judges themselves regulate that; they sit when it is necessary.

Mr. BERGERON. They have no regular terms ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No regular terms.

Law books, &c., and freight thereon, for the use of bench and bar and stationery, and freight thereon, for use of courts, $2,500.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that amount spent each year on the purchase of books ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, we have been doing that for years. I may tell my hon. friend that up to the last year or two we did this for the Northwest Territories as well. I am in the hands of the House with respect to that item. I cut it out with respect to the Northwest two years, and it is a question whether or not we should continue to supply books for the judges and the bar of the Yukon. I think it is a vicious practice that has grown up and has been continued for many years.

Mr. BERGERON. So long as the money is expended for that purpose it may be all right.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is no question about that.

Mr. BERGERON. I suppose that my hon. friend finds out if the books are bought ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I know absolutely nothing about that, but I take all the responsibility for anything that is done, because it is my deputy, one of the most competent men for work of that description, who makes a selection of books and sees that they are sent up.

Mr. BERGERON. They are sent from here ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, they are bought in Toronto and sent forward from there.

Mr. BERGERON. They have a librarian in the Yukon ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, there is a librarian who receives a salary of $1,500 and $1,200 as living allowance.

Mr. BERGERON. There is another discrimination, $1,200 for him and $1,800 for the stenographer.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I cannot help discriminations; a good man must necessarily command higher wages.

Mr. FOWLER. Did I understand the minister to say that he proposed to cut this item out ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, I did not say that; I said I was entirely in the hands of the House with respect to that. It is a practice that has grown up in all sections of the country administered from here. I found it in existence in the Northwest Territories and the same system was adopted for the Yukon, which, of course, had a provisional government similar in some respects to that of the Northwest Territories. Two years ago, I think it was, we dropped the item with respect to the Northwest Territo-

ries, and I now say that I am in the hands of the House with respect to this item. There are reasons why we should supply the judges and the bar with law books and there are reasons why we should not. I could urge very good reasons why a judge out there should be required to have his own library and why the bar should provide their own books as lawyers do with us.

Mr. FOWLER. As a matter of fact, it seems to me that the lawyers there get better fees than we do down here and are in a better position to buy books than we who are struggling in the east.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Some of you struggle very successfully.

Mr. FOWLER. In my judgment that item should be struck out.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have no objection to dropping it.

Mr. FOWLER. It is not a large item it is true, but the principle remains the same, whether it is large or small.

Mr. FOSTER. Let it drop.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The item of $2,500 is dropped.

Mr. GALLIHER. Do I understand you to say that item was cut out?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have no objection to hearing what my hon. friend (Mr. Galliher) has to say, but I am afraid it is disposed of.

Mr. GALLIHER. If the item has been dropped, of course it is no use my saying anything.

Miscellaneous expenditures, including fees and expense of crown prosecutor, salary and living allowance of stenographer of police court and other officers or employes connected with the administration of justice, coroners' inquests, &c., &c., $25,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Of that $25,000 how much was spent last year?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of the stenographers, Geo. Grey received $2,000, salary and living allowance, $1,800; J. A. Valiquette received a salary of $2,000 and living allowance, $1,800; H. G. Blankman, stenographer, received a salary of $1,200 and a living allowance of $1,800. The Crown prosecutor received somewhere in the neighbourhood of $7,030.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the minister in possession of information as to the amount of fees that are paid in these courts? I am inquiring especially in regard to fees for medical evidence.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not that information by me, but we have in the department a scale of allowances for the Yukon Territory.

Dominion Police, $37,000.

Mr. BERGERON. There is an increase there.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is caused by the increase of pay to the commissioner and the members of the force. The commissioner had been in receipt of $2,400 a year, and for many years there had not been any addition to his remuneration. I myself, without solicitation on his part, recently increased his allowance to $3,000 a year. The commissioner of police, Col. Sherwood, is one of the most competent officers in the Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. If he succeeded in getting the best of those bogus ballot boxes, I think he ought to get it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. When occasion requires, he is always to the fore.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the addition to the pay of the police?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Forty men received an increase of 25 cents per diem. The inspectors now get $2.90 and $2.75, the sergeants, $2.40; 14 constables, $2.15, 9, $2.05, 7 $1.80 and 8 $1.50.

Mr. FOWLER. Did you add any to the force?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, two men have been added, involving an increased expense of $1,350. The justification for that is the necessity for policing the different public buildings throughout the city. Formerly when the departments were all together here, we could do with a smaller force. So far as the police force is concerned, it is absolutely controlled by the commissioner. He makes all his recommendations, and the statute practically makes him the master of the force, and I think it is quite proper that it should be so.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the minister inform the House whether this building is under the control of this parliament or under the control of the provincial government? I saw in the press the other day that the barber down stairs had been reported for shaving on Sunday, and I thought that perhaps the hon. minister could give us a little information as to what extent policemen in plain clothes or otherwise, who are not members of the Dominion police, have the right to invade the barber shop, the restaurant and other parts of this building?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is a somewhat delicate constitutional question, and requires some consideration before I can give an answer. I am quite safe, however, in saying this, that if the Dominion police had been aware that any outsider had invaded the premises for the purpose described by my hon. friend, he would have received very scant courtesy indeed.

Post Office—outside service—salaries and allowances including salary of $960.00 for Mr. James Dundas, a railway mail clerk, re-instat-

ed in the service on the 1st September, 1898, and hereby restored to his former status under the Civil Service Superannuation Act on payment of a sum equivalent to the statutory deduction on that salary from date of dismissal; his service to be considered as continuous, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service or Superannuation Acts, $1,694,238.50.

Mr. FOWLER. Explain this.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Mr. Dundas was a railway mail clerk in Ontario. In the year 1896 he was reported by the judges in an election trial as guilty of some corrupt practice, and on that account was dismissed from the service.

Mr. FOSTER. In the Dominion elections or the provincial?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. In the Dominion, in a controverted election case. He was a year and a half out of the service, and was then reinstated. In the meantime, the civil service Superannuation Act had been repealed, and if he had not been allowed the benefit of that Act, he would have lost many of the advantages that would otherwise have accrued to him as the result of his contributions to the fund.

Mr. BERGERON. Whom was he dismissed by?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The present government.

Mr. FOSTER. What was his crime?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. He was convicted by the trial judges of having bribed an elector and paid money in the campaign.

Mr. FOSTER. Has my hon. friend any sympathy or fellow feeling for him?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not know what my hon. friend means by the inquiry. The item itself explains the extent of our sympathy.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a justification of him as a good officer anyway.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. He was dismissed as there was nothing apparently to mitigate the offence. But afterwards some friends of his told me that his offence really arose from good fellowship and that he was not a bad sort of fellow after all. In order to be satisfied, I myself applied to the trial judges to see if they could find anything in extenuation and they did so. On the strength of their view of the case, the Council reinstated him.

Mr. FOWLER. How long was he out—about a year and a half?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think so. I have here the Order in Council which I shall read, if my hon. friend desires. The judges made a friendly report and we concluded to reinstate him.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not wish to criticise my hon. friend's course. On the contrary, I think he took a very charitable view; but if the government are going to look at such things in that way, I could remind them of cases of men who were dismissed simply because they had voted at the elections and without undergoing any trial at all. Those men had paid into the superannuation fund and lost their positions and everything. If the government are prepared to continue in the course indicated by my hon. friend, I could present for their consideration some very deserving cases.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I would be very sorry indeed that any one should be dismissed simply for having voted.

Mr. BERGERON. I could name some.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not think it possible that the government could have dismissed a man simply because he exercised his rights as a citizen, and I am quite confident there must be some other circumstances of which my hon. friend apparently knows nothing.

Mr. FOSTER. In my own county a man was dismissed, who simply went and cast his vote, and took no other part in the election at all. The only reason given for his dismissal was that he had a brother, who did not hold a government office, but who took an active part in the campaign. That was conclusively proved by one of the government's own commissioners. The only reason why this man was dismissed, and the reason given parliament for his dismissal, was that his brother was an active partisan. Now that you have made the amende honourable to this gentleman—and I am not finding any fault with you for that—surely you ought to do something in the case I mention.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am not speaking for any other department but my own, and I have no information of anything of the kind to which my hon. friend refers. I think it will be found that there were other circumstances to justify the government, but it is quite impossible in a general way to deal with these methods. Each case must be dealt with on its own merits. I should be amazed if any minister ever dismissed any one for having simply exercised his rights as a citizen.

Mr. FOWLER. There were more persons dismissed in the district I represent from the hon. gentleman's own department after 1896 than from all the other departments. He seemed to be particularly vindictive against persons who had been reported to him as having simply voted as their consciences dictated. Persons holding post offices throughout the country were dismissed without any investigation whatever. The hon. gentleman says that a man has a perfect right to vote, in which I agree with him, but I go further and say he has not only the right to vote, but the right to use

whatever influence he has to induce others to vote as he thinks right. I do not think that a man should be dismissed for having exercised his powers of persuasion over his fellow citizens. The only ground for dismissal should be dereliction of office.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I would not like by my silence to be considered as admitting that I ever dismissed any one under such circumstances as those to which my hon. friend has referred. If he will bring any case of dismissal to my attention, he will find that the circumstances differ materially from what he thinks they were.

Mr. FOWLER. I never knew the hon. gentleman yet to admit anything, but he must remember that during the last four years I have frequently brought to his attention dismissals of postmasters for no other reason than the recommendation of the person who had control of the patronage.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The other day I promised my hon. friend from Beauharnois an explanation why a certain messenger was getting $720. The explanation is that some officers in that class have accepted the grade system, which was inaugurated three years ago. Under that system a man is graded at so much a day and may ultimately reach the yearly amount of $725.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is the line of demarcation between the two classes when the appointments are made?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The messengers may be appointed purely messengers or on the grade system. For example, a porter or packer gets $700 a year. To-day, if we were to appoint a porter or packer, we could, if we chose, appoint him as a grade officer, on a per diem basis. That system has been very generally adopted with letter-carriers and those who work around post offices. They enter at $1.25 per day, rising, in a few months, to $1.50 a day and so on until, after about four years service, they reach a maximum of $2.25 per day. In addition, they are entitled to a bonus of $20 a year for good conduct. I think that my hon. friend will find that these figures aggregate $724.25. The officer he speaks of was in that class, at a maximum of $724.25, and his name was A. Smith.

Mr. BERGERON. And they are appointed permanently ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, the difference is in the mode of payment.

Mr. BERGERON. Who decides how they shall be appointed ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. When the law came into effect, every man had the privilege of electing to continue under the old law or come under the new. The new appointments are made under the grade system.

Mr. BERGERON. I thank the Postmaster General for this information. Coming back to the matter we were speaking of a few moments ago, I wish to refer to a case that came under my own observation. The Postmaster at Beauharnois in 1896 was Mr. Alexis Doutre. He was a very good officer, and nothing was ever said against the way he kept the post office. Before his appointment he had been a strong partisan, but, while postmaster he did nothing that should have excited the anger of those in the locality who did not share his political opinions. When my hon. friend (Sir Wm. Mulock) took hold of the department, Mr. Doutre was dismissed summarily, without investigation granted, though I asked for it. An officer of the department came and demanded his keys. The dismissal caused Mr. Doutre great inconvenience. He had rented a house for which he was personally responsible. The gentleman who replaced him in office, a political friend of hon. gentlemen opposite, has performed his duties well. But, I am sorry to say, he is very sick to-day, and I believe, cannot hold his position very long. I think it would be a graceful and generous thing for the Postmaster General, if the position becomes vacant, to reappoint Mr. Doutre to the position he formerly held. He has not recovered financially from the disadvantages to which he was put by his sudden dismissal. It was unexpected ; it was a contingency he had not provided for. If he were reappointed, it would only be an act of justice, and it would do the party of the hon. member far more good than it would do me. It would be a wise move for the further reason that, when the time comes to fill the office, the Postmaster General will find many demands, but he will find few applicants who would be acceptable to himself if he knew the cases well. I might say that I have always looked at these matters differently from the Postmaster General. Even in the old days, during the time when I supported a government in this House, there were many postmasters in Beauharnois opposed to me. Yet, I never asked for the dismissal of any of them, and some of them are there still and they worked against me. I do not complain of that, because their official duties are properly performed. But I use this argument as a further ground for asking that, if the present postmaster of Beauharnois does not hold his office, the Postmaster General will re-appoint the man who was dismissed—as he will find on looking into the matter—without any good reason.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) has certainly a very winning way of appealing to one. I can only say that if it becomes necessary to appoint a postmaster at Beauharnois, what the hon.

gentleman has said will be remembered. Of course, I cannot make any promise. I do not recollect the circumstances under which the former postmaster was relieved of his duties.

Mr. BERGERON. I would be happy, in another place to remind my hon. friend of the circumstances.

Mr. SPROULE. Some time ago, it was intimated in the newspapers that, notwithstanding that the Postmaster General had increased the salaries of country postmasters, it was contemplated to give them another raise, and that that would be done this winter. Was there anything in that, or was it a rumour for election purposes ? It was spoken of several times in our part of the country.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I did not hear the rumour, and do not know of any foundation for it.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the hon. gentleman (Sir William Mulock) please explain the increases ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There is a total increase of $125,068. This is made up as follows : Increases in Post Office Inspectors' offices $2,154.75 ; increases in the railway mail service $22,456.50 ; the city post offices $90,456.75—all increases in salaries.

Mr. FOWLER. Are they all statutory ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think so. The inspectors are entitled to certain increases after certain years of service. There are seven increases of $100, seventeen increases of $50 each, one increase of $78.25, one increase of $30 and a short estimate in 1904-5 of $496.50. There are seven increases to the inspectors of $100 each. In the New Brunswick division Mr. N. R. Colter gets an increase of $100, which will bring his salary up to $2,500. The limit is $2,600.

Mr. FOSTER. According to the Auditor General's Report he is not nearly up to the maximum yet.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. At all events, he is entitled under the law to an extra $100. The Civil Service Amendment Act raises the maximum to these inspectors. They were not entitled to promotion to a higher class until they had passed so many years in the service, that was under the old law ; but under the amendment of two years ago many changes were made in the salaries of civil servants, and, amongst others, of the inspectors.

Mr. FOWLER. Are they all on one footing ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. All treated exactly the same, no discrimination at all, no favouritism ; they are all treated according to the law.

Mr. FOWLER. Discrimination is not always favouritism.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. In the Quebec division Inspector Bolduc gets an increase of $100.

Mr. FOSTER. In the New Brunswick division Mr. Colter is now getting how much?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. What the Auditor General has assigned to him, I suppose.

Mr. FOSTER. The yearly increase is $100 to an inspector ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I forget what the provision of the Act is, there are a number of changes in the status of the civil service. Inspector Bolduc is now getting $2,400.

Mr. FOSTER. No, he got $2,288 according to this report.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My officer says $2,400 is right. I cannot explain the Auditor General's figures ; I do not know which is right. But he is at his maximum.

Mr. FOSTER. But these are all government officers. Does he get anything besides his salary ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My officer explains that that will be for the year closing June 30, 1904, and that would be $2,300. He has probably had $100 of an increase, and then on that $2,300 there may have been some reduction for superannuation, which will bring it down to that broken sum. Now my officer says that the salary was increased from $2,300 to $2,400 in August last. Therefore, what I am reading is correct.

Mr. FOWLER. For the new year he will get $2,500 ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. He is actually now in receipt of $2,400, and that will continue to be his salary until these estimates come into effect. Then he will get the benefit of the $100 increase.

Mr. FOWLER. Will that $12 and some cents be the amount of his superannuation tax ?

Mr. FOSTER. It is $11.58.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not know what the deduction is for the superannuation fund. It is two and a-half per cent, is it not ?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If Mr. Colter entered after the repeal of the Superannuation Act, his contribution would be at the rate of five per cent per annum to the retirement fund.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, I do not see how you get that figure.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The next item is J. W. Bain, Montreal division. He re-

ceives an increase of $100. J. A. Madore, assistant inspector, will get an increase of $100. Kingston office, Henry Merrick, present salary $2,500, will get $100 extra; Toronto office, J. Henderson, present salary, $2,500, will get $100 extra; Victoria division, E. H. Fletcher——

Mr. FOWLER. If these increases are only by virtue of the Act passed two years ago, how do these men come to get $100 more than the other inspectors you spoke of?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I suppose they have been longer in the service, and got their promotion earlier.

Mr. FOWLER. But I understand that all this dates from the Civil Service Act passed two years ago.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. This $100 is one thing and the salary before that Act applied is another thing. They were appointed at different dates.

Mr. FOWLER. But they were not getting these statutory increases before the passing of that Act.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Not these, of course.

Mr. FOWLER. No, but they were all supposed, as I understand, to start even from the time the Act was passed two years ago, and I cannot understand how some persons get a little farther ahead than others.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We will see what the old Civil Service Act gave them. The old Act said that a first-class inspector on appointment should receive $2,200 a year, after ten years' service $2,400, and after twenty years' service $2,600 a year. A second-class inspector on appointment received $2,000, after ten years' service $2,200, and after twenty years' service $2,400. Then this law was amended by the Post Office Amendment Act, chapter 49 of the statutes of 1903 as follows:

The salary of a post office inspector on appointment shall be two thousand dollars, with increases of fifty dollars a year for six years, and one hundred dollars a year thereafter up to a maximum of two thousand six hundred dollars.

Any post office inspector who, at the passing of this Act, has completed six years of service as such may be granted an increase of one hundred dollars a year up to the maximum of two thousand six hundred dollars.

Any post office inspector who, at the passing of this Act, has completed less than six years of service as such may be granted an increase of fifty dollars a year until he has completed six years of service, and one hundred a year thereafter up to the maximum of two thousand six hundred dollars.

The salary of an assistant post office inspector on appointment shall be twelve hundred dollars, with increases of fifty dollars a year for the first six years, and one hundred dollars a year thereafter up to a maximum of one thousand eight hundred dollars.

And so on. There are two other classes. These persons did not have the same salaries.

Mr. FOWLER. They did not all start even?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, they did not. That disposes of seven of them. I did not give Mr. E. H. Fletcher, of Victoria, whose salary is $2,400. He will get $100. That makes $700 given to the inspectors.

Mr. FOWLER. Are there only seven inspectors altogether?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There are about eleven, but the others are at the maximum. Then there are seventeen increases of $50 each, making $850. I will give those. They are clerks in the inspectors' offices, as follows:

	Present salary.
Nova Scotia Division—	
E. A. Macdonald, junior 3rd class	$ 750
New Brunswick division—	
W. Hatch, first class	1,200
A. Thompson, senior second class	1,150
Quebec division—	
M. Pelletier, junior 2nd class	950
M. M. Shaw, junior 3rd class	750
Montreal division—	
M. A. Curran, 4th class	630
Ottawa division—	
M. J. Whitty, first class	1,300
A. L. Robinson, junior 3rd class	750
M. C. Green, 4th class	630
Kingston division—	
M. Ford, junior 3rd class	750
Toronto division—	
M. S. Bradley, senior 2nd class	1,050
London division—	
H. G. Sears, 4th class	450
Manitoba division—	
J. L. Broughton, first class	1,250
J. R. Simmons, senior 2nd class	1,050
E. R. A. Stevenson, senior 2nd class	1,050
N. Gouin, 4th class	630
Vancouver division—	
P. Keyes, junior 3rd class	750

Seventeen in all receiving $50 each, which makes $850. Then in the office at St. John there is an increase of $78.25. This is to advance J. C. Henderson, messenger in the office of the post office inspector at St. John from grade D to grade C, increasing his salary from $1.50 to $1.75 a day. There is also an increase of $30 to increase the salary of M. A. O'Reilly, junior third-class clerk in the office of the post office inspector at Quebec, from $770 to $800, the maximum of the class. This includes another item of $496.50, short estimated for 1904-5. It is made up of the following particulars: The salaries of the undermentioned junior third-class clerks were raised to $700 on 13th August, 1903, which became the minimum salary of that class by the amendment to the Civil Service Act of 1903:

	From	To	
Quebec division—			
M. M. Shaw	$ 690	$ 700	
Kingston division—			
M. Ford	610	700	
Vancouver division—			
P. Keyes..	600	700	
	1,900	2,000	
		1,900	200

Three increases of $50 each granted to the undermentioned junior third-class clerks which had not been specially provided for in the estimates for 1904-5.

	From	To	
Quebec division—			
M. M. Shaw	$700	$750	
Kingston division—			
M. Ford	700	750	
Vancouver division—			
P. Keyes..	700	750	$150
Two increases of $78.25 each.			
Messrs. J. A. Screaton, messenger in the office of the post office inspector at London, and A. Raymond, messenger in the office of the post office inspector at Quebec, were advanced from grade 'D' to grade 'E' from March 1, and September 1, 1904, respectively, with an increase of 25 cents a day or $78.25 a year each..			$156 50
			$506 50
Less an over-estimate, in the salary of Miss M. A. O'Reilly, junior third-class clerk in the office of the post office inspector at Quebec....			10 00
			$496 50

The next item making up this $125,000 is increases to the salaries of the railway mail clerks. The total amount of the increase in the salaries of the railway mail service men is $32,456.50.

I may explain generally that there was an amendment to the Post Office Act affecting the salaries of the railway mail clerks. Formerly the railway mail clerk service was divided into three classes. A man received, I think, $480 at entrance, and in a short time when his period of probation ended, he was entitled to be promoted to a third-class clerkship at $520. He remained in this class for at least five years and then he might be eligible to be promoted to the second class. I think the minimum of the second class was $640. If he were promoted from the third class to the second class he would enter at a minimum of $640 and go up to $800, the maximum of the second class. He would remain at that figure until he was promoted into a higher class, which in the past depended to some extent upon the occurrence of a vacancy, so that a man might stick at $800 for a considerable period. The maximum of the first class was $960, and if a man was promoted from the second to the first class his maximum would be $960 and mileage. We changed the law a couple of years ago abolishing classes and fixing a minimum entrance salary and a maximum salary. Men now enter the service as probationers for six months, after examination, and they are paid $400 a year during this probationary period and also their mileage. If at the expiration of the probationary period they are considered fit to be continued in the service they are appointed and begin at a salary of $500 a year. There is now no division into classes, but every mail clerk is entitled to an annual increase if his service is satisfactory until he attains the maximum salary of $1,200.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the annual increase?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. $50. We have 460 railway mail clerks, and this $50 a year practically applies to all of them who are deserving, and I think there are not many who are not deserving. Even those who were formerly at the maximum are getting the benefit of the $50 until they reach the $1,200.

Mr. FOWLER. Has there been any change in the mileage rate ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, it is the same as it was, half a cent per mile in the day time and a cent at night.

Mr. FOWLER. Who settles the routes of the different clerks?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The Controller of the Railway Mail Service, Mr. Armstrong.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the duty of the chief railway mail clerk of each?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We have no such office now, we have a superintendent for each province.

Mr. FOWLER. He used to be called the chief clerk.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. In New Brunswick for example there is a superintendent.

Mr. FOWLER. What is his duty?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. He is an office man to some extent, keeping tab on the clerks.

Mr. FOWLER. Does he not settle their routes?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Subject to the opinion of the controller.

Mr. FOWLER. Always?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I suppose he is largely responsible for the organization in his district.

Mr. FOWLER. The controller would not have to pass upon the route of each man. For instance, suppose the superintendent directed John Smith to run from St. John to Montreal, the controller would not have to pass on that before it would be made

John Smith's route, but if there was a complaint the controller would be brought in.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I fancy he would have to pass on that because a railway mail clerk running from St. John to Montreal would be operating in other inspectors' districts, and that circumstance would have to be considered. Does the committee desire me to read the names of the clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. They are all on that uniform basis?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. All on that uniform basis. There may be some who do not get the increase for some reason. The controller determines the question. I have nothing to do with that except to act on his advice and the advice of the deputy.

Mr. FOWLER. Where you have a system of mileage as with the railway mail clerks I suppose the amount of salary depends largely on the number of miles travelled; they are not all alike.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not think that there is much profit to the clerks in the mileage as when traveling they are put to extra expense. Some of them are economical and may make something out of it, but from what I hear there is not much gain to them in travelling when they receive only half a cent to a cent a mile.

That disposes of $32,456.50. The next item making up the $125.000 is an item of $90,456.70 for city post offices.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Sir William Mulock, House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, January 25, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

STR. CHAMPLAIN.

Mr. MORIN asked:

1. What is the actual cost to the government of the steamer 'Champlain' delivered at Quebec?
2. What average sum per diem has the said steamer 'Champlain' cost the government since she arrived at Quebec?
3. How many trips across the St. Lawrence, from the wharf at Riviere Ouelle or St. Denis, to Murray Bay has the said 'Champlain' made?
4. What is the reason why the said steamer 'Champlain' has not made regular trips between the two above named places?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. $87,600.
2. For wages, board, fuel, oil and clothing, an average of $80.
3. Sixteen round trips, up to the latest report on the 17th instant.
4. Very heavy ice which grounds on a shoal extending off Rivière Ouelle wharf (this shoal will be removed this season) combined with snow storms and fog; and for a short time undergoing repairs owing to slight accident.

STR. 'MONTCALM.'

Mr. MORIN asked:

1. What is the actual cost to the government of the steamer 'Montcalm' delivered at Quebec?
2. What is the average cost per diem to the government of the steamer 'Montcalm' since its arrival at Quebec?
3. What is the said steamer employed for?
4. How many trips has the said steamer made from the city of Quebec to the Island of Orleans and vice versa?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. $272,000.
2. $150 principally owing to the large coal consumption.
3. She is employed in the endeavour to secure the opening of navigation between Quebec and Montreal earlier in the spring, and keep it open later in the fall. Also to render assistance to vessels caught in the ice, and establish the possibility of winter navigation on the north shore of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. She will also be employed in the summer time as a lighthouse and buoy tender for the province of Quebec.
4. None; her work has been above Quebec.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. Who are the present members of the Harbour Commission of the port of Montreal appointed by the government?
2. When were the several appointments made?
3. What is the length of their term of office?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Hon. Robert Mackay, Jonathan Hodgson, Robert Bickerdike, M.P., Alphonse Racine, Eustache H. Lemay and W. E. Doran.

2. The date of appointment of the first five was September 28, 1896. The date of Mr. Doran's appointment was April 15, 1902.

3. During pleasure.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. Has Mr. Jonathan Hodgson tendered his resignation as a member of the Board of Commissioners for the port of Montreal ?

2. If so, what reasons did he give for his action ?

3. Has the said resignation been accepted ?

4. Is it the intention of the government to name another in his place ?

5. If so, when will the nomination be made ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Yes; March 23, 1904.

2. Personal reasons.

3. No.

4. No. The intention of the government is to revise the whole organization of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal this session.

5. Answered by the answer to No. 4.

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. Referring to the estimates for 1904-5, in which occurred the following item : Ocean and river service, further amount required for removal of obstructions, including sunken elevator at Montreal, and obstruction in Ostall river, B.C., $9,000, and regarding which it was stated in the House by the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that $7,000 of this amount was for the raising of the above elevator, has this amount been reimbursed to the government by the parties interested, or are any steps being taken to secure the repayment of same ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. The cost of raising the sunken elevator at Montreal has been paid to the Montreal Harbour Commissioners by the Montreal Grain Elevating Company. The Department of Marine and Fisheries has been put to no expense in the matter.

STEEL SHEDS—MONTREAL HARBOUR.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. When were the plans, specifications and estimates for the steel sheds, presently being constructed in the port of Montreal, first approved by the government ?

2. Since the aforesaid approval have any alterations in said plans, specifications and estimates been authorized by the government ?

3. Since the awarding of the contract by the Harbour Commission have any alterations in the terms thereof received the sanction of the government, and if so, what are they ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. December 21, 1903.

2. No.

3. No.

Mr. PREFONTAINE.

MR. P. W. ST. GEORGE.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. Is there at present in the employment of the Department of Marine and Fisheries a party by the name of P. W. St. George ?

2. If so, when did his term of service commence ; for what work was he engaged ; and what remuneration has he to date received ?

3. What degrees, titles or certificates does the said P. W. St. George hold as engineer ; and what previous experience has he had in the matter of the construction of steel sheds ?

4. Has the said P. W. St. George prepared plans independent of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal for steel wharf sheds ? If so, when, and at whose instance ; and have any such plans been submitted to or approved by the Governor in Council, or by the Minister of Public Works, or by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Yes.

2. August 9, 1904. As engineer to superintendent, in conjunction with the engineer of the Montreal Harbour Commissioners the construction of sheds and conveyor galleries in the harbour of Montreal.

He has been paid up to date, $1,167.67.

3. He is a member of the Institute of Civil Engineers of London, England, and a member of the Council of the Canadian Society of Civil Engineers. This is considered sufficient guarantee of his professional standing.

4. In October, 1904. At the instance of the minister to embody changes suggested by the Shipping Federation and other parties interested. They have been submitted to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and are now under consideration.

IMPORTS UNDER PREFERENTIAL TARIFF.

Mr. DANIEL asked :

1. What is the amount and value of goods imported into Canada under the preferential tariff during the years 1903 and 1904 ?

2. Of these amounts, what proportion was imported through St. Lawrence ports, and what proportion through Canadian Atlantic ports ?

3. What amounts were imported through United States ports, and what were the ports, and what was the amount for each such ports ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. The Customs Statistical Returns do not enable an answer to be given to this inquiry, except as to the value of goods entered for consumption in Canada under the Preferential Tariff, which was as follows :

For fiscal year 1902-3, $37,614,505.

For fiscal year 1903-4, $44,765,253.

2.—3. The Customs Statistical Returns do not show separately the goods imported through the United States of the St. Lawrence or Atlantic ports of Canada when entered under the Preferential Tariff. We could give from the total imports under both the General and Preferential Tariffs,

the quantity that came in at the Atlantic and St. Lawrence ports and the American ports, but we cannot distinguish with reference to the Preferential goods in that respect.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. WARD—by Mr. Foster—asked :

1. What surveys, if any, have been made during the past year, of proposed routes of the Trent Valley Canal between Rice Lake and Lake Ontario ?
2. By whom have such surveys been made ?
3. Have any reports of such surveys been received by the government ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Surveys have been or are being made between Rice Lake and Port Hope, also between Rice Lake and Cobourg and between Rice Lake and Trenton in connection with the Trent canal.
2. The surveys are being conducted by Mr. E. J. Walsh, C.E.:
Port Hope survey being made by Mr. G. L. Law.
Cobourg survey being made by Mr. G. L. Law.
Trenton survey being made by Mr. S. E. Patterson.
3. No reports have yet been received of the results of these surveys, which are not finished.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION—PERMANENT SHEDS.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved:

For copies of all correspondence between the Board of Montreal Harbour Commissioners and the Department of Marine and Fisheries in regard to the erection of permanent sheds upon the wharfs in the harbour of Montreal ; and of the correspondence had between the government and the Federation of Shippers ; and engineers' reports in the possession of the government upon the same subject ; also copies of correspondence between the Department of Marine and Fisheries and F. D. Monk, M.P., upon the same subject.

He said : The object of this motion is to obtain all the correspondence which has taken place within the last two or three years between the government and the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal. It is desired also to have some light thrown, by the production of that correspondence, upon the difficulties alleged to exist among the Harbour Commissioners, or if not within that body itself, between the Harbour Board and the government. These difficulties have undoubtedly delayed the prosecution of the harbour improvements and more particularly the construction of the permanent sheds, which were expected to be terminated for the opening of navigation.

It is also desired to know what is the policy of the government in reference to the Montreal Harbour Board, and if the government intends, during the present session, remodelling and changing completely the constitution of the board. I perceive by an answer given by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) a moment ago, that that object is in contemplation; hence it is that we are interested, not only in Montreal, but I submit all over the Dominion, in knowing what those changes are. Let me state, Sir, for the information of the House, that the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal are a very old institution. The administration of the harbour may be said to have been organized long before confederation, and indeed previous to the union of the two Canadas. The first statute relating to harbour administration in the port of Montreal is 6 William IV, chap. 20; and from time to time during the union that statute was amended by the parliament of United Canada. Since confederation, no less, I believe, than twenty-one amendments were made to the law organizing as a body the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, defining their jurisdiction and indicating the limits of the harbour itself.

In 1894 the legislation to which I have just referred was consolidated by chapter 48 of 57 and 58 Victoria, known as the Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Act of 1894, which is the law as it stands to-day. Under the terms of this law, I think it is well to remind the House, the Montreal Harbour Board, the administration of the harbour, is, in an indirect manner, under the control of the Dominion government. The corporation of the Harbour Board of Montreal now consists of eleven commissioners, of whom six are appointed by the Governor General in Council, and hold their office during pleasure. The mayor of Montreal is ex-officio, during his occupation of the magisterial chair, that is during his term of office, a member of the Montreal Harbour Board. In addition there are four commissioners elected by each of the following bodies for four years : First, the commissioner elected by the Montreal Board of Trade, another commissioner elected by the Montreal Corn Exchange Association, another by the Chambre de Commerce de Montréal, and finally, a fourth by the shipping interests; that is to say, persons or companies having offices in Montreal, owners or agents of sea-going vessels entering the harbour of Montreal for the purpose of trade. This legislation of 1894 not only defines anew the limits of the harbour, but gives the commissioners extensive powers of borrowing, expropriating, executing improvements, and levying tolls and rates.

A word now as to the personnel of the commission as it is composed at the present time. The members of the commission named by the government and occupying their positions during pleasure, are : The Hon. Robert Mackay, president of the

board; Jonathan Hodgson, Robert Bickerdike, M.P., Alphonse Racine, merchant, Eustache Lemay, merchant, Wm. E. Doran, architect—all six named by the government; His Honour Mayor Laporte, ex-officio member of the board, and James Crathern, John Torrance, L. A. Geoffrion and Robert Reford, elected by the different interests I mentioned a moment ago. I need not say that these gentlemen are excellent representatives of the business, commerce, trade and shipping interests of the city and port. The president, Hon. Robert Mackay, is a man of leisure, having large interests in the city and port of Montreal, a man of executive ability; and I am bound to say has always seemed to take a lively interest in the improvement of the harbour. Under the legislation of 1894, and pursuant to the provisions of that statute, the board has a secretary, a chief engineer, Mr. John Kennedy, a harbour master, Mr. James McShane, a deputy harbour master, Captain Bourassa, and a paymaster.

Within the last ten or eleven years very extensive improvements have been contemplated and have been in part carried out in the port of Montreal. Not only were these improvements advisable, but they were absolutely necessary in order to ensure to that seaport its share of the trade of this continent, and in order to keep pace with rival ports in the United States. The situation of the port of Montreal, as members of this House know, is such that if properly improved it should occupy a preponderant position in the grain export trade, and indeed in the commerce of the west generally upon this continent. Let me give a few figures, taken from the statistics of 1900 in order to show the comparative importance of that port as compared with the other seaports of the Dominion. The foreign trade of the chief ports of the Dominion is shown in the following table:

Port.	Amount of trade.
Montreal	$133,895,190
Quebec	10,619,765
Halifax	13,094,094
St. John, N.B.	14,463,937

These statistics are for the year 1900; but the amount of trade in the port of Montreal since that date has been increasing, I think, regularly every year. The customs receipts for the cities named amounted in the same year to the following figures:

Port.	Receipts.
Montreal	$9,136,377
St. John, N.B.	897,659
Halifax	1,252,067
Quebec	961,937

It will be seen by these figures that the port of Montreal, by reason of its situation, appears destined to command, if properly managed—subject of course to necessary improvements—a very large proportion indeed of the trade of the west, not only of Canada, but indeed, as many believe, of the trade of the Western States.

Under the terms of the statute now governing the Montreal Harbour Board, the commissioners make yearly reports to the government. Formerly these reports were made to the Department of Public Works, under the jurisdiction of which department the Harbour Board of Montreal was. Under the legislation of last parliament, the supervision of the Harbour Board and of the works to be executed therein, has been removed from the Department of Public Works and handed over to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Unfortunately, the Harbour Board has made no report, at least, so far as I am aware, for the year 1903 nor for the year 1904. Some disagreement, so far as I have been able to ascertain, occurred in regard to the report of 1903, and in consequence we are in possession only of the report of 1902, the latest report given out and published, and, I believe, returned to the government.

From this report we learn that the total bonded debt of the Harbour Board of Montreal at the end of the year 1902 was $5,322,000, of which $2,222,000 was due to the public at large and $3,100,000 to the government. Upon this debt the average rate of interest is about 3⅞ per cent. And I may say that the Montreal Board has never defaulted in its payment of interest either to the bondholders at large or to the government, differing in that respect from other harbour boards of the Dominion. As members of the House know, the government of Canada has, from time to time, advanced the money to the Montreal Harbour Board for permanent improvements to be made subject to the government's approval of the plans. I do not find any specific provision of the law which obliges the Harbour Board to submit its plans for permanent improvements for the approval of the government, but I presume that would result from the fact that the Harbour Board is a body supervised by the government, as represented by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or it may be a condition of the advances made by the government. By the Act 61 Victoria, chapter 47, a loan of $2,000,000 by the Dominion government to the Montreal Harbour Board was authorized. The report of 1902 shows that of this sum $650,000 was handed over to the Harbour Commissioners on capital account. In the same year over $1,000,000 was expended in permanent improvements, of which $333,522.21 was applied to the construction of a grain elevator in a prominent part of the harbour. The plans for permanent improvements seemed to have been prepared after mature consideration of all the interests involved, and, if carefully carried out, would, no doubt, place the port of Montreal upon a modernized footing, which would enable it to compete successfully with all the rival ports of the continent. While dealing with

the situation of the Montreal Harbour Board, I may mention also that the revenue of the Board for the year ending 31st December, 1902, amounted to $327,236.07, being an increase over the previous year of $56,824.93. As to the tolls collected at the port—a matter of some importance, since it is the desire of those interested in the port, and the expectation of all who are interested in the trade of the Dominion, that ultimately the port shall be made free—we find that the wharfage dues on imports amounted to $183,426.79, while the wharfage dues on exports amounted to $96,822.11, or a total of $280,248.98. There were other tolls and dues collected. So the House will see that we are far indeed from having a free port at Montreal. It is proper to say that there was an increase in the revenue for 1902 as compared with the previous year. The increase of dues on imports was $50,812.11, and on exports $9,139.06. There was a surplus of ordinary revenue over expenditure of $19,402.52. That the port of Montreal increased in importance during this last year for which we have the record may be inferred from the fact that there was an increase of over 88,000 tons in ocean vessels and over 200,000 tons in inland vessels. There was a decrease in the shipments of grain for export of 1,800,000 bushels, showing that probably there is a great deal of truth in what has been said from time to time that though the port of Montreal was favourably situated for the export of grain, it has not benefited by such improvements to such an extent as will enable it to compete successfully with the great grain shipping ports of the United States. It is well to note an increase in the exports of lumber to Europe of 18,000,000 feet, though there is a decrease in the shipment of lumber to South America of more than 500,000 feet. There was an increase in the export of flour of over 135,000 barrels, and a decrease of 41,000 cases in the export of eggs. The export of cheese increased by 328,000 boxes and the exports of butter by 132,000 boxes. Another increase worthy of being noted was that in the export of apples to Europe of over 387,000 barrels. The export of cattle increased by 3,000 head, but, on the other hand, there was a decrease of over 8,000 head in the export of sheep and over 6,000 head in the export of horses. The imports of coal decreased by 78,000 tons.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having made the House acquainted, in a superficial manner, with the position of the Harbour Board of Montreal, and with the condition of the trade there, I come more immediately to the object of the motion which I have the honour to place in your hands. And I would say that there seems to be—there is, in fact— a very widespread impression, which many circumstances tend to confirm, that there exist disagreements among the Harbour Commissioners, or differences of opinion amounting to disagreement between the Harbour Commissioners and the governmental department—the Department of Marine and Fisheries—under the supervision of which the Harbour Board carries on its work.

I may say to the House that, without going into details, traces of that disagreement can be found as far back as the year 1902. I have here in my hand a copy of a letter addressed by the then Minister of Public Works to the president of the Montreal Harbour Board, and having reference to the claims, the demands, the proposal of what was known as the Wolvin syndicate and other objects too, which show that there were at that time considerable difficulties existing between the government and the Harbour Board, and articles which I have also, which I will not take up the time of the House in reading and which I have taken from the government organs in Montreal and from other papers supporting the government indicate that in 1901 and 1902 there were difficulties existing between the government and the Harbour Board in regard to the plans for the improvement of the harbour and the execution thereof. In the early part of the present winter there certainly did arise difficulties in regard to that part of the plans for the improvement of the Montreal harbour which concerns the permanent sheds to be erected on the new wharfs. That these difficulties were of a rather acute nature, I think there is no doubt, although the House will readily conceive that it has been impossible for me to see exactly what these difficulties have been. Suffice it to say, that, although the original plans for the improvements have been approved by the government and although contracts have been entered into for the execution of these plans the works in connection with the permanent sheds were suspended for a certain time. The contractor in chief, Mr. Lyall, did in fact intimate to the sub-contractor, the Dominion Bridge Works, whose place of business is in the town of Lachine, that these difficulties existed and that the plans, as regards the permanent sheds might, for some reason or other, be altered. I come now to what was one of the objects which I had in view when I presented this motion. There entered into the construction of these permanent sheds a large quantity of iron, and as a result of these difficulties, the Dominion Bridge Company suspended work upon the preparation of the material to be used in these sheds, work which was to be continued during the winter at the works at Lachine and which would have enabled, I submit, the sheds to have been promptly erected in the spring at the opening of navigation. The consequence was that a large number of workmen in the town of Lachine, habitually engaged in work for the Dominion Bridge Company by the suspension or interruption of this work, found themselves without occupation and that at a season of the year when they had expected to be employed

in a continuous manner, and when this interruption was calculated to be very detrimental to them. It was stated in the town of Lachine by a number of people who were not my most active supporters in the last election that the suspension of these works was to be attributed to the fact that the county of Jacques Cartier had not elected a supporter of the government. Mr. Speaker, I think I may say to you who have been elevated by the unanimous vote of this House to the high position you occupy outside entirely of the field of active politics, and I think you will be prepared to admit, that there are a great many cunning men in the Liberal party who are endowed with the wisdom of the serpent. I deemed it incumbent upon myself to make an investigation, because I am bound to say that I never for one instant supposed that this government would have been so machinavellic as to endeavour to obtain a suspension of these works being carried on at Lachine out of pure party spirit. I corresponded in regard to the subject with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and he gave me every assurance that the cause of the suspension was not what I have just mentioned that it was represented to be and I believe he also gave me the assurance, as the correspondence will show, that he would endeavour to bring that matter to an immediate settlement, which, I believe, he has endeavoured to do.

Now, what in reality, has been the cause of these difficulties which seem to have existed between the Harbour Commissioners or amongst them and the government of this country? I have been unable to find for this question an absolutely definite solution, but I have no doubt that some light will be thrown upon the subject by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself, and by the correspondence which will be brought down. There was a consulting engineer named by the government, if I well understood the answer given to-day by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the question put by my hon. friend from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames), and I believe that there have been serious differences of opinion between that consulting engineer and the regular engineer of the Board. I believe that these two gentlemen are both qualified to advise the Harbour Board and the authorities in charge of the carrying out of these improvements, and it would be, I think, highly desirable that the government should use its influence because in reality not only has it the supervision, but as I have indicated before, it has the absolute control of the majority of that board, and it would be desirable I say that the government should exercise its influence to harmonize, if possible, the relations existing between these two engineers in charge of the works.

It has been said that differences have existed even between some members of the Board and the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) and it has been said that my hon. friend from the St. Lawrence division of Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) is one of those who have had serious differences of opinion with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in regard to what was to be done in the harbour of Montreal, and there are others also. Possibly the hon. gentleman will be able to throw some light upon that subject himself. What we particularly desire to know and what I trust the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will be able to tell us is, in the first place, whether the plans for the present improvements have received the approval of the department and if they have received that approval, and if no change has occurred, if the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries is of the same opinion as the previous minister who no doubt was called upon to give his approval to those plans, then what are the causes of delay and of difficulty? There is also the larger question which I mentioned when I opened my remarks and it is this: Is it the policy of the government to change the present order of things and to assume immediately or during the present session, under legislation to be introduced, complete control of the port of Montreal. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) will remember that last year he gave notice of a Bill relating to the Montreal Harbour Board, a Bill which was no doubt intended to modify in some degree the present law. My hon. friend gave notice of that Bill but towards the end of the session, I think in May last, he withdrew the Bill and I do not believe the House ever had any knowledge of what were the provisions or dispositions of law contained in that Bill. In regard to this latter question, which is one of very much importance not only to ourselves in Montreal but to the Dominion at large, opinions are divided. There are a great many who believe that it would be in the interest of the port of Montreal and of the country in general that the government should assume absolute control of that very important port, and make it a national port and a free port. That opinion is entertained by many, and if I had time Sir, I would read to the House a very interesting report which I have here which was prepared by a sub-committee of 'La Chambre de Commerce de Montreal, a body represented by election upon the Board of Harbour Commissioners, a report prepared with the object of showing that the change to which I have alluded would be a change in the interest of the harbour of Montreal and of the commerce of the country generally. There are others who undoubtedly fear that if that change was carried into effect the administration of the harbour of Montreal would no longer be participated in by representatives of our great commercial bodies as it is at present, would no longer be participated in by the mayor of Montreal,

one of the Harbour Commissioners ex-officio, and I may mention for the information of the House that the city of Montreal in 1902 contributed over $125,000 to these harbour improvements. There is a fear in other words, Mr. Speaker, that the administration of the affairs of the board would assume a political aspect and that the business interests would not be sufficiently represented. It seems to me, after having gone fully into the matter, that it would be possible to obtain the great advantage of the government making the port of Montreal a national port, assuming its cumbersome debt and administering the port without at the same time sacrificing the right of representation, which under the present law is reserved for the shipping, commercial and business interests of Montreal, nor would it, I think, be absolutely necessary to eliminate from representation on the Board of Commissioners, if such were created for the administration of the port, some representation from the city of Montreal itself. The House will understand that these questions are questions of importance upon which we have a right to expect some information and enlightenment from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. 'I hope, Sir, that nothing which I have said has tended to reflect upon the Harbour Board as at present constituted, which is a body entitled to the greatest respect, but there are two observations which I would make, one is that it appears from reports of recent meetings of the board that the difficulties to which I have alluded do in reality exist and that these meetings of that important body convened for practical and urgent purposes are sometimes employed in what would appear to be a purposeless manner. I have here a copy of the Montreal 'Witness' of Saturday, January 21 last, in which appears a report of the meeting of the board which occupies some three columns. It is entitled 'A wrangle over an inventory' and, without taking up the time of the House in reading that report, which is somewhat long, I may say that members of the House, by looking at that report, will understand that there was some truth in what appears to have been said by a member of the board present at that meeting. He is reported to have said:

> We are ridiculous before the public. How much more ridiculous we are making ourselves.

Perhaps this comment upon the proceedings of the board was a little severe, particularly when applied to men occupying high business positions such as the members of the Montreal Harbour Board, but from one end of that report to the other it appears that the time of the meeting was taken up in discussing subsidiary questions. A violent altercation for instance occurred between the hon. member for the St. Lawrence division (Mr. Bickerdike) and some other members of the board as to whether the storekeeper had been absent for a month or less than a month on election work. My hon. friend for St. Lawrence Division (Mr. Bickerdike) if he looks over this report will see that there was a great deal of excitement in regard to what I consider a question of not very much importance, in view of the really very important matters that the board has to deal with at the present moment. The general impression in the city of Montreal is that there are difficulties there that should be assuaged. A general impression also exists that the government has a policy in regard to the administration of the board and that policy is a policy of change and of improvement. A French paper of Montreal, 'La Presse,' I think I may say an organ favourable to the government, on January 21 last alluded to that general impression in the following words:

> Rumour has it once more that it is the intention of the government to submit to the parliament the abolition of the harbour commission and to substitute in its place five standing commissioners who will give all their time to the business of the harbour.
>
> As a matter of course, such commissioners would be paid by the government.
>
> The commission so reconstituted would be put under the jurisdiction of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

There are other points of information there which do not bear exactly upon the question which I have just alluded to. Under all the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I think the production of this correspondence and a declaration from the government as to what its policy is at the present moment in regard to the port will be information very gratefully received by this House and the public at large.

Mr. ROBERT BICKERDIKE (St. Lawrence, Montreal). Mr. Speaker, I had not intended taking any part in this discussion, as I felt that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries would bring down all the correspondence that has been asked for, only that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has alluded to me as being one of the wrangling members of the Harbour Commission. It is true that a large body of merchants, eleven in all, cannot always be of one mind. If they were, there would be no necessity of having eleven ; it would be sufficient to have one. There is hardly an institution in existence, commercial or otherwise, in which there are not sometimes differences of opinion. If the newspaper reports are correct, even in the Tory caucuses, which my hon. friend sometimes attends, there are differences of opinion.

Mr. FOSTER. Fight like blazes.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I think there is no better guarantee that the funds of the public will be judiciously expended than the fact that there are on that board different representatives who have different views. The best proof of that fact is that we have

now a port which, while not complete by any means, is very much better than it ever was before. With regard to the permanent sheds which my hon. friend has alluded to, there has been considerable discussion. He will, I am sure, remember that we had meetings with all the different commercial bodies of Montreal on that subject, and that we thrashed it out for nearly a year getting ideas from the steamship companies, the railway companies and the minister himself. Finally we had a joint meeting of all the interested bodies in Montreal, at which I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Public Works were present, and the Prime Minister as well. The various ideas on the subject were threshed out on that occasion, and the general consensus of opinion was that for the upper or extreme western portion of the harbour, which the large mail and passenger steamers mostly frequent, double-decked sheds were absolutely necessary, that in the centre of the harbour, the section known as the Bonsecours market district, which is frequented by the large freight and cargo steamers, single sheds would be sufficient, and that at the eastern end of the harbour, which is chiefly used for lumber and coal, no sheds would be required.

Mr. MONK. Might I interrupt my hon. friend to ask him if this was decided on before the trip which the Harbour Commissioners made within the last three or four months to the United States for the purpose of inspecting the permanent sheds there ?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. The Harbour Commissioners did not make a trip recently to the United States to examine the permanent sheds. The recent trip to which my hon. friend alludes was made by the Harbour Commissioners for the purpose of examining the railway terminals. It was in January, 1903, that it was decided to build the permanent sheds in Montreal. I will just read, for the information of my hon. friend, one of the motions that was then adopted :

After an examination of the plans and a very long discussion, it was moved by Mr. Robert Reford, seconded by Mr. Lemay, that the plans of the sheds on the wharfs prepared by the chief engineer be approved.—Carried.

It was in January, 1904, that the Harbour Commissioners went to the United States to examine the terminals of the railways. So far as I know, there has been no delay. I think it is a mistake to say that the bridge works at Lachine, in the county which my hon. friend represents, stopped work on that account. I have no doubt they closed down during the winter months, just as a great many factories do, when there is not much to do ; but it was not on account of any change in the plans. It is true, the government have had some plans submitted to them, and they are looking into them to see whether they would be any improvement on the old plans ; but up to the present time there has been no change in the plans. So that that story about the bridge works is entirely without foundation. We must have, Mr. Speaker, at Montreal the best harbour on the continent, and it will be made so either by the present board or by our successors. What Montreal requires is these permanent sheds, with good elevators. We have now one elevator belonging to the harbour, two belonging to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and two or three belonging to the Grand Trunk Railway. There is no reason whatever why the harbour of Montreal should not, inside of two years, be the best equipped harbour in America and become the Liverpool of this country. Even with the reduction of over 40 per cent that was made in Montreal on the harbour dues, we have still paid our interest, we have never repudiated it, and we hope to continue paying our interest out of revenue without any additional taxation.

Mr. MONK. Would my hon. friend, who is a member of the Board, tell me why no report has been issued for 1903 and 1904 ? The last report published was for 1902.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. There is a very good reason for that. We have not had the time to get out the report for 1904. The report for 1903 was delayed on account of a difference in stock taking. When the stock was taken by the Harbour Board they were not quite certain whether it was quite correct or not, and they decided to take it over again. That could not be done in the summer and had to be postponed until the autumn. It is now being done, and the report will be out inside of a month.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For copies of all Orders in Council, reports of the minister, recommending and authorizing the sale of government lands in the Northwest Territories during the years 1903 and 1904. Also a return of the lands sold, if any ; the rates and terms at which they were sold, and the persons to whom they were sold.—Mr. Foster.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—TRANSPORT OF HAY.

Hon. G. E. FOSTER (North Toronto) moved :

For copies of all correspondence had with the government or any member thereof, or with any official of the Intercolonial Railway, in reference to the transport of hay during the year 1904, from points in Ontario and Quebec to points along the Intercolonial Railway, including the railway in Prince Edward Island. Also the report of the Minister to Council and the Order in Council, if any were passed, recommending or authorizing a rebate or reduction in the rates for carrying the same. And the names of the parties to whom rebates or reductions in the rate of freight upon hay were made, and the quantities shipped to each.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). There is no objection to the motion, but it may take some little time to prepare the return, because the papers are very largely at Moncton.

Motion agreed to.

ARBITRATION *IN RE* INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY AND GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

Hon. G. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would remind my hon. friend the Minister of Justice of the conversation we had across the floor the other day regarding the arbitration now going on, I have picked up incidentally some little information myself in respect of it, and I see that the arbitration really covers all the disputed points—of which there are a great many—between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial Railway, from the contract of 1879 down to the latest, including those important ones with reference to the Drummond County Railway and the procuring of terminal advantages in the city of Montreal. I find also that the situation is really very grave and serious, and I think the House ought to have all the information that can be given it. I quite understand that the questions in dispute are being arbitrated but any papers that can be brought down ought to be brought down. Some of the points are extremely important, and the House should be possessed of all information concerning them as soon as possible.

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). There is no deed of submission, as I thought there was. The contract provides for an arbitration with respect to the difficulties referred to by my hon. friend, and the arbitrators are now adjudicating upon claims put forward, both by the government and the Grand Trunk Railway. In view of the statement I made in the House the other day, I thought it proper to apply to the gentlemen representing the government before the arbitrators for a statement. I received a very complete statement this morning, which I intend to have copied and laid on the table, and will have a copy sent to my hon. friend. In all probability in a day or two I shall be obliged to ask for leave to introduce a bill to amend the Act of last session, and will then be in a position to give further information.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Post office—outside service, $1,694,238.50.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). When the committee rose yesterday I was explaining the increase of $125,068 in the outside service. I had got down to the last classification of increases, namely, the increases in the city post offices, which amounted to $92,680.75. I propose now to give the details. I will give the increase by classes :

375 increases of $50 each	$18,750 00
178 increases of $78.25 each	18,928 00
19 increases of $30 each	570 00
1 increase of $24	24 00
52 additional appointments	25,197 50
Short estimate 1904-5	30,210 75
Increase in provisional allowance	4,000 00
Total	$92,680 75

Mr. FOSTER. There is no benefit in going over the list ; if there are any special cases the hon. gentleman might mention them.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There is nothing special. But perhaps I might give some particulars of that estimate of $30,000. There is someting I ought to explain. There is a short estimate of $30,210.75, and an increase in the provisional allowances of $4,000. That $4,000 is to provide for increasing the staff of the Winnipeg, Vancouver and Victoria post offices, and to meet the increased expenditures, and the increases in the salaries of the staff. The hon. gentleman will remember there is an increased provisional allowance given to the staffs in all the cities west of Ontario.

Mr. FOSTER. At what rate is that given now ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. In Manitoba and British Columbia to employees whose salaries are $800 and under, the provisional allowance is at the rate of $15 a month, or $180 a year. That is given on account of the increased cost of living in the west over the cost in eastern Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that on the same scale in Manitoba, the Northwest and British Columbia ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The same.

Mr. FOSTER. What difference is there between that scale now and the scale, say in 1896 ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Allow me to complete the statement. I gave the provisional allowance where the salary is under $800. Where the salary is over $800 and running up to $900, clerks are paid an amount which will make the total income reach $980, this being the amount that would be received by a clerk whose salary is $800 a year. Where the salary is $900 and up to $1,200 a year, the allowance is at the rate of 10 per cent of the salary. Railway mail clerks are paid a provisional allowance at the rate of $10 monthly if the salary is less than $800, and from $800 to $960, the allowance is 10 per cent on the salary. There is no allowance when the salary exceeds $960 a year. I am told that the rate at a

former period was $10 a month, and it is now $15.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the rate of living increased ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. When this increase was made it had been pressed upon us as a just provision. I think there is no doubt that in consequence of the recent development in Manitoba, and the large number of people going in there and into the Territories, the cost of living has increased, and in British Columbia as well.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister any data upon which he makes that statement or is it just an impression ? What means has he taken to find out ? It would seem to me that, with the opening up of that country, the larger number of railways and better communication, more products in the country itself, and all that, the cost of living should not increase—I mean over and above the rate of increase in other parts of the Dominion. I think the rate of living has increased in Toronto for instance. But has it increased more largely after all this development in the west, has it increased more largely there than it has in the east ? The hon. gentleman knows that the provisional allowance was first given because there was a difference between the scale of living in the east and west. Now if the scale of living has increased in the east and is equal, to say no more, to the increase in the west, there is no justification for the increase in that provisional allowance. I would like to have some information so that we may know upon what basis this is done. I hope the time will soon come when we will be able to treat these employees in their several classes just the same all through the Dominion. I think these distinctions and discriminations should cease as soon as possible.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is not just lately that the increase has been made. It is three years since the increase was made in the provisional allowances. Speaking from memory, my recollection is that information was obtained as to the increased rental, and the value of many of the necessaries of life, in consequence of the great growth in the cities of Winnipeg and Vancouver. There was a careful consideration of the question, and I will give to my hon. friend proof that this was a necessary step. We could not retain in the service in the Winnipeg post office any persons who were appointed at the salary allowed by law, and with the old provisional allowance ; they could do far better elsewhere, we could not get them to remain with us, and they complained that they could not even subsist reasonably on the allowance made. In fact, the difficulty was so great that until this was brought about, we had to transfer officers from the older districts having larger salaries, to Winnipeg, giving them a provisional allowance. But since we have increased the provisional allowance we do not experience the same difficulty. This allowance was made in two steps. Frst of all, it was given to the staff in Manitoba, and it was represented to us that the same reasons existed for giving it to the staff in British Columbia ; and it was not possible, on looking into the matter, to resist the argument, it seemed to be well supported. There were communications of different kinds, members on both sides of the House brought this matter up in parliament and pressed it on the attention of the government ; so it was not a haphazard step at all.

Mr. DANIEL. Have all the clerks in the St. John post office received the statutory increase who were entitled to it by length of service ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am told that all the members of the staff of the St. John post office with one exception were given increases. That was an exception on merit. That one person was not considered entitled to the increase.

Mr. DANIEL. On examination?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Proper inquiry by the department. My deputy is unavoidably absent on account of some domestic affliction, but the accountant informs me that the deputy passed upon that case deliberately, and thought that the clerk in question was not entitled to his increase. I do not interfere with these matters at all.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the system ? Do you get reports from the postmasters.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The practice is to require the superior officers—the postmasters—to report upon the merits of the different persons who are members of the staff, to furnish a good deal of detailed information and to give their opinion. The deputy in turn—

Mr. FOSTER. The deputy here?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My deputy here. The deputy here also exercises some judgment or discretion, and as the result he brings to me his recommendation.

Mr. FOSTER. The superintendent in the province has nothing to do with that?—Coulter, for instance, in New Brunswick?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, the postmaster of St. John, for instance, would speak for the St. John post office. These matters do not pass through the inspectors' hands at all.

Mr. SPROULE. It seemed to me while listening to the names being read that at some post offices there was a larger number who got additions to their salaries than at others. Is there any basis or principle upon which it is done?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The maximum salaries as provided by law are not excessive or unreasonable, and the practice of the department is to consider every person entitled as time goes on to his ordinary annual increase if his services have been satisfactory, and that is the rule that is applicable throughout. There may be some instances where persons, as in the case of St. John, do not receive the increase because they do not deserve it. As to there being more increases in one office than in another the explanation of that is that there are more clerks in one office than in another. Take Toronto for instance; my hon. friend representing Toronto will be pleased to know that the growth of business has been something very great there. The revenue exceeds a million dollars a year now. I have forgotten what it was a few years ago but you cannot have an extra $50,000 of revenue without having to correspondingly increase the staff. There is a constant growth and our staff is increasing almost every day in consequence of the increased business. Toronto has a staff of many hundreds now. The revenue in Toronto is by far the greatest of any post office in Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. That is one of the offices that I was impressed with comparing Toronto with Montreal. It appeared to me, while listening to the list being read out that there was a larger number of employees in Montreal who had received increases than in Toronto, and I was anxious to know upon what principle or basis these increases were made. We had in addition to the information given to us that increases were granted in Winnipeg and Vancouver because of the increased cost of living which it was said was much greater there than in the east. Of course, that would not apply to Toronto or Montreal. There surely must be some basis established for increases in all these post offices —Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. They are all treated in the same way. I think on the surface my hon. friend must have something to justify his inquiry but I think I can explain it to his satisfaction. Whilst there has been a great increase in the revenue of the Montreal office and also of the Toronto office there has been a greater increase in the Toronto office and that has involved greater additions to the staff. If a member of the staff has reached the maximum, that ends him. The more new men who are appointed the more increases there will be, because there will be more men below the maximum, and that will explain why there are more men below the maximum in Toronto than in Montreal.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in understanding that each clerk, say a first-class clerk, who has not reached the maximum gets a certain percentage of increase according to the number of years he has served, and that the same rule applies to the second, third and fourth-class clerks as well?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, they are all treated in the same way. Every man's case is gone into individually. If he has not reached the maximum he will be given an increase if his services are satisfactory. That principle has been applied throughout the whole service.

Mr. SPROULE. If they are not satisfactory they are not increased?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There are increases that the law allows. Under the Civil Service Act there is a maximum salary assigned to every office and the Civil Service Act provides for a sum that may be paid by way of increase. Parliament votes the money and the increase is then awarded if the case is a meritorious one.

Mr. SPROULE. Under the Civil Service Act there is a statutory increase of $50 per year, but that would not be the same to the different grades in the post office.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Well, yes, some would get $50 and some are entitled to $30.

Mr. FOWLER. Does this work automatically? Do they get their increases as a matter of course?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No.

Mr. FOWLER. Only if they are recommended?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is all. Is my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) interested in the St. John post office?

Mr. FOWLER. Only generally.

Mr. CROCKET. Mr. Chairman, before this item passes I would like to call the attention of the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) to the fact that the Fredericton post office is not adequately equipped or sufficiently staffed for the business that is done in the office. I find by the Auditor General's Report that for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1904, the revenue amounted to $14,054.93 and that the staff of the office was composed of a postmaster, three second-class clerks, and two fourth-class clerks, five assistants in all. In 1895 the revenue of the Fredericton post office amounted to $11,638.74 so that there has been an increase in the business of the office amounting to nearly $2,500, whereas the staff, I believe, is the same to-day as it was ten years ago. I have examined the record in referenece to the Charlottetown post office for the purpose of making a comparison, and I find that for the year ending June 30, 1904, the revenue of the Charlottetown post office amounted to $19,193.57,

while the staff of that office was composed of a postmaster, one assistant postmaster, four second class, five third class, and one fourth class clerk and one stamper and sorter. The postmaster in Charlottetown had twelve assistants where the business done amounted to $19,193.57. Fredericton, then with three quarters of the business of Charlottetown has less than one half the staff.

I think that these facts show pretty conclusively that the Fredericton office is not sufficiently staffed. There have been many complaints among the business and professional classes of Fredericton, and among all citizens who have occasion to go to the post office frequently of the slowness with which the mails are distributed. Fredericton, as all know, is an important city. It is the capital of New Brunswick, the seat of the legislature, the seat of the courts, the military centre of the province, and the seat also of the provincial university, the provincial normal school and several other important provincial institutions. A large volume of business is done there, and the citizens generally feel that they are entitled to a more expeditious distribution of mails than they are receiving under the present service. I trust the minister will take this matter into his consideration, and if possible provide that office with at least two or three additional clerks, as I think the records clearly show it is entitled to.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Mr. Chairman, I would explain to my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) that in the case of Charlottetown the post office officials also discharge the duties which ordinarily devolve on the office of inspector. There is no inspector's office in Prince Edward Island, and the postmaster, and such of his staff as he may draw on, act also as inspectors. We have a separate inspector's establishment for New Brunswick. It may be, however, that the public interest would be advanced by the addition of a junior clerk, and I will have that inquired into again.

Mr. CROCKET. I observe in the statement for the city of Charlottetown that one official is designated as being also assistant post office inspector.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. I did not observe that any of the other clerks had any duties to perform in reference to the inspection.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I should have added that the post office officials in Charlottetown also do the work performed by the superintendent of the railway mail service in other places. For instance, in New Brunswick you have a superintendent of railway mail services, but we have none for Prince Edward Island, this work devolving upon the postmaster and such of his staff as he may require, and I have already explained the case of the inspectors.

Mr. FOSTER. At the same time I think, having some knowledge of that city myself, as I represented it for four years—and this matter was a subject of complaint even at that time—that if the minister will look into it, he will see that the people are not given as complete and quick service as they ought to get. There is a great deal of waiting and delay in the delivery of the mail, and the general impression there is that this occurs because there is not a sufficiently large staff to have the work done quickly as well as efficiently. It is a well managed office at the present time, and the clerks are efficient clerks, but I think that the minister will probably find that he will consult the convenience of the people and greatly help matters by the addition of at least one more clerk to the staff.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I shall carefully inquire into it.

Mr. FOSTER. There are, of course, all these other things to which my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) has referred, which entail a great deal of work.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The same thing applies to Prince Edward Island.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, there is a local legislature there and also university educational establishments. However, I think the facts of the case, as set forth by my friend from York (Mr. Crocket), merit some inquiry from the minister.

Mr. CROCKET. I do not wish to be understood as in any way reflecting on the staff of the Fredericton post office. It is recognized throughout that city that the staff is painstaking, faithful and efficient from the head down; the complaint is that the staff is not sufficiently large.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I shall have the officer whose duty it is to look into these matters give his best consideration to the case of Fredericton.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand, with reference to the provisional allowance, that this $4,000 extra is not to increase the amount of allowance given to the clerks who have already received the allowance, but is for new services.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, it is to meet the additions to the staff.

Mr. FOSTER. There was an item of 52 new appointments that the minister is to explain.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, there is an item of 52 additional appointments with salaries amounting to $29,197.50, as follows :

Charlottetown post office, one stamper and sorter.

Halifax post office, one letter-carrier.

St. John city post office, one fourth-class clerk.

Sherbrooke post office, one porter.

Montreal post office, three fourth-class clerks, one stamper and sorter, fifteen letter-carriers, three porters.

Toronto post office, five letter-carriers, nine porters.

London post office, three letter-carriers.

Hamilton post office, one letter-carrier, one porter.

Winnipeg post office, one junior third-class clerk, one letter-carrier, one porter.

Vancouver post office, three letter-carriers.

Victoria post office, one letter-carrier.

That makes up the list.

Mr. SPROULE. I presume that later on we will have supplementary estimates in which these officers are interested, and that we can discuss these matters then, because some of our friends who are absent desire to speak on them.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is quite right, there will be opportunities. I said that in that $125,000 there was an item of $30,210.75, a short estimate. I have given the details of everything except this. My statement in reference to it is as follows :

The minimum salary of the senior second-class having been fixed at $1,000, and the minimum salary of the junior third-class at $700 by the amendment to the Post Office Act of 1903, the salaries of seven senior second-class clerks were raised to $1,000 each and the salaries of forty-one junior third-class clerks to $700 each, making a total increase of $2,360.

One hundred and thirty-nine increases of salaries not specially provided for in the estimates for 1904-5, $12,416.50.

The undermentioned employees having been promoted to higher classes, their salaries were raised in consequence :

J. O. Carrier, Quebec post office, senior third at $800 to junior second at $900..	$100 00
G. W. Wills, Ottawa post office, senior third at $800 to junior second at $900..	100 00
C. F. Cole, Windsor post office, stamper and sorter at $360 to fourth-class at $400..	40 00
	$240 00

One hundred and forty-nine letter-carriers, messengers and porters have been brought under the provisions of the amendment of 1902 to the Post Office Act, involving an increase of $15,620.50. I will explain why this was not estimated before. Under the new Act they had the option within a certain period to come under its provisions. They have come in by degrees. As they come in they become entitled to additional pay. A letter-carrier now appointed is appointed under the grade system, at a per diem rate of pay. At $2.25 per day it amounts to about $700 a year, in addition to which he is entitled to a bonus of $20 for good conduct. So that he can now get $725 a year instead of the old maximum of $600. We do not force the new system upon them, but one by one they have been coming in under it.

Mr. FOSTER. What advantage do they lose ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think it is entirely for their benefit.

Mr. FOSTER. Did they have superannuation under the old system ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, and they have the same under the new. The Act declares that their coming in under the new system shall not affect them prejudiciously with respect to their superannuation. Some of them were nervous about it for a while and hung back; but a great many have now come in.

Mr. SPROULE. What percentage of them have availed themselves of the Act since last year ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Of those appointed prior to July 1, 1896, 49 accepted in 1902, 60 in 1903, and 108 in 1904. Of those appointed since July 1, 1896, 144 accepted in 1902, 11 in 1903 and 12 in 1904. According to this statement, there are now 384 under the new Act. That leaves out about 142. They are timid about it, having an idea that if they were sick they would not receive pay and might be in some way prejudiced. The idea of the amendment was to put pressure upon them to prevent them being unnecessarily sick. When men are paid by the year, we find that they are occasionally absent from duty, when, if they had a fear of loss of pay, they would discharge their duty. With regard to letter-carriers, it is extremely inconvenient to the public if they do not report for duty.

Mr. FOSTER. How many grace days has a letter-carrier ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. They are allowed two weeks' holidays, and they have a sort of half holiday on the ordinary statutory and other holidays enjoyed by the people.

Mr. FOSTER. The per diem is simply for working days, including holidays ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes. They are paid for all holidays.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose one does not turn up for duty, what is the process to find out what is the matter with him ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. When a man does not turn up, it is the duty of an officer of the post office to at once seek the cause of his absence, and to make a report to the postmaster and ultimately to the deputy. Every case of absence is specially inquired into, not just dealt with in an automatic way, and the true merits ascertained. Under this system a letter-carrier can make

$125 a year more than he could under the old system, and for that increase we reserve the right to deduct his pay when he does not appear for duty.

Mr. FOSTER. But if he is really ill ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We do not encourage absences at all.

Mr. FOSTER. If he is really ill, is his pay docked ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There is no provision for payment in the case of absences from casual illnesses. I would not say anything to lessen the influence of the department on the staff to see that they are in attendance. There is one case on record, a very sad case, of a man being paid though absent; but I think that should be the exception.

Mr. FOSTER. It has also this point to it: it makes the government a pretty hard employer. An employer of labour in a factory or a store, if he has deserving employees and they are laid up for a few days by real sickness, will commonly pay them. It seems that, if it is real illness, there should be at least a minimum limit for which deserving employees should have the pay granted to them.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend did not quite catch the point. I explained that we have a provision for paying the men a bonus of $20 a year; so that if a man had a few days illness, that bonus would cover eight days at $2.25, or ten days at $2. All who give good and faithful service during the year get the bonus.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought you expected good conduct from every employee who was earning his salary. What other kind of conduct do you expect ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Every man is supposed to render reasonably good service, and if he does he gets the bonus. No two men discharge their duties precisely alike; but when a man is reported as having rendered satisfactory service, he gets the bonus of $20.

Mr. SPROULE. He is reported on by some superior officer ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, there is a superintendent of letter-carriers attached to every post office except perhaps some small ones. The superintendent keeps a check on the letter-carriers. They are all, I think, very well satisfied with the arrangement, and I think are giving very excellent service. We hold the postmaster responsible for the efficiency of the office. He in turn looks to his subordinate officers to do their duty, and will call upon the superintendent of the letter-carriers to see that they do their duty. The superintendent reports to the postmaster, who in due time makes his recommendations to us. There is every disposition to encourage faithful service and the men are treated very well.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not saying that they are not, but wish to know if they are all dealt with exactly on the same principle, or is it in the power of some one to favour some and overlook others ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There could not be a man overlooked. The superintendent is there every day and knows every one of these men. He is anxious to have them do their duty and he would demoralize the service if he were to introduce favouritism. A letter-carrier must be faithful and punctual in attendance, prompt in his work and tidy. These are conditions the superintendent will bear in mind, and he is most anxious to encourage them. I think there is an excellent feeling amongst all the officers. I have never heard of any friction and would be very much disappointed if I thought any superintendent was guilty of any injustice to any one.

Mr. SPROULE. I have not heard of any, but simply asked for information.

Mr. FOSTER. What superannuations has the minister made last year ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am not in a position to give that information.

Mr. FOSTER. I see by the returns that one O'Neil, in Montreal, was superannuated at thirty-three years of age and a gratuity of $506 paid him.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. He had consumption and has since died. He was not superannuated in the ordinary sense. Under the Act, if a man has not been ten years in the service, he cannot get superannuation but a gratuity.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be the case here, because he had been only 9⅔ years in the service.

Mail service by railways	$1,468,800 00
Mail service by steamboats	87,900 00
Mail service by ordinary land conveyance..	975,000 00
Supply and repair of mail bags, &c.	30,000 00
	2,561,700 00

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I will explain the practice which has been followed of late years. You will observe that there is no increase either in the mail service or miscellaneous expenditure, but it does not follow that there will not be an increase asked for. Our service is expanding very rapidly and I would prefer waiting until the last moment before asking for any increase. In a couple of months we will be three-quarters through our fiscal year, and my officers will be in a better position to tell me what increases will be required than they were last December when these estimates were prepared. I prefer to ask

for all the increases later on than ask for them piecemeal.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a reasonable position provided the minister does not wait until the dying hours of the session, as is so often done, to ask for increases. My hon. friend has frequently sinned in that respect as well as his illustrious colleagues. If the items are brought down in sufficiently good time to enable the House to criticise and discuss them, that will be perfectly satisfactory. Is there any system upon which our carriers by water are paid? Are they paid according to weight or is it just a rule of thumb arrangement, each carrier getting as much as he can for the service he does?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We have a maximum allowance of 5 cents a mile for steamers. Where the volume is very small the rate is lower.

Mr. FOSTER. Have you no system of paying by weight?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, there has never been such a system.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it five cents for any quantity of mail, or for any specific quantity?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The volume of mail matter which goes by steamer is not very great. A steamer will have to handle a bag or two or three and really the trouble is bringing the bags to the dock and putting them on board and receiving them and taking care of them during the voyage.

Mr. FOSTER. I see that the Newfoundland service, between North Sydney and Port Aux Basques seems to be upon a weight basis. Mr. Reid is paid at 50 cents per pound for letters and 5 cents per pound for papers.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am informed that that is an arrangement that has been in force for about twenty years. Newfoundland pays it one way and we pay it the other. At one time it was paid through some other department, and it has been transferred to the Post Office Department.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the only case in which the payment goes by weight?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I believe so.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, this does not include the steamship subsidies?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not know whether the steamship gets a subsidy or not.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood, when the Minister of Trade and Commerce explained the steamship subsidies that they had some relation to the number of pounds carried. But now the Postmaster General, as I understand him, says it makes no difference whether the mail matter carried is much or little.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The amount of mail matter carried varies with the occasion. Take, for instance, the ordinary man-carrier, one day he may start with a bag almost empty, and next day, through the publication of a weekly paper or something of that kind, the bag may be pretty heavy.

Mr. FOSTER. Are tenders called for in the case of these steamships?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No. I do not recall a case where there is any competition.

Mr. FOSTER. But where there are competing lines on the same route, are tenders called for and contracts made?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes. But cases of competition are so rare that I thought for the moment there were none. I am informed that there is one, from Vancouver up the north shore.

Mr. FOSTER. And between Kingston and Cape Vincent there ought to be competition.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think there is no competition. The contract is held by the Folgers. I think it is a continuance by renewal of a contract that has been in force for many years. I remember looking into it when it expired and trying to find a way by which we could better ourselves, but decided to renew it.

Mr. FOSTER. Has there been any change in the basis upon which the railways are paid? Some ten years ago, or more, I think, there was a readjustment. Has any change been made since then?

Sir WILIAM MULOCK. There has been no change.

Mr. FOSTER. And the mileage allowances of that time have been extended to the new branches of the railways?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. On the same basis?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. In some cases where the line is into a new country where population is very sparse, we pay a smaller rate, which is increased as the volume grows. The controller keeps track of them.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the minister tell us whether he is carrying parcels, pamphlets and that kind of matter at a rate that pays for the service rendered. It must be a large part of the mail carriage at the present time and constantly increasing. There was a period, I think, when the country was paying a good deal more for this class of matter than it received. The country has a right to get at least the cost of carriage upon that class of matter.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am afraid I could not give an opinion that would be of any value on the question whether or not we lose money in the parcel post branch. But, taking parcel post and newspaper post together, I am assured it is a great loss.

Mr. FOSTER. Postage is imposed on newspapers is it not?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. A very small one.

Mr. FOSTER. On the zone system?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Within a radius of forty miles from the place of publication newspapers pass free from the office of publication. This is the same as it was before. Beyond the radius of forty miles, and within a radius of 300 miles the rate is ¼ cent per pound, and beyond that ½ cent per pound.

Mr. FOSTER. These are the rates fixed at the time the hon. gentleman (Sir William Mulock) made the change ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There has been a slight change since then.

Mr. FOSTER. In the way of lowering or increasing?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Lowering.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the practice with regard to mail carrying contracts. Some years ago, a good many contracts were cancelled because they had been renewed without public tender. Are all contracts on expiration thrown open to the tender ? Or are they renewed, and if so on what basis ? Are any contracts renewed at higher figures than when they were tendered for in open competition ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The Post Office Act provides that all contracts involving an expenditure of $200 or over must be let by tender. That, of course, has been done. When these contracts have matured we have made it our business to ascertain whether or not the service had been satisfactory and whether it would be in the public interest to renew or to call for tenders. I do not think it expedient to be always changing mail carriers if the one holding the contract has given satisfactory service. When a contract which was let at open competition expires, the inspector makes a report stating whether good service has been performed or not. If the service has been good, the contractor is given the opportunity of renewing. If the service involves an expenditure of less than $200 a year, the law gives the Postmaster General power to make a contract without tender. But that is a power I have not exercised unless the expenditure was very trifling, and the circumstances justified it.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that the Postmaster General has drifted into a system that was in vogue before he took charge of that department, and which he condemned unsparingly on many occasions, that was the renewal of contracts to mail carriers where the amount was $200 or less and where it had originally been let by public tender. I know that many of these contracts in our part of the country were cancelled, where they had been let exactly upon those principles, and it was stated to this House that there was a great saving to the country in consequence, and of course the previous government were condemned for carrying out a system which was not the most economical. Now it seems that experience has proven the wisdom of what the hon. gentleman's predecessors did, he is now adopting the same principle that was in vogue before he came into power. In some instances I am told that these contracts are renewed and a larger price given. I am not complaining of that, because I think that on the whole mail contractors are doing the work at prices too low. I do not know of any specific cases where there is a great grievance ; but I have been told that in some instances where this work was let by contract originally, at the expiration of the time when others were contemplating doing it at a lower figure, they did not have an opportunity of tendering because the contract was renewed at the original figure. They think now they have as good grounds of complaint as others had before who were under the same system denied the right of tendering by a renewal of the contract.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not know that it is necessary to revive the discussion on that point which we have had many times. But perhaps my hon. friend would permit me to explain to him the point I used to take. The objection I took to the contracts was that they had not been let by tender where the law required them to be let by tender, and therefore they had to be cancelled and relet by tender.

Mr. SPROULE. I drew the attention of the minister to cases in my personal knowledge where they have been let by tender and cancelled.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend will agree that where a contract is let by tender and it might be well in the public interest to renew it, it might not be wise to renew it under the same conditions. In a market where the price of labour goes down there might be such a change in the conditions as would make it proper to renew that contract without tender. But where the reverse is the case, as it is to-day, where the price of labour is going up, there is nothing to be gained by inviting tenders to perform a service that was let by public tender four or five years ago. I am desirous of renewing now, where we can on that basis, any contract made a few years ago,

and where it is in the public interest. I do not think my hon. friend can cite to me one single case since I have been Postmaster General, where I have renewed a contract involving an expenditure exceeding $200 a year, and allowed a larger sum. I have no power in law to do it, and I am quite satisfied that I have not done so. There are cases where I have had to increase the price where a contract involved a smaller sum than $200, where the contract has expired, and the contractor would not renew it. Then it is wiser to get somebody else to take it, if you can, for ten or twenty dollars more. There are some cases of that kind, but that power is given to me by law, I have power to make these contracts under those circumstances ; but I have no power by law to renew a contract involving $200 a year or more, a year at a higher price, and I do not think I have ever violated the law in that respect.

Mr. SPROULE. I have been told of cases where the contracts were entered into at a higher figure. I do not complain of that, because I do not think they were paid too much. But I rose more especially to say that I do not think there was that fluctuation in wages from year to year previous to 1896, which would justify the adoption of the principle that is carried out now, any more than it justified the same principle then, because wages are about the same to-day.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. A good deal higher to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, the contracts for carrying the mails, so far as I know, are about the same as they were eight or ten years ago.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It costs more to keep a horse to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. It may, but I find contracts were taken when they were made without public tender, and were taken at about the same figure as seen years ago.

Mr. DANIEL. Do these items include the subsidies given for carrying the mails on the River St. John?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. All those expenses are included here.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the minister state the amount paid as subsidy to the Star line of steamers carrying the mails on the St. John river ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The Star line for many years, long before we took office, carried the mails under an arrangement which has been continued since. But of late years there has been some additional post offices established along the route, which involve some more trouble and expense to the steamers, and some allowance has been made for that.

Mr. DANIEL. I understand that the amount of subsidy given to the Star line amounts to $1,510 a year, for thirty-two weeks; they do not run in the winter-time. Out of that $1,510 they have to pay, or did have to pay a year or two ago, $550 to employees for the delivery of mails at the St. John office and getting mails from that office. The same way at all the stopping places such as Maugerville, Gagetown and other places on the River St. John, also at Fredericton. That leaves them only $950 for the service, which is at the rate of eleven and a quarter cents a mail bag. They consider that the amount is entirely too small. In addition, they have to give bonds of $3,000 a year; and they carry between 8,000 and 9,000 bags a year. They also state that the amounts which they have to pay for obtaining delivery of these mails are increasing year by year and they think that the amount of the remuneration which they receive for carrying these mails is not sufficient and that it should be increased. I would be very glad if the hon. Postmaster General would leave that item over so that we can see a little more about it and bring the facts a little more to his personal attention. I have just now met a gentleman who is interested in this very service and I know he expects to call upon the hon. Postmaster General to-morrow and I would be glad if the items were allowed to stand over for to-day.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I may explain to my hon. friend that we do not take a vote for each separate service. We have thousands and thousands of services and there is a bulk sum taken. My hon. friend will have an opportunity later on to discuss this matter upon the supplementary estimates.

Mr. DANIEL. Very well.

Mr. AMES. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General whether any complaints have reached him as yet in reference to the unsanitary condition of the branch post office on St. Catherine street in the city of Montreal, whether it is his intention to renew the lease for the post office without requiring the premises to be put in a proper sanitary condition, and whether the Health Department in Montreal has not on several occasions found fault with the condition in which the premises are kept and no notice has been taken of its complaints.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We have no information upon that subject. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) is perhaps misinformed.

Mr. AMES. I can lay the originals of the Health Department's reports before the House if necessary. I should like also to ask the hon. Postmaster General whether any report was made to him on or about November 1 in respect to the illegal stamp-

ing of letters by an employee of the department in the main post office in the city of Montreal ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My officer does not know the facts in that case. He says that there has been something of that nature the subject of an inquiry, but if my hon. friend desires information upon that point I will get it for him.

Mr. AMES. I would be very glad to have it. I would also like to ask the hon. Postmaster General whether it has been brought to his attention of late that a number of remittances of interest made by the city of Montreal to some of its bondholders have disappeared, presumably in the mails of the city of Montreal, and whether any investigation has taken place to ascertain whether these cheques have been stolen, endorsed and paid through the negligence or culpability of any of the officials of the department ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, we have no information upon that point. Were these letters registered ?

Mr. AMES. I cannot say as to that, but I can lay the facts before the House.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Can my hon. friend say whether the letters were registered ?

Mr. AMES. I do not think the letters were registered, but there were letters sent out by the city treasurer containing cheques for interest due to certain parties, which cheques disappeared and which were forged and collected to the detriment and loss of the parties for whom they were intended.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Can my hon. friend say whether the matter was brought to the attention of the postmaster of Montreal ?

Mr. AMES. It was by the public prints. I can lay a statement before the House if desirable.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is generally the case, if there is any possible chance of a grievance, that it is brought formally before the officials. They may have taken steps in this case, and if so I have no doubt it will be fully investigated. Of course, the parties would not suffer by reason of the forging of the endorsement.

Mr. AMES. The reason I bring these matters up is for the purpose of ascertaining whether the hon. Postmaster General is at present satisfied with the working of the Montreal post office and all its particulars.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There has been a recent change in the postmastership.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. Postmaster General give any information as to the number of new offices opened during the year ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is in the annual report.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. Postmaster General might turn up at the same time the number of miles of mail service added during the year.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There was an addition of 317,468 miles of stage routes during the year. If the hon. gentleman desires to know the number of miles additional carried, it will be necessary to go through the service and multiply that mileage by the frequency of the service. There were 919 and 96-100 of a mile additional railway mail service in force during the past year. We are now carrying the mails 18,366 track miles a year and 16,129,121 stage route miles per year. The total number of post offices in existence on June 30 last was 10,460, but I do not find a statement in the report showing the increase during the year.

Mr. SPROULE. I was led to make the inquiry from the fact that the same amount is asked for the mail service for the coming year as was voted last year. It would appear to be very easy, if we added 317,468 miles of mail service, to determine approximately how much more money would be needed. It would seem from the estimates here as though the country is not expanding at all or that the service is not growing. It is true that the hon. minister says that later in the year he will be better able to make an estimate of just about how much will be needed in the year, but you would think even at the beginning of the year, in view of the number of new offices that have been opened up and the number of additional miles of mail service, that one could make an approximate estimate of the additional amount of money that would be required for the coming year.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We are adding new post offices and mail services every day especially in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. SPROULE. That 378,000 miles is some proportion of what we had last year. Would it not seem natural to assume that there would be that proportion and that it would increase by that amount.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. When the supplementary estimates are brought down we will have a great deal of data giving the actual conditions up to that time. People are flocking into the Territories and wherever there is a little coterie of settlers we try to establish services whether they pay or do not pay. People are spreading all over the Territories ; they are going everywhere and we are adding servics every day of the year.

Mr. SPROULE. It does not appear to be on a very intelligent business basis if you have no idea of the proportion. There must be some proportion from year to year.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If the hon. gentleman can tell me how many immigrants are going into Manitoba from now until next year and where they are going to settle, then perhaps I can tell him definitely. In answer to the hon. gentleman's inquiry as to the increase in the number of post offices I find that 310 were added during the last fiscal year.

Mr. SPROULE. There are now 10,460 post offices and 310 must be some proportion of the whole number, must it not? There were so many miles of mail routes; this year we have added so many more, and that must be some proportion of the whole number. Now would it not be natural to estimate, if you are judging from a business standpoint, what would be the additional amount required for the coming year, and then to provide for that proportion of increase? We are only estimating one year ahead, but you are giving exactly the same estimate as that of last year. That does not seem to be the most intelligent business judgment that could be exercised.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It must be remembered that these estimates are prepared not to-day, but as long ago as December, on data covering the period up to the end of November. I want to give the House the latest possible information, and when the supplementaries are brought in we will know the state of affairs up to that date, as the new services are posted up in the department from day to day. Is it not better to have definite information up to March 1, than up to last November?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is the object of it and I think my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) on reflection will see that we are taking the better course.

Mr. SPROULE. I can hardly agree with that. Whatever information was in the possession of the department up to November or December must be as reliable, in estimating the future, as the information up to March 1 would be; one is a proportion of the year just as the other is. Any one coming into this country picking up the estimates and seeing that the Postmaster General is asking the same amount for the coming year as he did for the last year would naturally reach the conclusion that the country is not expanding very fast, but we know that it is expanding very fast.

Mr. FOSTER. My friend is right. I think that on general principles the main estimate ought, wherever it is possible, to be the main estimate and that the supplementary estimate should be made as small as possible. I wish to ask the minister from what railways we are now getting free mail service and to what extent. It strikes me that some of our subsidies were given some time ago with an obligation compelling the railway taking the subsidy to carry the mails of the Dominion free. Are we getting any return in that way at the present time?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The department is getting no mails carried free. I think the condition attached to these subsidies is that in the case of a railway receiving a subsidy it must perform services to the government to the extent of three per cent of the subsidy before it would be entitled to payment for services.

Mr. FOSTER. For mail services?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. For services of any kind, for carrying police or supplies or mails, it would have to earn three per cent on the subsidy before it could get any cash.

Mr. FOSTER. To what extent is the Post Office Department benefited by that?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think we pay the Receiver General as if the Receiver General was the railway. When we put the mails on a new line of railway that is in that position, instead of paying what the railway earns to the railway we pay it over to the Receiver General.

Mr. FOSTER. What payments are made by the Post Office Department, and in respect of what roads? What I want to get at is whether we have got any actual advantage in that respect?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I suppose the Receiver General could get us up a statement on that point. We simply pay our money over to him. These roads are only in their infancy as yet.

Mr. FOSTER. Was not the Canadian Northern which runs to Winnipeg subsidized under that condition? That has been running for two years.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think it first ran one train a week, then two and then three trains a week. It is now, I believe, running a train daily.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the minister inquire in his department and find out to what extent the post office or the country has benefited in that way?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The post office, I explained, has not benefited in the slightest.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend knows what I mean. He knows that certain railways were bonused under certain conditions, one of these being that they were to do a certain amount of public carrying for the country. What I want to get at is

to what extent the Post Office Department has participated in that. The country has got the benefit of it if these roads under these conditions have been carrying the mails.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. As I explained to the hon. gentleman, if it is a question between the department and the railways the department has to pay the Receiver General for the service. The railway company has not received money from the government, because it is not entitled to payment of its claim until it has earned three per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well, I will put my question in another way. Will the minister give us the information as to how much his department has paid the Receiver General in respect of the services rendered to his department by such roads as were bonused under the condition that they should do a certain amount of carrying for the country ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I will get that information.

Mr. SPROULE. There has been a good deal of talking for some years past as to whether it would not be wise to put the telegraph and telephone systems of the country under the Post Office Department, and the hon. minister informed us last year that that question was engaging his attention. I would like to inquire if he has reached any conclusion regarding it, or has he been able to collect sufficient data to enable him to judge whether it would be a proper thing to do or not ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is a very interesting and large question. I am afraid I am not able to supplement what I stated last session. It is now 6 o'clock, and I do not think it is desired to meet to-night. If it is not, perhaps my hon. friend will allow the discussion to terminate now. I move that the Committee rise and report progress.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General to bring down, for the next meeting of the Committee, the report alluded to by my hon. friend from St. Antoine, Montreal, in regard to the illegal stamping of letters which took place during the last election campaign.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, January 26, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER.

QUESTIONS.

NAVAL STATION AT ESQUIMALT.

Mr. SLOAN asked :

1. Has the government any information that the Imperial authorities propose to abandon Esquimalt as a naval station ?

2. If so, what action has this government taken in respect to section nine (9) of the terms of the union, under which the colony of British Columbia entered into union with the Dominion of Canada, reading as follows : 'The influence of the Dominion government will be used to secure the maintenance of the naval station at Esquimalt.' ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The government has no information that the Imperial government proposed to abandon Esquimalt as a naval station. Therefore, there is no occasion to make a statement in regard to the second question of my hon. friend (Mr. Sloan).

MACCAN MAIL CARRYING CONTRACT.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Foster—asked :

1. Is there a contract in force for the carrying of mails from Maccan, Intercolonial Railway station, to the post office in the town ?

2. If so (a) what is the contract price, and (b) who is the contractor ?

3. (a) Were public tenders asked for ? (b) If so, who were the several tenderers, and what were the amounts respectively ?

4. What sum was paid the previous contractor for same service ?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General) :

1. Yes.

2. (a) Ninety-seven dollars per annum ; (b) Robert Harrison.

3. (a) Yes ; (b) Robert J. Harrison, $97; Jerome Loring, $97; George J. Harrison, $126.

4. One hundred and eighteen dollars and ninety-two cents per annum.

MARCONI SYSTEM ON THE 'STANLEY' AND THE 'MINTO.'

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Martin—asked :

1. Under what arrangement and for what purposes has the Marconi system of telegraph been placed in the government boats 'Stanley' and 'Minto' ?

2. Does the government pay for this, and if so, how much ?

3. Has the work thus far been successful?

4. Has the Anglo-American Telegraph Company protested against the establishment of Marconi stations on Prince Edward Island, (a) in connection with these boats ; or (b) for the purpose of establishing telegraphic communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland ? If so, why ?

5. Does the government recognize such a protest ? If so, why ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Under contract, for the purpose of being able to communicate from one ship at

the mainland to the other ship at the island.

2. Yes, $1,500 for each ship, the cost of the installation.

3. Very successful.

4. Yes. (a) No. (b) Yes, on account of competition with them.

5. No, for public reasons.

MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH, P.E.I. RAILWAY.

Mr. MARTIN asked :

1. Has the Murray Harbour branch line of railway in Prince Edward Island been completed ? If so, when ?

2. If not, what remains to be done, and what is the estimated cost of same, including rolling stock ?

3. How many of the bridges are wooden, or partly wooden structures ? Are they to be replaced by stone or steel ? If so, when, and what is the estimated cost ?

4. How many booking and other stations are now built on this line, and where ? How many more are proposed to be built, and where ?

5. Is a station to be built at Grand View or Newton Crossing on this line ? If so, is it to be a booking station ?

6. Has a delegation from Prince Edward waited on any member or official of the government during the session of parliament, asking for this station ? If so, of whom composed ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). The information to enable me to answer this question is only to be had at Moncton, and I have not yet had an opportunity to secure it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

DISALLOWANCE OF ACT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA LEGISLATURE.

Mr. RALPH SMITH asked :

1. Have any of the Acts passed at the last session of the British Columbia Legislature of 1904 been disallowed ?

2. If any of such Acts have been disallowed, what are they, and for what reason ?

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) :

1. Yes.

2. Chapter 20, intituled : 'An Act to regulate immigration into British Columbia'; it was found to be ultra vires or interfering with Dominion policy.

EMPLOYMENT OF MR. P. M. BREDT.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. Is Mr. P. M. Bredt at present in the employ of the Dominion government ?

2. If so, since when, in what capacity, and at what salary ?

3. On whose recommendation was Mr. Bredt appointed to his present position ?

4. Was Mr. Bredt in the employ of the Dominion government in 1904 ? If so, during what period or periods, and in what capacity or capacities ?

5. Did Mr. Bredt retire from the service of the Dominion government in 1904 ? If so, on what date ?

6. What was the reason for his retirement ?

7. On whose recommendation was Mr. Bredt appointed to the position he occupied with the government during 1904, and prior to that year?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Will the hon. member (Mr. Lake) tell me to what department he refers ?

Mr. LAKE. The immigration department.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will let the question stand, and I will try to get the answer.

EMPLOYMENT OF MR. SYDNEY PORTER.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. On what date did Mr. Sydney Porter retire from the position of homestead inspector prior to the general election of 1904 ?

2. What salary was Mr. Porter drawing at the time of his retirement ?

3. Is Mr. Porter at present in the employ of the Dominion government ? If so, in what capacity, and at what salary ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER Prime Minister) :

1. Mr. Sidney Porter retired from the position of homestead inspector on August 31, 1903.

2. He was receiving a salary of $125 per month.

3. Yes ; colonization agent at $125 per month.

EMPLOYMENT OF MR. J. R. POLLOCK.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. Is Mr. J. R. Pollock in the employ of the government ? If so, since when ?

2. Was Mr. J. R. Pollock in the employ of the government during October, 1904 ? If so, what were his duties ?

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

1. Yes, Mr. Pollock has been in the employ of the government since May 12, 1902.

2. Yes; homestead inspector.

LAND OBTAINED BY MR. HENRY ENTENIER.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. When did Henry Entenier enter for his first homestead ?

2. Has Mr. Entenier entered for a second homestead, or obtained from the government any land since that time ? If so, what is its location, at what price, and under what conditions did he receive it ?

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

1. On May 31, 1893.

2. Mr. Entenier has not entered for a second homestead. Upon report of homestead inspector that only a portion of the land in their homesteads was cultivable in consequence of early frosts, caused by the lowness of the land, and because of hail in some years, settlers in the Kroneau district (of which Mr. Entenier is one) were al-

lowed to purchase each an additional quarter section, subject to ordinary cultivation conditions. He bought the SE. quarter section 14, township 15, range 17, west of the 2nd meridian, at the regulation price of $3 per acre, payable one-fourth at time of purchase, the balance in three annual instalments, with interest on any unpaid balance at 5 per cent per annum.

DRILL HALL IN SHERBROOKE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

1. Has a sum of money been placed in the estimates for the construction of a drill hall in Sherbrooke ?
2. If so, what amount, and when will such appropriation be available ?
3. Is it the intention of the government to increase the appropriation in the near future ?
4. Has a suitable site been procured ? If so, where, and at what cost ?
5. Have plans and specifications been prepared ?
6. Is it the intention of the government to call for tenders for the construction of the same ?
7. When does the government intend commencing the construction of such drill hall ?
8. Is the government aware that the four different branches of the service which exist in Sherbrooke have for some time past had no suitable premises for the retention of arms and accoutrements ?

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

1. Yes.
2. $10,000. Money available at present.
3. Yes.
4. Yes ; on Victoria street, between Belvedere and Goodhue streets ; price paid $6,000, of which $1,500 was contributed by the corporation of the town of Sherbrooke.
5. Plans and specifications are now in course of preparation.
6. Yes.
7. As soon as plans are prepared.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Part of that question is not answered.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is so general that I cannot answer it. I would have to communicate with several departments, and that will be done perhaps later on.

POST OFFICE IN SHERBROOKE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

1. Has any amount been placed in the estimates for the purpose of improving and increasing the accommodation of the Sherbrooke post office ?
2. If so, what amount has been so placed in the estimates, and when will such appropriation be made ?
3. Have tenders been called for the work of the same? If so, have any been accepted, and from whom?
4. Is it the intention of the department to increase the staff and efficiency of the Sherbrooke office ?
5. What are the salaries of those now employed, postmaster and clerks ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

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

1 & 2. Yes ; there is at present an amount of $2,000 available for that purpose.

3. The principal item is for lock boxes ($1,650), which are supplied under contract.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). I would ask the hon. gentman to allow the last two parts of his question to stand.

ANTHRACITE COAL USED BY GOVERNMENT.

Mr. A. K. McLEAN—by Mr. Martin—asked :

1. What were the quantities of anthracite coal used in the several departments of the government of Canada, in the provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island, in the years 1900, 1901, 1902. 1903 and 1904 ?
2. What was the total expenditure per year for said coal for each of said provinces during said years ; and separately, what were the names of the parties to whom paid, and the price per ton paid to each ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). As this reply would require a large amount of work, would the hon. gentleman be kind enough to ask for an order of the House for a return ?

SURVEYS FOR GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

Mr. BRABAZON asked :

1. How many parties are engaged on the surveys of the proposed Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal ?
2. Who are the engineers in charge of said parties, and what territory do they respectively cover ?
3. When did the several parties commence operations ?
4. Of how many men did each party consist on the 1st of January inst. ?
5. Have any interim reports been received by the government from any of the engineers ? If so, what is their tenor ?
6. When is it expected that the survey will be completed ?

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

1. Ten.

2. Section No. 1, Lake Nipissing to middle of Lake Huron, A. J. McDougall engineer in charge. Section No. 2, middle of Lake Huron to head of Johnson's rapids, on the Ottawa river, H. P. Bell engineer in charge. Section No. 3, head of Johnson's rapids to Des Joachims rapids, Wm. Cross engineer in charge. Section No. 4, head of Des Joachims rapids through north and south channels of Allumette island to Fort Coulonge, G. L. Griffith engineer in charge. Section No. 5, from Fort Coulonge through Calumet, Portage du Fort and Snows to head of Chats rapids, A. Robert engineer in charge. Section No. 6, head of Chats rapids through Lake Deschênes to the Gatineau river, W. G. Warner engineer in charge. Section No. 7, from the Gatineau river down

the Ottawa river, through Grenville rapids, to the foot of Carillon rapids, E. E. Perrault engineer in charge. Section No. 8, from foot of Carillon rapids, through Lake of Two Mountains and Ste. Anne rapids, to head of Lake St. Louis, C. E. McNaughton engineer in charge. Section No. 9, from head of Lake St. Louis to Montreal by the Lachine canal, with investigation of the Back river channels to the St. Lawrence river, L. R. Voligny engineer in charge. Party No. 10 (subdivision of section No. 1), Lake Nipissing, F. H. Peters, first assistant, in charge.

3. The first nine parties were ordered to report on the 27th October, 1904; party No. 10 was formed later on, and began work in the first week of January instant.

4. Each party is composed of 16 men—engineering staff, 7 men; river men, labourers and cook, 9 men. Extra men are employed when required. On the 1st January instant the several staffs were as follows:—

Section No.	1	16 men.
"	2	21 "
"	3	16 "
"	4	21 "
"	5	16 "
"	6	21 "
"	7	29 "
"	8	20 "
"	9	28 "

5. Only usual reports respecting field work have been received.

6. The survey is expected to last one year.

I. C. R.—STATION AGENT AT FREDERICTON.

Mr. CROCKET moved:

For copies of the letters of Mr. Tiffin, general traffic manager, and J. E. Price, general superintendent, of the Intercolonial Railway, reporting Odbur White, station agent at Fredericton, N.B., as not qualified for his position; and of all other correspondence in the possession of the government or the Department of Railways and Canals, relating to the dismissal of said Odbur White?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). There is no correspondence. Reports were made to me orally at Moncton in the month of December. I have received a letter from Mr. White, to which I have replied. That correspondence can be furnished if the hon. gentleman is satisfied with that.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. Perhaps the minister would be more particular in future, when he gives an answer to a question put in the House, to state that the report is an oral one; for certainly, in listening to him, I came to the conclusion that it was a report in writing that had been made in reference to that matter.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For copies of all correspondence had with the government or any member or official thereof, in reference to the building and location of a railway station at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island; also report or reports or memorandum of any minister or official of the government, with reference to delegations from the province of Prince Edward Island, asking for the construction of such work.—Mr. A. Martin.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Post office—outside service, miscellaneous expenditure, $289,740.

Mr. AMES. Mr. Chairman, before this amount is voted, I would like to refer again to a matter which I spoke of yesterday when we were discussing the estimates of the hon. Postmaster General with special reference to the post office in the city of Montreal. I would like to quote for the benefit of the hon. Postmaster General and the members of this House an extract from a statement which was delivered by Mr. Justice Desnoyers from the bench in the city of Montreal on December 17, 1904, at the time that he committed six prisoners for trial in the case of the Crown vs. Geo. Bissonnette et al., charged with conspiracy. At that time the hon. judge spoke as follows:

Besides, the first of November, Bissonnette, took from No. 29 St. Charles Borromée street, a bundle of envelopes and had the stamps cancelled and the envelopes brought back to No. 29 St. Charles Borromée street. These letters were to serve bogus voters by putting them in a position to make fraudulent identification in case it should be necessary so to do.

I would like to know whether the hon. Postmaster General has received a report from his subordinate, and what action has been taken on this report, inasmuch as it would appear from the words of the judge that some of the officials of the Montreal post office had prostituted their position in order to assist in the preparation of electoral frauds.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). Until yesterday, I had never heard of the matter in any way. I made inquiry in the department and I find the following report from Mr. J. L. Palmer, the assistant postmaster at Montreal:

Montreal, 3rd November, 1904.

Sir,—I beg to report that yesterday complaint was made to this office that some one upstairs had handed a parcel of letters to an employee to postmark and return to him; that the same man had used the same employee for the same purpose the day before. I made inquiries of those likely to know something about the matter, and finally ascertained that Mr. Louis Thibault, of the public works branch here, had, on Tuesday about noon stamped a certain number of envelopes, whether empty and addressed I do not know. When I learned this I sent for Mr. Thibault, who is a very obliging person

and very useful to us, and questioned him concerning this accusation.

Mr. MORIN. To us!

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. This is the assistant postmaster who is writing. This is Mr. J. L. Palmer's statement:

He said that he had stamped some letters the day before; that he thought he was doing no harm, and the chances are he did not think there was any harm in doing so. He said that he would bring me down what letters had been given to him yesterday. There were about thirty, I fancy, empty envelopes, unaddressed, prepaid with a two-cent stamp each, and some five or six closed against inspection. He gave me to understand that he got them from some one of the name of Bissonnette.

I asked the superintendent to warn the clerks in charge, our stampers and sorters and others concerned against allowing any one to meddle with our stamping machines, other than those authorized to do so.

Of course these stamping machines and electric plant are kept in order by employees of the Public Works Department, and they have, necessarily, free access to the office in consequence.

Mr. Thibault wanted to know what he would do with these envelopes, and few closed letters which had been given to him by this party. He was told to do as he pleased with them; that they had not been posted and that, consequently, it rested with him to dispose of them as he deemed best.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) J. L. PALMER,
Assistant Postmaster.

The Postmaster General
Ottawa. Ont.

I sent for the secretary of the department and questioned him as to the position of this man Thibault and he gave me the following memorandum:

Re case of Louis Thibault:

Under date the 3rd November last, the postmaster of Montreal reported that Louis Thibault, who is employed as an electrician by the Department of Public Works, to attend to the electric stamping machines in use at the Montreal post office, had, at the instigation of a friend of his named Bissonnette, improperly passed through one of the stamping machines a number of unsealed empty envelopes unaddressed and prepaid with a two-cent stamp each, also some five or six envelopes which were closed against inspection.

The object which this man Bissonnette had was, it appears, to give the envelopes in question (which he used to inclose certain election documents) the semblance of having passed legitimately through the post office, although actually delivered by hand.

The question as to whether this department has any action against Bissonnette for an improper use of post office material, apparently for a fraudulent purpose, has been submitted to the Department of Justice, but as yet no answer has been received from that department.

The Department of Public Works has also been asked whether in view of the serious impropriety of Thibault's conduct he is a suitable person to be entrusted with work which gives him the opportunity of making an improper use of post office material, but no reply has yet been received from the Department of Public Works, beyond a statement from the private secretary that the minister was out of town and that the matter would be referred to him on his return.

I asked the secretary of the department how this man Thibault came to be allowed access to the working part of the post office, and he gave me the following explanation: It appears that there are certain electrical works in connection with the building generally and that this man Thibault is an electrician. A small part of the post office in the city of Montreal is occupied by stamping machines that are run by electrical power, and it was part of the duty of this man Thibault to come in from time to time and see that these machines were in proper order. Accordingly, no question would arise in case of his appearing at one of these machines. The probability is that on one of these occasions he came to one of these machines, and whether surreptitiously or otherwise, the probability is that he made an improper use of his position, which was only to examine the machines and see that they were in order, to stamp these envelopes.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the date of the letter in which you made inquiry of the Department of Public Works and to which you seem to have no answer?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. December 17. I will read the letter to my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart). It is from the Deputy Postmaster General to the Minister of Public Works, and it is as follows:

Under date the 3rd November last, the postmaster of Montreal reported that Louis Thibault, who is employed as an electrician by the Department of Public Works to attend to the electric stamping machines in use at the Montreal post office, had, at the instigation of a friend of his named Bissonnette, improperly passed through one of the stamping machines a number of unsealed empty envelopes unaddressed and prepaid with a two-cent stamp each, also some five or six envelopes which were closed against inspection.

The object which this man Bissonnette had was, it appears, to give the envelopes in question (which he used to inclose certain election documents) the semblance of having passed legitimately through the post office, although actually delivered by hand.

I beg therefore, to submit the question as to whether in view of the serious impropriety of Thibault's conduct he is a suitable person to be entrusted with work which gives him the opportunity of making an improper use of post office material.

That is signed by the Deputy Postmaster General.

Mr. BERGERON. To that letter there was no answer.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There is an answer dated December 23, 1904, from the private secretary to the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. BERGERON. What is that answer?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is as follows :—

December 23rd, 1904.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge your favour of the 17th inst., which has been received in the absence of Honourable Mr. Hyman from Ottawa, with reference to an employee of this department in the Montreal post office, Louis Thibault by name. On the minister's return to the city, your letter will be laid before him.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
JAS. B. HUNTER,
Private Secretary.

Mr. AMES. I would like to point out to the minister that all this correspondence relates to the second offence, that the first time the letters passed through without detection and that nearly all this correspondence related to the second lot of letters which were caught while they were going through.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I have not seen my deputy on the subject because he has been absent from Ottawa, but the file contains the letter from Palmer and of course our action would be with reference to this complaint. The letter from Mr. Palmer says:

I beg to report that yesterday complaint was made to this office that some one 'upstairs' had handed a parcel of letters, &c.

That was the information furnished to us by the assistant postmaster and that is the information which moved the department to action; I do not think we have any other information in regard to any other alleged offence. It may have been as my friend (Mr. Ames) says, but the whole file was submitted to me by the secretary of the department this morning.

Mr. SPROULE. In the letter you refer to another alleged offence, so that there must have been another occasion when the same thing was done.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That may appear; whatever was in Palmer's letter was the subject of our inquiries of the other departments, first as to whether Thibault or Bissonnette can be proceeded against criminally, and whether Thibault is a proper person to continue in the public service. One act of this kind is just as censurable as a dozen acts. If a man has committed this offence on one day that is sufficient ground for action although two offences may aggravate the case.

Mr. AMES. Has the minister any reply to his inquiry to the Department of Justice as to whether the department can proceed against Bissonnette for the misuse of the mails?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The matter has been referred to the Deputy Minister of Justice, but I do not know what has transpired as I have not had an opportunity of inquiring.

Mr. AMES. Will the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) let us know?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Probably we have fourteen or fifteen applications of this sort every day, and it is absolutely impossible for me to carry in my mind the result of the different references, but since the matter was brought up I have made application to the department for details and I expect to have them in a few minutes.

Mr. AMES. I should be very sorry to believe that there are fourteen or fifteen cases of this kind every day because it is a case of such an extraordinary character.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) would not intentionally misrepresent what I said. I did not say there were fourteen or fifteen cases of this sort every day; I said there were fourteen or fifteen references to the department.

Mr. AMES. There is another matter which I would like to bring to the attention of the Postmaster General before we have the estimates for his department. In the Montreal 'Star' of January 13, 1905, there occurs a statement purporting to come from the city treasurer as follows:

It is true that letters containing cheques for interest upon civic bonds have evidently been opened at the post office in this city and have been forged and cashed.

I would like to know if the minister has any information on this.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am informed that this matter has not been brought to the attention of the department except through a newspaper report, but as soon as it was brought to the notice of the department in that way, a communication was directed, on December 19, to the inspector at Montreal, Mr. Bain, instructing him to make an investigation. The memorandum is as follows :—

This matter was referred to the post office inspector at Montreal for a report on the 19th instant, but the report has not yet come to hand.

Mr. SPROULE. What seems strange to me about this case is that it was reported to the Department of Public Works, that one of their employees was doing improper work in the Post Office Department, and yet for two and a half months, so far as we know, that employee has never been dismissed or reprimanded.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. In the absence of the acting Minister of Public Works I may say that he has not had this matter in hand for two and a half months. It was on December 17 that the Post Office Department directed a communication to him. The holidays were then on and the Minister of

Public Works, I presume, did not return to Ottawa until some time in the new year. It may be that he has dealt with the case, for all we know, but it has not been under his notice for two and a half months. I presume the minister was with his family during the holiday season; he came down to Ottawa early in January and since then there has been a good deal to do getting ready for the session, and we are still only at January 26.

Mr. SPROULE. This I think would be the proper time to make inquiry in reference to another matter. Complaints are made with regard to the time of the delivery of mail, especially of newspapers, in the House of Commons post office. I was here week before last and we waited a little over an hour after the trains were in before we could get a paper in the House of Commons. I was told that this could be easily remedied by having a bag brought direct from the train to the House of Commons post office, instead of having the mails delivered at the post office down town, sorted there and then brought up here. It seems to me that could be easily done and it would be a convenience. We went down town and bought papers there, and had them up here nearly an hour before they were delivered in the House of Commons post office. That I think ought to be changed. I would also call attention to the fact that on Sundays the House post office is closed at four o'clock in the evening. Letters dropped into the post office after four o'clock do not go out by that night's mail, which leaves at eleven o'clock. It seems to me that it would be an easy matter to have a bag sent from here at the last moment either to the train or to the city post office. I spoke about this to the postmaster, who is a most courteous, accommodating, and obliging man, and he told me that it would not be difficult to have a more convenient arrangement, but that his attention had not been drawn to it before. This system has not always prevailed, because I can remember that some years ago we could mail our letters at a much later hour. Having drawn the attention of the hon. Postmaster General to the matter, I have no doubt that he will confer with his employees and have a change made.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. With reference to the first point made by my hon. friend, whether the mails would get here more quickly if sent direct from the train to the House of Commons rather than via the post office, let me explain that the arrangements for conveying the mails to and from the House of Commone are under the control of a committee of this House or a joint committee of both Houses. The postmaster here is not an officer of our department; he is an officer of this House.

Mr. HAGGART. What joint committee controls them ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is called the Committee of Internal Economy, I believe. The Post Office Department has no jurisdiction over the mail service between the Post Office and the House.

Mr. SPROULE. The Postmaster General did not say so when we were distributing our literature and he threatened to throw it out.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We will discuss one thing at a time ; I am now giving my hon. friend the information he desired. At present the practice is to have the mails that come from the west and from Montreal sent here in a special bag directed to the House of Commons. They are brought by electric car to the post office and there delivered to the courier of the House of Commons, who is in attendance, and who at once brings them here. He does not wait on the sortation of the mails at the city post office at all.

Mr. SPROULE. The Postmaster General evidently misunderstands me. I said that the complaint was not with regard to letters, but papers.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Whether letters or papers, they came in a bag directed to the House of Commons, and there is no delay caused by their coming via the city post office. There may be some delay on the part of the courier, but that is a matter for Mr. Speaker, and I will call his attention to the hon. gentleman's question. With regard to having the outgoing mail on Sunday evening close at half-past ten instead of 4 o'clock, I may say that the mails are despatched from the city post office to the station at the latest possible moment before the departure of the train, and if the House of Commons gets its mails into the city post office in time for the last despatch of the mails to the station, which takes place at about half-past ten, my hon. friend's point would be met. The remedy rests with the post office in the House of Commons, not with us.

Mr. SPROULE. The papers were one hour later than the letters. After I had gone down to the city and purchased a paper, I inquired here, and was told that the mail had not yet arrived from the post office.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is between the postmaster here and the courier.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the party who brings the mail from the city post office to the House of Commons under the control of the Speaker or of the postal authorities ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The postmaster of the House of Commons informs me that he is a man named Patterson, and he is employed by Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he is able to tell the com-

mittee what is the amount of rental paid for the branch post office in the city of Montreal situated at No. 2467 St. Catherine St., and whether the lease for that office expires this year ? Some documents have just been placed in my hands by the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) who has been obliged to absent himself, and who represents that part of the city, from which it would appear that that post office as at present organized is a source of danger to the public health. Numerous complaints were placed in the hands of my hon. friend from St. Antoine division ; in consequence of these, the health officer of the city of Montreal was asked to make an examination and report. This is the report which he made :

Montreal, December 1, 1904.

H. B. Ames, Esq.,
180 St. James Street.

Sir,—I have the honour to make you the following report re the sanitary condition of No. 2467 St. Catherine Street. We made the smoke test. The place is unhealthy at present and is besides very badly kept. There are not sufficient water closets for the number of employees. The proprietor, Mr. Pacaud, was notified to put the premises in good order and the department will see that that is done as soon as possible. I may also add that it is largely the fault of the occupants if their quarters are not kept as they ought to be.

Your obedient servant,
J. A. DUROCHER.
Supt. of Sanitary Police

It would appear that at a later date inquiry was again made of Mr. Durocher as to what had been done with regard to these premises. I have here his answer addressed to Alderman Ames :

City Hall, Montreal, 12th, January, 1905.

H. B. Ames, Esq.,
180 St. James Street.

Sir,—Your letter of the 10th instant was received yesterday. In reply I must say, as I did, on December 1st, that the place is not kept as it should be. The water closets and floors are dirty. There has been negligence since we have had all put into good order, and it is again in a bad state. There is gas escaping from a pipe placed in the back by order of the manager of the office. There is not a single cuspidor in the establishment and you can imagine the result. We have notified the proper party to repair the gas pipe, to supply cuspidors, to have the floors washed, &c. The said official believes the owner to be bound to do the cleaning, therefore, I believe he should be made to fulfil his obligation. I do not believe that the health department would be justified in interfering in such a case.

Your obedient servant,
J. A. DUROCHER.

It is in consequence of these documents that I ask my hon. friend whether the lease expires this year or whether, in the short time which is to elapse between now and February 1, the Post Office Department could not take measures, before allowing that lease to be renewed either expressly or tacitly, to have that public office made absolutely conformable to all the sanitary rules and by-laws of the city of Montreal ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. After my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) had referred to this matter yesterday, I made inquiry, and was informed that it had not been brought to the attention of the department. I gather from the papers just read by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, that the health superintendent of the city of Montreal informed the hon. member for St. Antoine that the premises were not proof against the smoke test. Whilst Mr. Durocher has said in his report that the case is perhaps one which does not come within the jurisdiction of the health department of the city of Montreal, the Post Office Department is very much interested in having all its buildings in a sanitary condition satisfactory to the public and the officials. I am sorry therefore, that my hon. friend from St. Antoine did not at once bring the matter to the attention of my department. According to the superintendent's statement, it would appear that most of the condition complained of is due to the neglect of the occupants of the building over whom the health department has no jurisdiction. That is a very extraordinary state of affairs. It is very extraordinary that the occupants of any public building should be so regardless of hygienic conditions as to impair their own health as well as that of the public. I shall however, have the matter looked into and see what can be done to abate the nuisance, whether the superintendent of sanitary police in Montreal has jurisdiction or not. That would have been done long ago if we had been made aware of the facts. The rental paid for the premises is $250 per annum, but I cannot say when the lease expires. I shall look into the matter and see that the department does everything possible to remedy the condition complained of.

Mr. MONK. I do not understand how my hon. friend can pretend that the health department of the city of Montreal has no jurisdiction.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not say so. It is Mr. Durocher who says so in one of his reports.

Mr. BRODEUR. Has this report of the sanitary superintendent's been sent to the Board of Health of Montreal ?

Mr. MONK. When a health officer in Montreal is called upon to visit a house, he makes an entry of his visit and the result, and that constitutes a report. He makes no special report, but will make one, if asked to do so, to a member of the Board of Health or any one else who wants it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. For the information of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) I made inquiry of the postmaster, and he says that whilst there is a

mail despatched from here at four o'clock in the afternoon on Sundays, there is also one despatched as late as 9 o'clock at night. Does my hon. friend desire a later service ?

Mr. SPROULE. I have mailed letters myself at 5 o'clock on Sunday, and they were only stamped and despatched the next day.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The concluding words of Mr. Durocher's report of January 12 are :

I do not believe that the health department would be justified in interfering in such a case.

Mr. BERGERON. But the minister says that he will act in spite of that.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I will do all that is reasonably possible. I am sorry it was not brought to my attention sooner.

Mr. MONK. I think the sense of that is that the Health Department would not be jusified in interfering to make the repairs itself, because there is no doubt I suppose, that the proprietor or occupant is bound by direction of the Act to obey a health officer. Perhaps the sanitary inspector considers that his rights do not authorize him to act, but I think this department has enough in these reports to insist upon the place being kept in a sanitary condition.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Quite right.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that the Postmaster General still keeps a separate item for the Yukon Territory mail service. What object is there in that ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The revenue and expenditure are given as a whole. It may be some information to give the Yukon expenditure separately. I suppose it is no harm to give that information.

Mr. SPROULE. But I was asking the reason for it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not know. I instructed the Deputy Postmaster General in balancing up the accounts to incorporate the revenue and expenditure as before, but I did not go into his report in detail.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose it is a relic of the system adopted by the Postmaster General some years ago, when he kept the Yukon expenditure by itself. And, as he showed a surplus without taking account of the Yukon expenditure he claimed it as a surplus for the department. Yet, as every one knew, there was a large deficit in the total service. I am glad he has given up that arrangement, and I do not see any reason why a special heading should be made here for the Yukon. Before we leave the consideration of sums paid steamships and railways and miscellaneous expenditure, there are two or three points I wish to bring to the Postmaster General's attention. Will the Postmaster General tell us what was spent in commissions on savings bank business last year. He has taken $27,500. The rate has not been changed, I suppose?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) knows postmasters are not only paid an allowance on their revenues but also what is called forward allowance, allowance on money matters, saving's banks, postal notes and so on. They are now paid ten per cent more than they were on all salaries and allowances. For example, the man who formerly received $10 on money order business would now receive $11 ; the man who received $50 on savings banks would now receive $55. The Auditor General's Report page S—51 shows that the commissions allowed to postmasters on saving's bank business transacted was $23,604.90.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister is taking $4,000 more than was expended last year. I suppose there is a gradual increase in the business?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The transactions in and out may be greater but I do not think there was a real increase in the amount on deposit at the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. FOSTER. Does this cover money order business?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, only savings bank business.

Mr. FOSTER. On what principal are the allowances for travelling expenses of inspectors based?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. They must furnish an itemized account of their expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. They actually give vouchers, I suppose?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, so far as one can in travelling.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to be informed as to the payments for the manufacture of postage stamps, post cards, envelopes and post bands. As I remembered it, there was formerly a contract with the Burlands but a new arrangement was made. Under that new arrangement are the same rates paid as before, or are they lower rates?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The rates paid now are lower than were paid to the Burlands.

Mr. FOSTER. Considerably lower?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) desires it I can have a comparison made of the figures in the Auditor General's Report for 1897 with those in the last report.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. minister has his contracts?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is all covered by contract.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not need the information to-day, but perhaps the Postmaster General will have it prepared.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I will have it sent to the hon. gentleman. To avoid mistake will he be good enough to send a memorandum of just what he wants.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a large expenditure for mail bags, locks, repairs and so on. And I see a number of people are employed in Ottawa, Toronto and other cities in making the mail bags. Does the minister call for tenders for this work, giving specifications and allowing for public tender ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. A contract was let after tenders had been invited from competent persons. The present contractor is Mr. Carson, of Ottawa. The contract was let about two years ago.

Mr. FOSTER. My question was, whether public tenders were called for, either by circular or advertisement ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There was a fair and honest competition. I am told that we have adhered to the practice that was in force when we took office.

Mr. FOSTER. To come squarely to the point, does the minister simply advise certain friends of the party, whom he knows to be such, and get rates from them in a sort of private competition ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Or is it a competition in which the public generally has a chance to give figures ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am informed by the superintendent of stores branch that he adheres to the practice that has been followed in the department for many years, of sending out notices to different parties asking them on or before a certain date to send in written tenders for the work. These tenders come in registered, they are all opened at the same time, and contracts are awarded strictly according to the tenders.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend still does not answer as to the selection of persons who receive these kindly invitations to send in estimates. How are they selected ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Well, the hon. gentleman's colleagues left us a list of names, to which we have added, of men in the trade who are competent to do the work. They are not all of the same political faith—if that is what my hon. friend is driving at. In fact, the successful contractor on the present occasion, Mr. Carson, I understand is not a supporter of this administration.

Mr. FOSTER. The information I have, then, is that there is no distinction made, that the selection is made independently of the political leanings of the parties, who are supposed to be competent manufacturers in that line, and that consequently these invitations are not confined to one class or one party.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I thought I had made it quite plain. The superintendent of the branch informs me that there was a list of persons to whom the late government was in the habit of sending invitations for tenders. We have added some names to that list, but we have not created a new list, and tenders are invited from those whose names are on the old list, as well as from those who have been added. He reminds me that some of the late contractors, Borbridge & Co., are on that list. They are invited to tender, and have been successful more than once. They were not the successful tenderers the last time, they were third on the list; but when they were first they got the contract.

Mr. FOSTER. The contract goes to the lowest tenderer, other things being equal.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. With respect to the uniforms, are they all got at one establishment, or is a contract price made, and then are parties asked whether they will manufacture at that price ? I notice that, whether they are made in Toronto, or Ottawa, or somewhere else, the price seems to be the same all the way through, so far as I can judge. If separate tenders are called for in each city, it seems to me a little strange that the prices are exactly the same.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The superintendent of stores branch informs me that at one time the department invited tenders for the supply of uniforms complete, the contractors furnishing the cloth. But there was a weak spot in that practice, we got inferior cloth, and we would not discover it perhaps until the goods were delivered, when it was too late to remedy it. We had to have different suits of clothing at different seasons of the year, and a few months before a change of season, supplies were required by the contract to be delivered to be used when that season arrived. But there was so much difficulty in getting uniform styles of cloth, and good cloth which complied with the samples, that at last the department decided to purchase the cloth itself, which had not been the practice. I made the mistake myself of inviting tenders for goods made up, the contractor furnishing the cloth, and our attempts in that direction were very unsatisfactory. So the department had to revert to the former practice of purchasing the cloth itself and issuing it to the contractors to be made up. The department also supplies small things called trimmings, monograms and numbers. The department knows what is the reasonable rate to allow for making up a garment, and

that rate is made known to the different makers. They are communicated with and informed that the department is prepared to allow such and such a rate for the manufacture of such and such garments. The superintendent informs me that he communicated with a number of manufacturers in different cities to see what rate they would charge for making up different garments. That gentleman has had thirty-five years' experience, and is able to form a good and reliable opinion. He thus established for the department a scale of prices for the manufacture of the respective garments, and that is the scale on which they are paid.

Mr. FOSTER. Then there is no competition as to the price for making ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We do not call for their manufacture at a lower price than the minimum price that we have made. so there is no competition in the matter of making up.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, by allowing a fair price we are in a position to criticise the manufacturers and to see that the goods are properly made up.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. A reasonable price is offered, and every garment has to pass examination.

Mr. FOSTER. Every garment will have to pass examination even if they had a competitive price. I do not suppose the slowest department would accept the work, even if the contractor was making the garment at fifty cents less than his competitor unless he filled the specifications. This then takes away all competition as far as the making up is concerned. I am not saying that the price may not be a fair price for good work. It very probably is. After the long experience that has been had, it would probably be the fairest price consistent with quality and workmanship that you could get. Well, then, in reference to the purchase of the original cloths—is that advertised for, or is it a matter of public tender ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Reputable mills are asked to tender.

Mr. BERGERON. Which mills ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Good manufacturers of cloth.

Mr. BERGERON. All Canadian ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. All Canadian, all wool and a yard wide.

Mr. BERGERON. If I understand well, the cloth is furnished by the department to the different makers in different parts of the country. All that the government has to pay for is the cutting and making of the uniforms. Could the hon. gentleman say how much each of these uniforms costs ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The manufacturers of uniforms purchase the material from the department. We get it from the mills, and we supply it to the men who make up the goods. They have to pay us the cost price.

Mr. BERGERON. The cloth is inspected, of course, when it leaves here ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Every yard of the cloth is inspected by the men in the department. To prevent substitution of any other cloth, every yard is stamped with the stamp of the department inside in a practically indelible way, so that the department can identify its own cloth after it is manufactured and after the goods come back.

Mr. BERGERON. Who has given the idea of the model of the letter-carriers' uniforms and caps ? I think the letter-carriers' uniform is the worst I have ever seen in my life.

Mr. FOSTER. I imagine a prize was offered for it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am told that the design has been hallowed by antiquity.

Mr. BERGERON. Could it not be changed ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Mr. Smith tells me that the question is under consideration. I would be very glad indeed if my hon. friend would furnish us with some suggestions.

Mr. BERGERON. The cap, also, I suppose, is a piece of antiquity ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I believe there have been some improvements in the summer cap.

Mr. BERGERON. There might be an invitation issued for competitive designs.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the same principle carried out in reference to the duck for the bags, or are the contracts made for the material and making up as well ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. In the case of the mail bags, the contractors supply duck and all materials and furnish the bags complete.

Mr. FOSTER. Would not my hon. friend think that he would probably get better bags and have a better return for his money if he took the same course in respect to those that he does in reference to the uniforms for the men, or are the standards more easily distinguished in duck ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The superintendent says there is not the same necessity for adopting the precautions we take in regard to cloth for the uniforms in regard to the supply of duck, because the standards in duck are clear, precise and easily distinguished, so that there is not the same opportunity for the duck not being in accordance with the specifications.

Mr. FOSTER. I dare say that is so. The only information I would like to have, if the hon. minister will make a note of it, is the names of the parties from whom tenders were asked for the making of the bags and their tendered figures.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Do you want the amounts and all ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I will give all that information.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I see here that there is an item of $4,342 for detective service. In what way is detective service used by the hon. Postmaster General ?

Mr. INGRAM. Perhaps, before you leave that item of clothing, I may be allowed to ask the hon. minister a question in reference to the locks for mail bags. Do you anticipate making any change in the style of lock used on the mail bags, or do you propose to continue the use of the old one ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) allow me to answer the question my hon. friend from North Toronto refers to ? He asks me what is covered by the item of $4,342 for detective service.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the general line of service ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Last year, or a year or so ago, we had a very serious robbery of the mails in the Northwest Territories, and we spared no expense to bring the culprits to justice. We succeeded, after a long investigation, in tracing guilt to a mail clerk and to a member of the legal profession, and put them on trial. They were convicted. One of them is undergoing a sentence of three years, and the other, I think, of seven years.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the Calgary case ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, or the Regina case. Some of the money was recovered, but we did not spare expense in order to detect the guilty parties. I think there is another person accused of complicity or guilty knowledge at present in confinement awaiting trial. I think that about absorbs that item.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Minister of Justice is not concealing the other, I hope.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No ; he came back, but I do not know what became of him.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you use the Dominion officials as detectives ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Altogether.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The case was entirely dealt with by the Dominion officials.

Mr. INGRAM. Who has the contract for furnishing the locks for the mail sacks and is that contract being continued ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The lock on the mail bag is a patent lock. The patent was at one time owned by Mr. Low, and it was with him that the department had the contract for their supply. That was the condition of affairs prior to our coming into office, but some seven years ago Mr. Low sold out his patent rights and business to a Mr. Sheppard, who has carried on the manufacture ever since.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the department not been consulted with respect to a patent lock that is much quicker, that will close ten or twelve bags in the time that it takes to close one of the old ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The superintendent says that we have had no notice of any complaints that the lock is too slow in fastening or in any way unsatisfactory or that there was any new and quicker working lock. He says that this lock has been in use for ten years and has had a good trial.

Mr. INGRAM. I think the hon. gentleman will find some correspondence in his department with respect to this improved lock which I understand is now being used quite largely in the United States. Time is a very important factor in the closing of mail bags where you have a large number to deal with.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am informed by the superintendent that on several occasions persons from the United States, some of them connected with the United States post office and some not, have come to the department at Ottawa showing what they considered were improved locks. They have been shown our locks, and after examining them have invariably gone away saying that we had a better lock than theirs and that they had nothing to teach us.

Mr. FOSTER. Where does the gentleman get his boots, I mean the boots for his letter-carriers ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The same system that has been in force for years is in force to-day, the old price and the old system.

Mr. FOSTER. What is that ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The department has a standard quality and fixes a price of so much a pair for boots of that quality. The standard price is $4.50.

Mr. FOSTER. I find that you have been particularly good to the Halifax people because the boots for letter-carriers in Halifax are put down at $7.50 a pair. Are they a long boot or different from the others ? There is a great disparity in price there. When you come to Ottawa, which must have just as strenuous a climate as that of Halifax, though perhaps there is not as much fog, the boots cost you $4.50 and there are

some cities where they do not appear to be any.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The $7.50 must be a misprint or a mistake in multiplication.

Mr. FOSTER. The multiplication is all right, but I see the $7.50 is a mistake, because the multiplication carries out about $4.50. Are all these boots made in the same place ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. They are made in different cities.

Mr. FOSTER. I find that in St. John there are no bootmakers ; the boots for that city are made by W. M. Watson of Aurora. Where is Aurora ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. In North York. The system is to have the boots to be used in one place made by bootmakers in another place ; for example, the boots for Halifax will be made in St. John and elsewhere. They say that that practice was adopted to prevent the carriers dickering with the contractors, perhaps getting them to have boots of a little different appearance and different material, and in order to preserve the standard for which we are paying, they are made in that way. The letter-carriers are measured and the boots are issued to them. The boots are all sent here to Ottawa and then re-issued.

Mr. FOSTER. And there is no competition in the price for the making of the boots ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, $4.50 is the standard price.

Mr. DANIEL. Who has the contract in St. John for making the letter-carriers' boots ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. E. Walsh is the bootmaker in St. John who makes for us.

Mr. FOSTER. He makes them for Aurora, does he ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There are no letter-carriers in Aurora.

Mr. FOSTER. There the minister is neglecting his privileges ; he should have letter-carriers there and have their boots made in St. John. There is an item here with reference to a stamper :

The International Postal Supply Company, New York, to rent of two stamp cancelling machines, 12 months to June 30, 1904, $1,000.

Does the minister use these in his large post offices ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And does it on the rental system ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the cost ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We have machines of two classes, one is worked by electrical power and the other by hand. The patent is owned by a United States firm, the International Supply Company, but it was Mr. Dalton of that firm who interviewed me upon that subject. We formerly had perhaps a dozen machines which we rented. Some of them were electrical stamping machines, but they were very slow and were always breaking down. This type of machine is certainly the best known in the post office world to-day, and it was impossible to buy them. I tried the best I could to buy them outright, but it was not possible to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there no price for the sale of the machine ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There is no price ; they would not sell them, and it would not pay any government to go to work to make them. If my hon. friend would drop into the city post office of Toronto or that of Ottawa, he would see a machine at work, and the rapidity with which it stamps will at once show him that no matter what rental we are paying, it is a great economy of time and money.

Mr. FOSTER. In Toronto, I notice that the rent is $500 and $200. I suppose they are on a smaller scale ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is $500 for each power machine and $200 for each hand machine.

Mr. FOSTER. One other question. In most of the city post offices a large number of labourers appear to be employed at from $1 to $1.50 per day. Outside of the packers and sorters, what do these labourers generally do ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. These would probably be persons on the way to entering the service.

Mr. FOSTER. Nine thousand dollars has been paid for labourers in Montreal.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. They may gradually be promoted into the ranks of the packers and sorters and carriers. At Christmas-time we have to employ large numbers —at Toronto perhaps 30 or 40 ; and as soon as the pressure is over, we lay them off.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the minister does not remember the number employed about October and November in the Montreal post office ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I know what my hon. friend has in mind, but I do not think there was any change.

Mr. SPROULE. In regard to the clothing for letter-carriers, do I understand that the cloth is furnished by the government, and the charge is only for making the clothing ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We issue so many yards of cloth to the contractor, and he has to make the garments to fit the different persons who wear them; and his price to us will be the cost of the work and the cost of the material.

Mr. SPROULE. In regard to the supply of mail bags and repairs, I understood the minister to say that there was no competition in that work. What method has been adopted to determine who should get these contracts ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There was a list of persons who made the mail bags when I took office, and I added to the list. We invited tenders from these persons, and the tenders are received in a very strict and regular way by the superintendent. They come by registered letter to him, and at the time named he opens them, figures them out, and makes a report to the deputy, and the contract is awarded to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. SPROULE. Are there only a few parties known to the government who are invited to tender, or is the invitation extended to the general public ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Specifications are prepared and sent to these different persons, with an intimation of the average quantity that may be required.

Mr. SPROULE. What I want to ascertain is how you determine to whom these will be sent; because if the matter were entirely in the hands of the minister, he could select a few of his own friends and ask them to tender, but the outside public would not have any opportunity.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The system we are following is the system that was in force when I took office. There were a number of reputable contractors known to the department, and we added to the list, and the superintendent sent invitations to the persons named on the list. One of the successful tenderers under our administration is Mr. Borbridge, who had been a contractor under the previous government. The present contractor in Toronto is one of my hon. friend's friends.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman says he extended the list, and I have no doubt he did, and he has been remarkably fortunate in finding good men in his own constituency. I find that one William Willis, of Aurora, was paid $3,217.55 for making duck bags, &c. I also find that Thomas Fardy, of Newmarket, for repairing cotton duck bags and jute newspaper sacks, was paid $600. Then, C. H. Hall, of King, which is in the same riding, was paid $2,024.75 for repairing cotton duck bags and linen newspaper sacks. Then, I see that Wm. Watson, of Aurora, was paid $307 for making letter-carriers' boots. So that the Postmaster General has been pretty fortunate in finding just the right kind of men in his own constituency to do this work. I do not see many constituencies represented by members of the opposition favoured in this way.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend has never asked me to give any of this work to his own friends. There is no telling what I might do if appealed to. These repairs are made on a regular system. You cannot measure the value of the work. The department allows a fixed sum out of which the contractors buy the material and make the repairs. They have to take the lean with the fat, and get the same price per bag whether it be seriously damaged or not. They are paid 25 cents a bag for supplying the material and doing the work and they are held to a minimum rate of wages to their employees.

Mr. SPROULE. I was not complaining about the cost of repairs, but, I was pointing out the large proportion of friends of the minster in his own constituency who are given this work and to whom a large sum is paid every year for this purpose. I believe that others quite as capable would do the work just as well and perhaps cheaper if they were allowed an opportunity to compete.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There are more on the list than those in my constituency.

Mr. SPROULE. I know that, but I am drawing attention to the somewhat large number of contracts given to the hon. gentleman's constituents.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It has always been the practice to let the work in that way.

Mr. FOSTER. I see that Chas. Miller was paid $3,713 and Robert Miller, $3,309, being amounts deposited by them in the Post Office Saving's Bank of St. Scholastique and fraudulently was drawn by the assistant postmaster.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That was discussed last year.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I shall not refer to it again. With reference to the hon. gentleman's officials in the Yukon Territory, does he give them a living allowance in addition to their salary?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, only a salary, but their pay is greater than it would be in old Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Justice might take a leaf out of the hon. gentleman's book and give a salary without a separate living allowance.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It would be well for the hon. gentleman to ascertain the dif-

ference in salaries. Our salaries are much smaller in proportion.

Mr. FOSTER. The salaries in the Post Office Department in the Yukon do not seem to be so inordinate. The postmaster of Dawson city gets $5,000.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He would not get more than $2,000 in an eastern city.

Mr. FOSTER. What I am objecting to, is keeping up the distinction between living allowance and salary. I think a fair salary should be given and the living allowance done away with.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is a great deal of force in the way my hon. friend puts the case but how would he deal with the judges?

Mr. FOSTER. They are always hard to deal with.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Would you pay a judge in the Yukon double the salary you pay a judge in the Territories, although each is administering justice under the same conditions except as regards living expenses?

Mr. FOSTER. That same line of argument would apply to everybody else. I should imagine that a judge after exercising his office two or three years in the Yukon, would not care to leave that delightful region and sacrifice his living allowance. But even if you made the salary larger and dispensed with the allowance, if a judge wished to be removed east to a less rigorous clime, he would in that case have to accept the smaller salary prevailing in the district to which he desired to be moved.

Mr. BERGERON. I see that my hon. friend gives a larger bonus to some letter-carriers than to others. Why this discrepancy?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The bonus is the same to all, and is at the rate of $20 per annum. But the letter-carriers come in at different times. Suppose a letter-carrier were appointed in November, he would only get his proportion of the $20 for that year. The bonus is estimated for the calendar year.

Mr. BERGERON. There must be many new letter-carriers, because I see a good deal of difference in the bonuses paid.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. They were employed before, but under the old Act to which I referred yesterday. They were given the privilege of coming in under the new Act, and so the bonus applies to them. A man, let us say, decides to come in under the new Act. He will be paid from that time forward on a different principle, and, on December 31, he will be given the part of the bonus of $20 proportionate to his length of service under the new Act to the end of the year. After that, at the end of every year he will be paid the bonus of $20 if his conduct during the year has been satisfactory.

Mr. BERGERON. Irrespective of the amount of his salary ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. But, on this page there does not seem to be three who are paid the same amount.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The amount paid would depend upon the length of time from the date of the letter-carrier coming under the new Act to the end of the year.

Mr. BERGERON. Some receive nothing at all ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. They are probably not under the new system.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it necessarily that, or does the payment depend at all upon good conduct ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If a man does not deserve it, he does not get it. If he has been guilty of misconduct sufficient in the opinion of his superior officer to disentitle him to the bonus, it would not be paid to him.

Mr. BERGERON. I suppose that would be decided by the postmaster or deputy postmaster ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The postmaster is responsible.

Mr. BERGERON. It is at his discretion? It does not come to the office here ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We have nothing to do with it. The men are reported on by the officers where they work. It is perfectly fair ; there is no politics in it and no interference.

Mr. BERGERON. I suppose not. I merely wanted to know the principle on which it was done. Now, on what principle does the Postmaster General proceed in determining what places shall have letter-carriers ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There is no rule. When it seems necessary in the public interest, and a wise thing to do then the system is established. Not many cities have been brought under the system. I think I have only brought one under it—Brantford.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the population of Brantford ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think the revenue of Brantford post office was over $36,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Would the revenue be one reason for establishing the letter-carrier system ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It would be a circumstance to be considered.

Mr. BERGERON. And the population too, I suppose ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the population of Brantford ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I could not say.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. The hon. member for Brantford city (Mr. Cockshutt) would be able to inform the committee.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The population of Brantford city is about 18,000. The population of the parliamentary division is different, because Brantford takes in also a part of the country district with a population of about 5,000.

Mr. BERGERON. In what cities has the letter-carrier system been established ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Halifax, St. John, Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa, Kingston, Toronto, Hamilton, Brantford, London, Winnipeg, Vancouver and Victoria.

Mr. FOSTER. There is some talk of a pneumatic tube system for certain cities. Will the Postmaster General please give us an idea of what is contemplated, and what the cost and advantages are likely to be ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. A contract has been let for the manfacture of tubes for a pneumatic system for Toronto and Montreal. These are the only cities for which there has been any parliamentary provision. The money was voted last session, and the matter is in charge of the Public Works Department.

Mr. FOSTER. What will be the extent of the system in these two cities.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The scheme for Toronto is to have tubes from the post office to be established wherever the Union station is, to the main post office at the head of Toronto Street, and also to the sub-office at the subway on Queen Street West. In Montreal it is proposed to acquire a site—it may have been acquired by this time—to erect a station post office near Bonaventure station, and to connect that office by pneumatic tube with the main post office. That is the extent of the work for which there is a parliamentary appropriation.

Mr. FOSTER. These tubes will be used, I suppose, for the transmission of the incoming mail matter to the central post office and of the collections at the central post office to the railway ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it intended that the whole service shall be done by the tube ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We shall utilize it as much as possible. I do not know whether or not it will be equal to the demands upon it.

Mr. BERGERON. Has it been decided to build a branch post office in the St. James division, Montreal ? Before the session opened I saw a correspondence about it in the papers, saying that an application had been made, and we were told the matter was being taken into serious consideration.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is a matter for the Public Works Department.

Mr. BERGERON. The construction of it, but the request for it must come from the hon. gentleman. If the hon. gentleman says he wants a branch here, it will be built.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am not able to give my hon. friend a scheme for the erection of public buildings in Montreal in connection with the post office. I know it has been the subject of investigation and inquiry, and the officials of the department have furnished to the Minister of Public Works a requisition, probably, in regard to the matter. But I do not pretend to give any details.

Mr. BERGERON. Has my hon. friend decided to recommend the establishment of a branch post office in St. James division, the eastern part of the city ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am not sufficiently familiar with the geography of Montreal, with the names of the wards and streets, to be able to speak upon that question with any degree of satisfaction to myself. I do remember that a decision was come to, to recommend the acquisition of a location for an office near the station. But I cannot say about these other points.

Mr. BERGERON. Perhaps I may be able to help my hon. friend's memory by reminding him of the fact that the member for St. James division, Montreal (Mr. Gervais), some time ago made a demand upon the hon. gentleman for the esablishment of a branch post office in the eastern part of Montreal, a great commercial division. If my hon. friend has not decided to recommend it, I do not know how the Minister of Public Works could ask parliament for an appropriation for that purpose. The Minister of Public Works will not ask any money from parliament to build a branch post office in that part of the city unless the hon. gentleman asks for it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If the hon. gentleman will look into the estimates he will see that there was an appropriation. Whatever was in the estimates was put there in accordance with the views of the department. I have not got the estimates of last year.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, the Minister of Public Works would not build a post office

anywhere without having first been advised by the Postmaster General.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I presume not.

Mr. BERGERON. Then the hon. gentleman must remember whether he has advised the erection of a branch in St. James division.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If I had advised it, I would not hesitate to tell my hon. friend exactly. I am very anxious to improve the service at Montreal; it has been the subject of investigation and inquiry. I think the views of the department have been presented to the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. BERGERON. Does my hon. friend remember receiving a letter about it from the member for St. James division? That might help him to remember.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Do not ask me to talk about letters that I have not here.

Mr. BERGERON. Could not the hon. gentleman find out whether he did get a letter from the member for St. James division?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If I had, I might not think it proper to divulge the letter.

Mr. BERGERON. It was published in the papers.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Then my hon. friend has seen it?

Mr. BERGERON. Certainly; and I am surprised the Postmaster General has not seen it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If he sent me a letter, I suppose I received it.

Mr. BERGERON. Now, we are coming to the point. I want to know from my hon. friend if he has decided to recommend the building of a branch post office in that part of Montreal. Since he says himself that in the estimates of the Minister of Public Works there will be an amount of money—

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I did not speak of the future; I said there had been a provision in the estimates of last session for giving additional facilities in Montreal.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General if he intends to place an amount in the estimates for improving the service in Brantford? Brantford is receiving at present a little over $5,000 per annum, whereas Kingston, giving a revenue about the same as Brantford, is receiving over $18,000 per annum. We think the facilities there are not what they should be, that the building is inadequate, and the whole service needs reorganization. The board of trade has pressed for that for several years, and I think they have communicated with the minister with reference to it. We would esteem it an act of justice if the minister would place an additional amount in the estimates for Brantford, making a more liberal allowance to the men employed there all round. I think they are underpaid. The letter-carriers are fairly well paid, I do not think they are complaining; but the general administration of the office is not very satisfactory to the business men. They pressed that point upon the minister last year, and I think it was investigated, but very little has been done. There has been a coat of paint applied to the outside of the building and some slight reorganization inside. But the building is not adequate for the purposes of the Post Office, the Inland Revenue and the Customs Departments, for which it is now used. We think it is not in keeping with the position of Brantford commercially. It may have been adequate twenty-five years ago, when the revenue derived from the post office was about one-third what it is to-day. I would like to ask the minister if anything is going to be done about it?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. With regard to the first part of my hon. friend's question as to whether there is to be an additional building, I cannot anticipate the estimates that are to be brought down. As to whether there is sufficient money expended upon the staff, or whether the service itself could be improved, those are departmental matters with which I am bound to deal. We have what is called a superintendent of city post offices, whose duty it is to keep himself advised of the conditions of city post offices and to report. If that officer should report that it was necessary to make any changes in the management and the business of the Brantford post office, the department would be very much influenced by his advice, and would endeavour to give effect to it. I am not aware that he has made any report or recommendation that has not been attended to.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. There is this important point, that while Brantford receives an expenditure of only $5,147, Kingston receives $18,978, and the revenue of the two offices is about the same; if there is any difference it is in favour of Brantford. We think the expenditure is altogether out of proportion to the revenue which the office returns to the department. Either we are getting a great deal too little, or Kingston is getting too much.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think my hon. friend has made a mistake in his figures when he says that Brantford is only receiving $5,147. That sum represents only the salaries of the letter-carriers. There is paid in salaries to the staff $6,829; altogether over $12,000 a year is paid to the Brantford staff, inside and outside.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend beside me is through with that other business, I want to ask the hon. Postmaster General a question on another point. That is in refer-

ence to rural delivery. Has the hon. minister come to any conclusion in reference to the introduction of that system ? It strikes me that at one time he had the idea that rural delivery might be experimentally tried in some sections of Canada. Does he hold that opinion now, or has he any intention of making any experiment in that way ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not think I ever expressed myself in favour of even making the experiment.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I expressed myself in favour of properly and thoroughly investigating the system, its merits and demerits, and I have come to the conclusion that it is altogether premature to talk of rural delivery in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. The reason being the sparseness of the population ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The conditions of Canada would not warrant it. It would involve this country in millions upon millions of dollars of expense. I think the prevailing opinion amongst the people of the United States is that they have established a system that in the course of time will be a burden upon them as great as the pension system, and I know that many of them would gladly recede from the system if they could, but it is too late. The United States congress four or five years ago voted $3,000,000 a year for this system. The vote went up to $6,000,000, then to $12,000,000, and now it is $20,000,000 a year, and they have not got beyond the fringe of the service yet.

Mr. FOSTER. This, I believe, is a point the hon. gentleman has looked into. To what extent is it applied in the United States ? Is it applied to certain portions of the country ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. They have certain regulations. They pretend to confine it to places where the roads are good and where there is a certain number of people per mile, but those who are living in less favoured places are not content with these regulations, and the regulations are not strong enough to bind the public and politicians. So, they are face to face with the question now as to whether they will have to apply it everywhere throughout the whole United States.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. minister is wise in his conclusion that we are not yet quite in a position in Canada to adopt that system. I quite agree with him in that respect. Another point is as to the increase of rates of certain classes of mail matter, since last session, or was it before last session that this increase took place ? It is greatly complained of, and it is said that it has made burdensome the transmission of certain articles, take books, for instance, commercial documents, and the like of that; that it has made it almost impossible to transmit them by mail at any kind of reasonable cost. Sometimes the cost of the postage is equivalent to the cost of the book itself that is sent. I think the hon. minister has power under the law to make these changes to a certain extent in the revenues that he collects, or in the taxes he puts upon certain articles. I would like to know what were the increases made and upon what classes of material and whether the hon. minister is satisfied that he did a wise thing, and did not overburden certain classes of transmitted articles.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There are a number of different rates chargeable to different kinds of mail matter. My hon. friend will not perhaps ask me to define the different articles, but I will just by way of illustration say that there would be one rate for a lithograph and another rate for a printed picture, and there were fine distinctions as to whether a bit of mail matter came under one rate or another. It was found perfectly impracticable to apply such fine discriminations in the practical working of a post office. Mail matter is brought in at a late hour and the staff cannot open the packages to see that they are properly prepaid. They had to have a practical scheme, and accordingly we endeavoured to reduce the classification. There is the letter rate, the newspaper rate, the parcel post rate, and the rate on miscellaneous articles.

Mr. FOSTER. That is one of the classes on which the raise took place.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend is not correct in describing it as a raise. This was discussed ad nauseam last session. When the Deputy Postmaster General was here last session, I remember asking him the question, and he told me that whilst they had grouped all of the miscellaneous articles into one class, it did not amount to a raise generally, although you might pick out an isolated item and say that there was a raise in respect to that one item, for example, as regards books. The rate on books in Canada is as low as it is in Great Britain, or the United States, or, I fancy, anywhere in the world.

Mr. BERGERON. In his last answer, the hon. Postmaster General spoke about a sum of money that had been voted last session for a site in Montreal. I find in the estimates the following items :

Montreal post office—improvements, $25,000.
Montreal post office—installation of pneumatic tube system for post office purposes, $55,000.
Montreal new postal station—site and building, $75,000.

Will my hon. friend tell me in what part of Montreal this site is, or where this post office will be situated ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think that is intended for the postal station, in the vicinity of Bonaventure station.

Mr. BERGERON. And the amount of $55,000 for the pneumatic tube system is entirely for that system and not for a building ? They are two different things ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. And the site of this new postal station will be near the Bonaventure station, of which my hon. friend spoke a few moments ago. Do I understand that ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I have said so, so many times that I did not think it necessary to repeat it. That item is to supply a postal station and plant in the vicinity of the railway station.

Mr. BERGERON. So it has nothing at all to do with any post office branch in St. James division or any other part of the city of Montreal ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is the hon. Postmaster General taking steps to have the post offices in the Northwest Territories opened up as settlement goes on from place to place ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, I think so.

Indians, Ontario and Quebec—relief, medical attendance and medicines, Quebec, $5,600.

Mr. FOSTER. Before going into that, I may say that in looking over the Auditor General's Report I find that the First Minister in some way fell into error in reference to the promotion of Mr. Bray to a chief clerkship. The reason given for the promotion was that when a deserving clerk in a class below had come to the maximum of his class and was a good clerk and there was no vacancy it was then legitimate to create a clerkship in the class above and translate him by promotion to that class. The right hon. gentleman's whole contention was on the ground that Mr. Bray had several years, and there are also two clerks but I find from the report that he had not reached the maximum, that he got last year only $1,650 and that the only person who has reached the maximum in that class was Mr. McGirr, who is at his maximum and has been at his maximum for several years, and there are also two clerks who are as high as or higher than Mr. Bray in point of salary, Mr. Dalton and Mr. Orr. This requires some explanation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall give the information to my hon. friend at the next sitting.

Mr. FOSTER. Coming to the item, is that relief administered on the same principle as when I was in the House before?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not aware that there is any change at all; it is given for actual medicines and for medical services. I shall read the explanation.

The Indians in the province of Quebec have with a few exceptions no funds of their own, and it has always been found necessary to provide funds for relief of destitute and for seed and medical attendance. Assistance in the way of relief is only extended to such Indians as are shown to be in actual need of the necessaries of life through sickness or some other unavoidable cause. Seed is only supplied to such Indians as have land ready for cultivation and who are unable to procure seed themselves, and it is supplied as near seeding time as possible. The cost of medical attendance is gradually increasing. It seems that not only in this province but in all, the cost of this service increases with the advance of civilization.

The amount provided for the year 1903-4 was $5,600.

The expenditure was $4,153.17.

Annual salaries are paid from this grant to the undermentioned physicians :

Dr. Jules Constantine, Pointe Bleue	$500 00
J. A. Claveau, M.D., Chicoutimi	200 00
J. A. Pelletier, M.D., St. Urbain	50 00
W. Ouimet, M.D., Oka	100 00
F. W. McCartney, M.D., Gaspe	80 00
E. Allard, M.D., Escoumains	200 00
L. G. Pinault, M.D., Restigouche	200 00

Other physicians are paid according to the attendance given from time to time. A portion of the cost of maintenance of Indian patients in the provincial lunatic asylums in Quebec is also paid from this vote.

Mr. FOSTER. How are the supplies that are given out in small quantities to the Indians purchased ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Through the agents on the reserves.

Mr. FOSTER. There seems to be a distinction between medical officers and the attendance of doctors. Have you some medical officers entirely devoted to the work of the Indians?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that on some of the reserves there are regularly attending physicians at yearly salaries and the others are simply called in for attendance and paid by fees. They send in their bills for services rendered and are paid.

Indians, Ontario—relief, medical attendance and medicine, $3,300.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The attendance in Ontario is of very much the same character. I shall give it in detail as I have it here.

This grant is intended for the assistance of sick and destitute Indians belonging to bands in the province of Ontario which have no funds in the hands of the department. The fixed charges against this grant are :—

Dr. J. W. McIntosh, Manitoulin Islands and North Shore	$184 00
(The balance of Dr. McIntosh's salary of $1,000 is paid by the band.)	
Dr. J. H. Arthur, Spanish River	75 00
(The balance of Dr. Arthur's salary of $600 is paid by the band.)	

Dr. F. H. Mitchell, Oneida Reserve.. ..$300 00
Dr. J. F. James, Munsee Reserve.. .. .. 60 00
Dr. J. W. Merrill, Pogomasing and White River.. .. .. 100 00
Dr. E. Bedard, Mattawa.. .. .. 200 00
Dr. Channonhouse, Golden Lake.. .. .. 200 00
Dr. J. M. Grady, Fort William.. .. .. .. 50 00
(The band pays $75 additional.)

I observe from the report that each year the demand for relief is increasing in the unorganized districts of the province.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it too late to inquire the name of the physician at the Caughnawaga reserve?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no regular physician for this reserve. The Indians pay their own fees for the services rendered, and the account is sent here and paid.

Mr. BERGERON. There is no regular physician.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in understanding that this is all that is paid out for medical attendance and medicine for Indians in the various provinces. I see you have Quebec, $5,000 and Ontario $3,300. Are no other salaries or payments made to medical men for attending Indians?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am giving the names of all the men who have been appointed to receive yearly salaries for attending the Indians. If there are reserves which have no regular physicians, and where the services of a physician are required, he is sent for, and his account is paid; but everything is paid out of this appropriation.

Indians—blankets and clothing, Ontario and Quebec, $500.

Mr. BERGERON. Where are these bought and from whom?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They are bought by tender. Last year they were furnished by Horn Bros., of Lindsay.

Indian Schools—Maritime Provinces. Ontario and Quebec, $49,230.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is the same vote as usual.

Mr. FOSTER. Are the schools being satisfactorily carried on? What are the results from year to year?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know how far we claim to have made progress in the education of the Indians, but I do not know that any retrogression has taken place either. The Indian, as my hon. friend knows, is rather refractory in regard to education. I understand from the department that the condition of things is about the same from year to year.

Mr. BERGERON. How many schools are at Caughnawaga?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The number of schools in the province of Quebec is 17, the number of pupils on the roll 795 and the average attendance 377. At Caughnawaga there are two Roman Catholic schools, each with a boys' division and a girls' division, and one Methodist school, at Lorette 1, at Becancour 1, at Oka Village and country 2, at Restigouche River 1, at Temiscaming 1, at Lake St. John 1, at Maria 1, at Maniwaki 1, at Lake St. Francis 2, at Betsiamits 1, and at St. Regis 2.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the school population from year to year increasing, diminishing, or keeping about stationary? Also, is the attendance compulsory? If we provide the school and the teacher, there ought to be means taken to see that the greatest benefit is got out of it for all the children.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that there is not much progress in that direction. The attendance is about stationary. There are compulsory clauses which the government may enforce, but whether that is done or not, I do not know.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the minister say what are the general effects of the schooling on the children? Do they still remain Indians, with all their desires, or do they get any higher ideals from going to these schools?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. On that point I cannot speak for the department; I speak from my own information. I am afraid we cannot have very much hope in that respect. Some years ago, at the time the Indians had a vote, I remember being in the province of Ontario, in a riding where there was a large Indian reserve, on which there were about seventy families of the Five Nations who were still pagans, who spoke their own language, and absolutely refused to be taught English. In the province of Quebec, so far as I have been able to see, the Indians at Lorette and Caughnawaga, Lorette especially, they are slowly improving. But they still live in tribes and pursue their own industries of fishing, hunting, and manufacturing certain Indian curiosities. Some of them, however, are educated, even liberally educated, and have joined the professions. Some have gone into the ministry. But speaking generally, I am afraid we cannot claim that we have trained the red man to the standard that we would like.

Mr. FOSTER. I acknowledge that it is a somewhat hopeless and despondent task; but I suppose we are obliged to do all we possibly can to put these advantages before them. What are these children taught? After they get through, are they able to read and write and do arithmetic, and thus somewhat fitted for business? Do they carry away anything with them in the shape of learning, and do they apply any of their knowledge to mechanical work in the schools?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My information from the department is that at the

day schools they are taught simply the primaries which are taught to white children. As regards results, if I can give personal experience, a large deputation last year from the Oka Indians waited on me. One of them was certainly a very well read man. He had a bundle of papers to show his titles and was well versed in the history of his tribe from the early concessions of the French kings down to the present. He could read and write very well. I believe that in the Ottawa and Quebec tribes the knowledge of reading and writing is pretty well distributed, but whether they apply that knowledge to the arts of life and to bettering their circumstances, I am unable to say.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the department know from its experience whether, as a result of a generation of education, the Indians who have grown up in these schools really do any amount of general reading?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They are large readers of the periodicals and the daily press.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, January 27, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

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

That Mr. Augustin Bourbonnais be transferred from the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills to the Committee on Standing Orders.

That Mr. L. P. Demers be transferred from the Committee on Standing Orders to the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

That Mr. Thomas Greenway be transferred from the Committee on Banking and Commerce to the Committee on Agriculture.

That Mr. Hugh Guthrie be transferred from the Committee on Agriculture to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Motion agreed to.

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he will tell the House whether there are any and substantial changes in the instructions of the new Governor General—changes from the ordinary instructions ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not aware of any.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY SURVEYS.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) whether he has any information which can be communicated to the House with reference to the Grand Trunk Pacific surveys of the route between Quebec and Moncton ? I noticed in the papers some semi-authoritative statements as to what had been found as a result of these surveys, and in some cases the statements were definite. If there is any information that the House could have, I would like very much to get it. If he has not got it at his hand, would he just intimate whether, in answer to a request of an order of the House, there are any papers that he could bring down at present with reference to those surveys ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). I may say in reply to my hon. friend that there are no reports in the Department of Railways and Canals with respect to the surveys. The Act provides, if I remember correctly, for reports to be furnished annually by the Commissioners to the Department of Railways and Canals. The surveys already made, as I understand, are preliminary. I know there has been no report from the construction commission to the Department of Railways and Canals with respect to these surveys. There is no information in the department which I could bring down to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Do I understand the minister to say that the procedure would be something like this : That those engineering parties, through their chief, would report to the commission, and that the commission would then include these in their annual report ? Does the minister mean to say that parliament should sit here and not have the benefit of the results of those engineers' reports until they came a year afterwards through the medium of the commission ? Surely my hon. friend will not contend that we are to sit here and wait eighteen months for reports to be digested, or pigeon-holed, or whatever is done with them, by the commission, whilst we, representing the country, are kept without the information. Surely that cannot be the course of procedure which will be followed.

Mr. EMMERSON. I suppose my hon. friend will have to exercise the same patience that I will have to exercise until those reports are given to the Department of Railways and Canals according to law. Then, of course, the department will be in a position to furnish the information. It is a question of the construction of the law. My hon. friend can refer to it for himself.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, what department is the commission under ?

Surely we have a right to the reports made to the commission, if they are completed; and there is no necessity for us to wait until the commission reports to the Minister of Railways and Canals. Under what department is that commission?

Mr. EMMERSON. I presume that the commission would be associated with the Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. FOSTER. How intimate would the association be?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not particularly under that department; it is a body by itself, an independent body, under the provisions of the Act which created it.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, perhaps we are not in a position to discuss the matter under this order——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. But if the rendering of the Minister of Railways and Canals is correct on that point, something will have to be done by the House, because I do not imagine that members on either side of the House would be willing to wait a year and a half for the commission to digest the information, when they want it themselves.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I suppose my hon. friend will wait, at all events, until there are reports of that survey made by the parties who are in the field. They will report to the commission, and the commission will have to report to the Railway Department. The discussion is premature now, and it may be renewed some time later.

Mr. MACLEAN. Perhaps the right hon. Prime Minister will bring down the Order in Council creating the commission and let us see it. There may be some information in it as to which department the commission belongs.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, there is no necessity for that, because the commission has been created under statute and not under Order in Council.

Mr. SPROULE. This report should be given to the public and communicated to parliament. It was given to the public through the press some time ago.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I think I noticed the report in the Toronto 'Globe,' and that is evidently the government organ we may assume that it is correct. If the report is available for the press it should be available for parliament.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What my hon. friend saw in the 'Globe' was only a rumour. There has been no report in the press.

Mr. SPROULE. Then it is only a rumour?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Sometimes there are rumours in the press and sometimes there are facts.

Mr. HAGGART. Have there been any reports from the surveyors to the commission in which there was a statement, approved or otherwise, as to the location?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I assume, and probably with some degree of certainty, that there may have been interim reports, but so far as my knowledge goes there has been no final report.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply,

Indians—schools, Maritime Provinces, Ontario and Quebec, $49,230.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Mr. Chairman, may I have the privilege of addressing you for a few moments in connection with the matter of grants to Indian schools? My right hon. friend the First Minister had the goodness to refer to me yesterday as an authority upon educational matters in connection with the young Indians. My information is perhaps obtained from sources that are as reliable as any that can be furnished, and I desire to submit a few observations in connection with the grants to Indian schools from the experience I have had in meeting the Six Nation Indians particularly for many years past. I may say that the Mohawk institution, that figures, I think, the fourth in the list of grants, is an institution with which I have had a good deal of familiarity and it is in reference to that particularly that I wish to speak. I may say that the grants that have been made from time to time to that institution have, I believe, for the most part, been very well expended. If I were sure that all the grants to all the Indian schools were of the same nature as that I should have no hesitation whatever in saying that it was well expended money. The question was asked, and my right hon. friend referred to me yesterday, in reference to what the effect was upon the rising generation of Indians. I may say that the effect has been for the most part very good indeed. It is perhaps not generally known that the county of Brant contains the largest reservation that exists in North America, that is in point of population, the population being upwards of 4,000. Contact with civilization has not acted as was generally expected it would in the destruction of the race. The race is actually upon the increase. I know from last year's report that it has increased some 63 in numbers. This fact then leads to an observation as to what is the ultimate destiny of our Indian race so far as the Six Nation Indians are concerned. I believe their destiny is not extinction but absorption, that they will ultimately be absorbed into the peoples of this country and become consolidated as a Canadian race. The white blood has now been

so infused into the race that there are comparatively few of pure blood there. This may appear to be surprising, but it is nevertheless the fact and we have to face the facts as they are. The race is likely to be absorbed among the population of Canada. Within probably three or five generations this change at the rate at which it is going on now, will have been completed. The question has been raised: Is the money being well expended which is devoted to the education of Indians? I think I may say it has been well expended at the Mohawk institution. The grant that is made at present is some $60 per head for 91 pupils, although I see that they did not obtain last year the total of that grant for reasons that I cannot explain. They obtained from $4,700 to $4,900. I find that it is stated as $4,700 in one report and $4,900 in another, whereas they were entitled to some $5,400. This grant has been made for perhaps ten years or in the neighbourhood of ten years. It was first made when Mr. Dewdney was in charge of the department, and I think I had the honour of seeing him in connection with the grant at that time. It has been continued ever since and young Indians have been turned out from that institution who are filling many honourable positions in the land. Residents of the city of Toronto well know that one of the most distinguished residents of Toronto was a former resident of the Six Nation reserve. He has obtained a salary which is not less than that of the First Minister sitting in this House and is at the head of one of the greatest financial institutions of this country. He is a former pupil of this institution. I would refer also to the fact that in the days of Sir John Macdonald, it was his custom to occasionally introduce into the Department of the Interior and the Indian service, graduates of note from the Six Nation reserve and there is one young lady still in the department. I would suggest to my right hon. friend that it would be wise to continue that custom introduced in the time of Sir John Macdonald. It furnishes an incentive to the young men of the Six Nations to make great efforts and I think that it is one of the object lessons that should be set before them. These are positions that they can fill and I think they are entitled to feel there are positions that they can occupy in this country. It should be remembered in discussing this question that the grants that are given to the Six Nations are largely taken out of their own moneys, that they are not a charge upon the country. These grants are derived largely from their own interest money and the Six Nation Indians are not a charge upon the people of the country. I know not whether they are considered constituents of my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) or of myself, but they are residents of the county of Brant, they are upwards of 4.000 in number and in the year 1887 my hon. friend the Minister of Customs and myself had the honour of polling the first Indian vote ever polled for a white man in North America. This vote was fairly evenly divided. I think the disfranchising of the Indians was a step in the wrong direction, inasmuch as I believe the Indians of the Six Nations are advanced by conferring upon them the responsibilities of citizenship. They were enfranchised in 1885, I think, by Sir John Macdonald, and up to the year 1896 or 1897 they had the privilege of voting in Dominion elections. That has been discontinued owing to the provincial lists becoming operative and they are not qualified to vote in provincial matters. I believe the advantage of voting to the race was considerable.

I believe that right should be again conferred, although I am not in a position to ask for that to-day. I say that our ideal should be the absorption of these tribes by the people of the country. With that end in view, I think I may well say that they will become a credit to this country and that the money we are expending on them is well expended. Probably no nation on the face of the earth has advanced more rapidly than the Six Nations of Brant county have done during the last century and a half. It is only a century and a half since they were a barbarous race; to-day many of them occupy well tilled farms and are in comfortable circumstances, and many of them are capable of discharging duties in high stations. That is a fact to which I can vouch from my own observation. We have had no less than eight of these Indians in our own domestic service in fifteen years, and they have all acquitted themselves satisfactorily. If my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will inquire in the department, he will find that there is a young Indian lady there who for the past fifteen years has acquitted herself creditably and is to-day drawing a considerable salary for efficient work. That is only a sample of what can be done and is being done through the instruction which is being obtained in the Mohawk institution. I may say that the training given at that institution is technical and manual as well as educational, and this, I think, should be the basis of all instruction to the Indians; that is, they should be taught to work. We know that in former days, even in my earlier days, the redman's burden was carried by the Indian woman. To-day that condition has disappeared. This shows the advance of civilization among them. The only way to assist the Indians to advance to first-class civilization is to teach them to work.

The Iroquois, or Six Nations, are probably the most advanced tribe on the North American continent to-day, and their advancement is largely due to the work of the industrial school near the confines of the city of Brantford. That institution is maintained largely by the New England Com-

pany, of London, England, a charitable institution, and not the government, nor is it aided largely by public moneys. During this past year the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Stamford, a commissioner of the company, visited that institution, and also investigated the schools on the Six Nations reserve. He went to Lytton, in British Columbia, also where the company has established an institution. As I said, these schools are almost entirely maintained as charities by the New England Company, and the government grant is a small proportion of the money expended on them. That being the case, I trust that when a further grant is asked, as I think it will be at an early day, for the purpose of furnishing fire protection for the new institution, my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will view that application favourably, and that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) will join with me in pressing the necessity of a grant towards this crying need of this institution. You will remember that it was burned down eighteen months ago. The buildings, which were totally destroyed, have been replaced with the insurance money, but fire protection is still required. Water mains are being laid by the city of Brantford into the country, and it is expected that it will cost $8,000 to provide the fire protection. The New England Company have applied to the department for $3,000 towards this expense, and I would be very glad if my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) could see his way to granting that request. The lives of the children would be in danger in the event of a fire under present conditions. I trust that when this matter comes up for consideration it will not be viewed from any party standpoint, as the remarks I am making are not made in any factious spirit or with a desire to unduly criticise; my desire is to point out the fact that the institution is worthy of the grant it is now getting, and should also receive a further grant of $3,000 towards fire protection. That grant would be appreciated not only by the Mohawk Institute but also by the Six Nations, who are a large part, probably 10 per cent, of the population of Brant.

The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) yesterday referred to pagan rites on this reserve. I am free to admit that they are still practised, but to a very small extent. My hon. friend says he saw them when he was there. I admit that the practice still exists, but not 10 per cent of the Six Nations or Iroquois are to-day pagans; I think less than 300 out of 4,000. It is true that the white dog is occasionally sacrificed and that the green corn dance takes place, but the occurrence of these rites is due to the white man rather than the Indian. The Indians cater for the audience that applies for the ancient rites, and if our intelligent white men would cease to demand this kind of entertainment these rites would cease. I am not blaming the Canadians particularly, as I believe that the British visitors are more to blame than the Canadians. They pass the Church of England, the Presbyterian Church, the Methodist Church and the Roman Catholic Church and drive to the long house, in order that they may see these rites performed, as they are something they have never seen before. That causes the Six Nations to continue the rites although they have long ceased to have any meaning. Of the 4,000 Indians in the county, a large majority are professing Christianity. I trust that when my hon. friend visits the reserve he will visit some of the other schools and churches; there he will not see war paint, but men seated and in their right minds, worshipping God in the same way as we all worship Him. The Indians are, of course, largely of the Church of England, and come under the heading, as I do myself, of miserable sinners. The Mohawk church is attended by the pupils of the Mohawk institute, 125 or 130 in number, and there is also a white congregation of six or eight, of which I am generally one when I am at home. I hear them every Sabbath, and I may say for the benefit of gentlemen on both sides of the House, that whenever they are in Brantford, if they attend service at this church, they will hear a service of which they may be proud, and will feel satisfied that the little grant made by the government of Canada towards the institution and the Mohawk church is well expended. I may say as a matter of information that the King of England during the past year has granted to the Mohawk church the privilege of being known as His Majesty's Chapel of the Mohawks. That is a privilege which the Mohawks enjoyed in the old days in the United States, and they were promised when they came into the Grand River valley that they would have the same privilege there, but it was only in the past year, through the Earl of Stamford and the late Governor General, Lord Minto, that application was made to the King for this privilege, which he has been graciously pleased to grant. This house of God, in which these pupils of the Mohawk Institute worship, is maintained by the New England Company, and the incumbent of the church is also the superintendent of the school. I think that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) will agree with me that the affairs of that institution, under the management of the New England Company—because, as I have said, it is not a government institution—have been well and faithfully administered for upwards of seventy-five years. The church and institute have been a great boon for the Six Nations, and it is through their influence that the Six Nations, although they were first in war in the old days, are to-day first of the native Indian tribes in the arts of civilization and peace. That is the reputation which this

nation to-day enjoys, and I trust that this item, which refers to the grant to the Mohawk Institute will be increased. I thank the hon. gentleman for the opportunity which he has given me of making these few remarks in connection with an institution in which I take a deep interest.

Salaries of chiefs, Cape Croker and Gibson and Agent Oka, $150.

Mr. BERGERON. Are the troubles at Oka between the Indians and the seminary now over?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say that the trouble is not over, but I am not without hope that it may be got over. We have lately had correspondence upon this subject, and there has been an agreement, not completed, but in the way of completion, to have the rights which are claimed by the Indians and disputed by the seminary, as to the land in question, referred to the Privy Council. Counsel have been empjoyed on both sides, in order to have the question submitted in the proper way for a judicial decision. I may say, speaking not officially, but on behalf of the department, that the government have agreed to this, and intend to ask for an appropriation from parliament to cover the expenses of the Indians.

Mr. BERGERON. What has become of the arrangements which were made between the government of Canada and the Indians of Oka, in 1882, I believe, by which the Indians were to surrender their rights on condition of the seminary buying a piece of land for them in the township of Gibson in Ontario?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. A piece of land was bought in the township of Gibson, on the Georgian bay, but there was never any official agreement between the Indians and the seminary in regard to it. A good many Indians left the reserve at Oka and went to Gibson to settle, but I understand that the greater part of them came back to Oka again. The Indians are under the impression that they have an absolute title to the land, that the grant made by the King of France to the seminary did not deprive them of any of their rights. This is disputed by the seminary, and until we can have a judicial determination of the question, it is impossible to expect that there will be peace in the locality. Every one of the Indians is absolutely convinced that the seminary are trespassers, and that they are the true owners of the soil. We have asked them to agree to submit the matter to the judicial decision of the Privy Council, and I understand that they are willing to do so. The seminary are also ready to have the question of their title submitted to the courts.

Mr. BERGERON. Was not the sum of $16,000 paid to purchase the property which was to be substituted for the Oka reserve? What is to become of that money?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The seminary agreed to pay and did pay $16,000 for the township of Gibson; but two years ago the money was returned to the seminary except the part which is actually held by Indians.

Mr. BERGERON. How is it that we are paying salaries to these Oka Indian chiefs? I do not see any such payments made to the chiefs of other reserves.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Most of the bands have funds of their own; but the Oka Indians have no money of their own, and therefore we pay $50 to the chief of the band at Gibson, also $50 to two other chiefs.

Ontario and Quebec—survey of Indian reserves, $500.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that a yearly business?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This grant of $500 has been voted for several years, and it is intended chiefly to pay the cost of subdividing some reserves and re-surveying the lines of old reserves where the lines have become obliterated. This is in cases only where the Indians have no funds of their own. Last year the expenditure was as follows:

A. E. Hanson—Expenditure on Canvose and York county surveys, N.B.	$155 78
Dominion Express Company—Express charges on plan of Bury	0 35
W. A. Hendry—Services and Expenses surveying Indian reserve, Shubenacadie, N.S.	19 00
H. W. Andrews—Making plan of Indian reserve, Head Ship Harbour, Great Lake	2 25
Deputy Minister of Lands and Mines and Irving R. Todd—Running lines Indian reserve, Seven Islands	300 61
Irving R. Todd—Running lines Indian reserve, Vanceboro, N.B.	14 15
Canadian Express Company—Express charges on map	0 25
J. K. Eaton—Sub-dividing 40-acre wood lot, Colchester county, N.S.	35 00
J. H. Honde—On account of survey Reserve Abenakis, St. Francis	200 00
	$727 39

Mr. SPROULE. Is any of that money used for surveys on the Indian islands in the Georgian bay?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, all that expenditure is over now. I understand that the surveys there are all done.

Indian land management fund, $14,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this the vote from which some of the salaries of the chiefs are taken?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, this item is to assist the Indian land management fund under terms of the Order in Council of July 1, 1893.

Mr. FOSTER. How long will it be before this ceases ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Fifteen years more.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the fund will be completed ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Grant for Agriculture Society, Munceys of the Thames, $90.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is an old grant, in existence about fifteen years. These people organized a very creditable agricultural society and have gone to considerable trouble and expense year after year. It has been of great benefit to the farming interest of the reserve.

Erection of lockup at St. Regis, $500.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It has been the policy of the department for a number of years to have a lockup at St. Regis, but the intention could not be carried out owing to some local trouble. The department had rather serious trouble with the St. Regis Indians the last few years. Peace however is now restored, and there is no difficulty in the way of having this lockup erected. Its erection is recommended by the agent.

Mr. BERGERON. Will $500 cover the whole cost ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. You had the same vote last year and there is nothing to indicate that this is a revote. Where items are revotes, that ought to be shown, so that we would know the money was voted before and not expended.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is perfectly right. This is a revote and nothing has been expended of it yet.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there any report of what took place in Caughnawaga when some detectives from Montreal seized liquor there. The liquor was found in a few houses but we have heard nothing about the matter yet.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It was reported that liquor was being illegally sold there and we organized a raid. I am sorry to say that our raid could not be called a success. We succeeded only in getting one case.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it intended to continue the work ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly.

General legal expenses, $3,500.

Mr. FOSTER. Who was the Attorney in the Buckshot case ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Lemieux.

Mr. FOSTER. And in the Six Nation reserve cases at Brantford ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Lewis Heyd.

House of Commons salaries, $77,550.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an increase here of $2,200. How is that accounted for ?

Mr. SPEAKER. There are thirty-five clerks, regular increment $1,850 ; the new appointment of Mr. Paradis in place of Mr. Polette, deceased, $1,200 ; Mr. Norbert, appointed in place of Mr. Scott, retired, $800 ; Mr. Patry, in post office, $700, making a total increase of $4,550, from which have to be deducted the salary of Mr. Polette, deceased, $1,100, and that of Mr. Scott, retired, $1,250, making a net increase of $2,200.

Mr. WHITE. There is a reduction of one clerk in the chief's branch. Has that officer been retired or has he been transferred to some other branch ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Retired.

Mr. WHITE. There has been a change in the translation branch of one second-class clerk. Was there a recommendation from the chief of the department, the Clerk of the House, for the appointment of the additional clerk ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. How many employees of the House are there ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Seventy-four. The list is given on page 29.

Mr. BERGERON. Does that include the sessional as well as the permanent employees ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, both.

Mr. BERGERON. Perhaps I shall be in order if I call Mr. Speaker's attention to a point not concerning salaries. I would like to know if rooms cannot be afforded for the accommodation of some of the old members of the opposition. I think I shall assist Mr. Speaker in meeting the existing difficulty by mentioning the matter here. There are a good many rooms in this building, and, perhaps, His Honour the Speaker, using a little authority, might place at least a few rooms at our disposal where we could carry on our work. I need hardly say, Mr. Chairman, that it is impossible for us to work under present conditions. During the sitting of the House we have to occupy ourselves with what goes on in this chamber, and when the House is not sitting we have no place to work. If a spare room cannot be found somewhere, I think it would be the part of grandeur d'âme for hon. members on the right of the Speaker to help us to obtain rooms where we could work.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is a matter that I have taken up within the last few days, but for the present, it does not seem possible to hold out much hope of complying with

the hon. gentleman's request. Even a number of the permanent officials are in quarters outside this building at this time. Until some increase in the number of rooms is secured, it will be difficult to afford the accommodation desired. However, we are looking into the matter, and some remedy may be found.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Perhaps Mr. Speaker would interview the Minister of Public Works and see if some enlargement of this building is not possible. Possibly putting on another story might meet the difficulty.

House of Commons—expenses of Commons—extra sessional clerks, &c., $25,780.

Mr. WHITE. What is the rate of pay to sessional clerks ? Is it $4 a day uniformly ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, that is the uniform rate.

Mr. WHITE. On looking over the last report of the Auditor General that is in our possession, I find that some sessional clerks were paid a less sum for part of the session —$2.50 per day, or $3.50 a day for part of the session and $4 a day for the remainder.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rate was changed during the session.

Mr. WHITE. That would hardly apply to all, because in some instances $4 a day is paid for the whole session. But, as I understand it, the intention is to make it $4 a day uniform.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, they are being paid at that rate now.

Mr. WHITE. There are two additional clerks provided for, outside of the twenty-eight permanent sessional clerks. These two, I presume, are the clerks in the whips' rooms ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Are they paid at the same rate as the others, $4 a day ?

Mr. SPEAKER. They are paid at the same rate, as I understand.

Mr. WHITE. I suppose the translation is paid for in the usual manner, by the page?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, in the same manner as heretofore.

House of Commons—contingencies, $26,460.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is an increase of $100 for expresses between the House and the government printing office. This is necessary owing to the additional work.

House of Commons—publication of debates, $60,000.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not think that the French version of 'Hansard' has been published yet. It had not been published a short time ago. The English 'Hansard' came out shortly before the beginning of the session. I called the attention of the Speaker to the fact. This work should be published as soon as possible.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is probable that the delay is due to the increased work thrown upon the Printing Bureau by the elections. Such a delay would not occur during an ordinary year.

House of Commons—estimate of the Sergeant at Arms, $50,055.

Mr. SPEAKER. I see there is a provision here of $800 for a Speaker's steward. Is that a new appointment ?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not exactly a new appointment, it is largely a change of title. The man was transferred from a similar position here and is doing a like work as before ; but under a resolution of the Internal Economy Committee of last year, he is assigned a special duty and given that title.

Mr. WHITE. Then I find there has been an addition to the staff of three permanent messengers, an increase from eight to eleven, including Mr. George, who is the Speaker's steward. What necessity was there for an increase of nearly 50 per cent in the permanent staff of messengers?

Mr. SPEAKER. This statement will explain the matter:

Increases to 4 on messenger staff—Connolly $50, T. Stewart $30, C. R. Stewart $50, and Boutet $60..	170 00
Lalonde appointed permanent messenger to fill place of C. George appointed Speaker's steward..	550 00
Two permanent messengers—one to take the place of Patry transferred to the clerk's department, and the other to take the place of Asselin appointed to the post office, 2 at $500 each..	1,000 00
One assistant house carpenter, formerly paid by Department of Public Works	700 00

Mr. WHITE. That is another vote altogether. There are at least three additional.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is all that is included in this vote.

Items increased—		
Pages $30, servants $162.50, permanent charwomen $1,095, sessional charwomen $575..	$2,262 50	
		4,682 50
Less items reduced—		
Salary of Patry transferred to clerk's department..	$650	
Sessional messengers..	678	
		1,328 00
Actual increase..		3,354 50

Mr. WHITE. Has Mr. Patry been taken out of the reading room or simply transferred to the clerk's department. Because if he has not been taken out of the reading room and somebody else put in his

place, the explanation is not very satisfactory.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is merely a case of transferring him from one staff to another.

Mr. WHITE. That does not account for the increase of three in the messengers staff, in addition to the extra house carpenter. I would like to know what necessity existed for that increase in the permanent messengers staff, and whether the Speaker had a report from the sergeant-at-arms as to the necessity of increasing the messengers staff from eight to eleven.

Mr. SPEAKER. The necessity of appointing these additional messengers was pressed upon the Speaker. The work is constantly increasing. Last session, and the session before particularly, were very long sessions.

Mr. WHITE. But surely there should have been some report of the chief official of that branch of the department that there was a necessity for an increase of these permanent messengers. You have an increase here of three permanent messengers. The explanation with regard to Mr. Patry, I have already shown, does not affect these three extra messengers at all, because Mr. Patry remains in the same position as before, but is merely transferred from the sergeant-at-arms' branch to the clerk's branch. Now I want to know why these three additional permanent messengers have been appointed, whether the sergeant-at-arms made a report to the Speaker intimating that there was a necessity for increasing the number.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am informed it was done under the express suggestion of the clerk. There was found to be a necessity for these additional employees by reason of the increased work. It was on his recommendation.

Mr. WHITE. And not on the recommendation of the sergeant-at-arms. Well, what is the maximum of the salary of permanent messengers?

Mr. SPEAKER. $750.

Mr. WHITE. I find there appears to have been an addition of $50 for five of these sessional messengers, and the rest appear to have only got $30 addition. Why is there that discrimination?

Mr. SPEAKER. By resolution of the Internal Economy Board the assistant chief received $50, and the others $30 of an increase.

Mr. WHITE. But there are five of them here who appear to have received $50 additional.

Mr. SPEAKER. I only see one who has got an increase of $50, Mr. Connolly.

Mr. WHITE. There are five permanent messengers here at $750, and according to the last estimates, these were at $700.

Mr. SPEAKER. Those five have reached the maximum.

Mr. WHITE. They have reached it by giving them $50 additional in one year. With regard to Mr. George, he has had an addition of $100, whereas the other messengers have only received an addition of $30 a year. If I remember well, the arrangement about increases was that the messengers were to get $30 a year. Of course if that applied to the whole there would be no special objection to it; but there should not be discrimination.

Mr. SPEAKER. Last year, I believe, there was a general increase.

Mr. WHITE. I find in the Auditor General's Report that bonuses were paid to the permanent messengers ranging from $50 to $100 for the session of 1903. I am not making any objection to that, because all these were good men, and perhaps deserving of the recognition that was given to them. But I think the practice is a vicious one, and I hope His Honour the Speaker will not continue it. If it is desirable to increase the salaries of the messengers, it should be increased permanently, I think. But what I am desirous of ascertaining is whether the $50 bonus which was given to the permanent messengers for the session of 1903, was made a permanent addition to their salaries, and whether they had reached the maximum by having that addition made to their salaries earlier than they otherwise would have done.

Mr. SPEAKER. The clerk informs me that the bonus was given owing to the length of the session, and was not to be a permanent increase.

Mr. WHITE. That is not a very satisfactory explanation, because these gentlemen were employed for the whole year. I am not finding any fault with granting bonuses to them, but they are employed for the whole year. It matters little what the length of the session may be, they have to be here the whole year round. With regard to that, I would like to ask Mr. Speaker as to whether his steward, during recess, is relieved of duty, or whether, having been taken out of the class of permanent messengers, he is required to be on duty as a messenger during recess.

Mr. SPEAKER. The allowance of course is not a sessional allowance. When the session has been very protracted, with long hours and that sort of thing, perhaps there cannot be much said in criticism of an allowance of that character.

Mr. WHITE. Is the system of bonuses to be continued or abandoned?

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot speak as to the future.

Mr. WHITE. Another question was as to whether the steward, who formerly was a messenger and who, during recess, performed the duties of a messenger, is to continue to perform those duties, or whether he will be relieved of duty altogether during the recess.

Mr. SPEAKER. He was formerly a permanent messenger. He is now in charge of the restaurant and of the property.

Mr. WHITE. I am afraid my hon. friend does not apprehend the meaning of the question I put to him. What I am asking is as to whether the Speaker's steward who was formerly a permanent messenger and required to discharge the duties of a permanent messenger during the recess will still continue to discharge the duties of messenger during the recess, or whether he will remain out altogether during the recess and only be required to be on duty during the session.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand he is now only employed during the session except that he has to take care of the property in his charge during the whole year.

Mr. WHITE. He always had to do that.

Mr. FOSTER. Do we understand then that what formerly was done by a permanent messenger detailed for that service while the House was in session, which messenger had his own duties during the remainder of the year to perform, is now done by another official, that now we have been advanced to this other stage that the Speaker has a full fledged steward of his own who comes when the Speaker comes, who goes when the Speaker goes, and who has no duties during any other part of the year ? I have not been able to find out exactly from what Mr. Speaker has said as to whether that is the condition of things or whether this steward comes back to his work when the Speaker leaves at the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. As I understand he has to be here under the order of the chief messenger during the entire year.

Mr. FOSTER. But the answer so far as I can get it is not an answer to my question, but simply a statement that he has to stay here under the orders of the chief messenger. The question is what duties does he perform after the Speaker leaves ? I know this was an arrangement made by the late Speaker, and not by the present one, but at the same time we ought to have an answer.

Mr. SPEAKER. As far as I can understand in the interim he is responsible for the property and looks after that. These are the only duties he is required to do.

Mr. WHITE. Yes, but these duties were imposed upon this gentleman when he was a permanent messenger. He had to take care of the property in the restaurant and in the Speaker's chambers and he discharged other duties as a messenger during that period of time. Now we have this curious circumstance or anomaly presented to us, that there are three additional messengers in these estimates more than were provided for last year, and the explanation we get from the hon. Speaker is that the clerk recommended the appointment of these three permanent messengers. I do not know what the clerk's authority is in regard to that matter, but I always supposed when I was occupying the position which my hon. friend occupies now, in so far as that branch of the staff was concerned, if any increase was required a report should come, and I required that a report should come, from the sergeant-at-arms, who is the chief of that staff. Of course, I understand that the clerk is the chief of the whole staff, but still it seems to me that it would have been more proper if the sergeant-at-arms had recommended the appointment of these permanent messengers. We never found in former years that eight messengers were too few to discharge the duties required of them. Now we find that we require an addition of three permanent messengers to the staff.

Mr. FOSTER. Is one of these the steward?

Mr. WHITE. No, there are three permanent messengers added to the staff and charged as permanent messengers and there is the Speaker's steward. In regard to the steward's duties spoken of by Mr. Speaker, they were discharged by him in former years ; that is to say he had to take care of the property in the restaurant during the recess and also of the property in the Speaker's chambers. All these properties were under the charge of the sergeant-at-arms, who was responsible for their safe-keeping. The sergeant-at-arms was responsible for the property in the restaurant and in the Speaker's chambers.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am now instructed that both the clerk and the sergeant-at-arms concurred in the recommendation.

Mr. WHITE. The sergeant-at-arms concurred in the recommendation of the appointment of these three permanent messengers ?

Mr. SPEAKER. So I am informed. The matter then came before the Internal Economy Committee in the regular way and they endorsed the recommendations and sent them on.

Mr. WHITE. No doubt the Committee on Internal Economy would give effect to any recommendation the Speaker might make in regard to this question, because the Speaker is supposed to know more about the needs of the House than any other

member of the Committee on Internal Economy. But I have been trying to find out what the necessity was for these three additional messengers and I confess that I have not been able to do so yet. Before we pass from the consideration of the messengers I wish to say that the two night watchmen do not appear to have received any addition to their salaries during the present year. Is there any good reason why they should not be given $750 the same as the five messengers referred to in the previous item? They are both good men, they have been a long time in the service, their duties are somewhat exacting, and if the maximum is $750, surely these two men ought to be considered as well as the rest of the messengers.

Mr. SPEAKER. As I am informed they had an increase in the previous year.

Mr. WHITE. Have not all these others had an increase in the previous year? They have all had an increase during the previous year.

Mr. SPEAKER. Well they were brought up to $700 during the previous year.

Mr. WHITE. Then these estimates are not correct because the estimates say that there was $700 estimated for each of them last year. The same amount is estimated this year as last year, $1,400, that is $700 each for the two night watchmen last year and the same amount is estimated this year so that the explanation does not appear to me to be very satisfactory.

Mr. SPEAKER. They came up to the $700 a year by the increase last year and they do not get any increase this year.

Mr. WHITE. Are they not entitled to reach the maximum the same as other messengers, the maximum being $750?

Mr. SPEAKER. They never have been considered in the same class.

Mr. WHITE. They have not been put on the same footing?

Mr. SPEAKER. No.

Mr. WHITE. We always had considered them the same.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is worth considering whether they should not be put upon the same footing.

Mr. WHITE. Yes, I think they should get the same as the other messengers. In regard to the House carpenter, is Mr. Sinclair still in the service?

Mr. SPEAKER. He is still in the service.

Mr. WHITE. I suppose this is his salary that is advanced to $750?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, he is getting $750.

Mr. WHITE. Was there a report as to the necessity of employing a second House carpenter from the sergeant-at-arms or any person in authority?

Mr. SPEAKER. There has always been one employed, and heretofore he was employed by the Department of Public Works and this is simply a transfer from the Department of Public Works to the House of Commons and not an increase.

Mr. WHITE. Was there one permanently sent from the Department of Public Works in addition to Mr. Sinclair? Was there a permanent House carpenter paid by the Department of Public Works to work here all the year round?

Mr. SPEAKER. I am informed that he is paid a per diem allowance; he has been on for fifteen years.

Mr. WHITE. Just for the days he was on duty?

Mr. SPEAKER. It amounted to very nearly this amount, practically this amount.

Mr. WHITE. With regard to the next item, 50 sessional messengers, at $2.75 per diem, when was the increase made in the pay of the sessional messengers?

Mr. SPEAKER. At the request of the House generally, as I am informed, there was an increase all round last year, and they shared in the increase.

Mr. WHITE. There is an increase in the number.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, I think there is an increase in the number.

Mr. WHITE. The estimates this year provide for the same number of messengers as last year, and yet there is a reduction of $678.50 in the item. How does that occur?

Mr. SPEAKER. The amount was over-estimated for the previous year; this year an estimate is taken only for the amount that it is expected will be expended.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an over estimate this year. Does the Speaker intend to take on more sessional messengers?

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no intention of doing so.

Mr. FOSTER. The length of the session, of course, is an indeterminate quantity. I do not think my hon. friend has been well answered as to why three additional messengers should be appointed. That is a large addition to the number now in the service. I would like to have the Speaker give the reasons why there had to be an increase in the number of messengers by one-third. What additional work made that necessary? Is it the duty of the sergeant-at-arms to make recommendations for such an increase? He is an old officer, and the officer in charge knows the amount of work, knows the messengers and how the work is done. It would seem that he would be

the proper person to recommend when an increase was necessary. He would recommend to the Speaker, and if the Speaker concurred in his recommendation it would go to the Internal Economy Committee for final action. The Internal Economy Committee should ask for a report in writing from the sergeant-at-arms to the Speaker setting forth the reasons for the proposed increase. I would ask if there is such a report ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I am informed that it was at the request of the sergeant-at-arms and at his suggestion that the increase was made, but I cannot ascertain that there was any written report on the matter. I am informed that the Internal Economy Committee acted upon the report of the sergeant-at-arms which was concurred in by the Speaker.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry to hear the Speaker say that; it is a reiteration of the remarks made by a responsible minister yesterday. The Intercolonial is a matter of much importance to this country, and consequently to the representatives of the people in parliament. Its business is the country's business, in fact, and yet we have the Minister of Railways yesterday saying that as he was travelling around some one made a verbal report, and he, like the Shah of Persia, or the Sultan of Turkey, immediately, on that verbal report, cut off a man's head. He had no report as to the reasons for the action, there was nothing but a verbal report. No business is well done, I think the House will agree, unless you have the officers pinned down in black and white on these important points. The sergeant-at-arms does not get to the Internal Economy Committee, but it is stated that he has made a recommendation. If I were on the Internal Economy Committee I should ask to see the written report. And I am sure there must be somewhere in the records of the Internal Economy Committee such a report, and I would like the Speaker to bring it down.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have made inquiry and I cannot find that there is any written recommendation.

Mr. WHITE. Then I hope my hon. friend will not make the appointments until he gets a recommendation from the sergeant-at-arms as to the necessity for this large addition to the permanent messengers' force. In the old days it was not found that the messenger staff was not too small, and I am inclined to think that the work of the House has not increased to such an extent as to render necessary the addition of nearly 50 per cent to the staff.

Mr. SPEAKER. I can see the force of the hon. gentleman's observation and will endeavour to carry out that suggestion in the future and to have reports.

Mr. WHITE. Have these appointments been made ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, they have been made.

Mr. OSLER. Are these men paid $2.75 for each working day or for each day in the week ?

Mr. SPEAKER. They are paid for every day during the week; many of them do duty on Sunday.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the Speaker give the date at which these appointments were made ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I have not the dates by me at present.

Mr. FOSTER. I think this is of sufficient importance to let the estimate stand until we find out about it. I do not see how the appointment could have been made if there was no money voted for it. How many sessional messengers are there now at work?

Mr. SPEAKER. There are nine permanent.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the other two are not appointed ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, but not as permanent. They will commence next July to be permanent.

Mr. FOSTER. Then they are not appointed yet ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Not as permanent.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the Speaker make any examination as to the personal qualifications of these men for the position ? Last year here was a young lad, who was one of the best messengers I have seen about the House. It might be well to consider the advisability of getting active energetic young fellows, who would do the work up to time.

Mr. WHITE. If two of these messengers are not yet appointed as permanent, how are they being paid—out of the sessional vote ?

Mr. SPEAKER. At present out of the sessional appropriation.

Mr. FOSTER. Then to say that they are not appointed is simply a technical answer. They are in the service, and they are being paid out of the people's money. I think we ought to have the recommendation of the sergeant-at-arms. There is one business way in which this ought to be managed. According to all the traditions of the House, the sergeant-at-arms is the responsible officer who should make the recommendations when additions are necessary, after which they come before the Internal Economy Committee. I do not presume to give advice to the hon. gentleman ; but if I were Speaker, I think I should rather have these appointments, which are part of the domestic

economy of the House, come to me in the shape of recommendations from the responsible officer, with a detailed statement as to why they were necessary, before I brought them before the House. I think that is the businesslike way of having the thing done.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. the Speaker got a vote last year for the purpose of paying a certain number of sessional messengers, and he has had the full number up to the 1st of July next. How does he pay these two, who are above the number, when he has not a vote for them ?

Mr. SPEAKER. They are regular sessional messengers like the other messengers. They are included in the fifty who are being paid out of last year's vote.

Mr. HAGGART. You got a certain vote for a certain number of sessional messengers last year. You have increased that number by two, whom you are paying as sessional messengers until you get authority from the House to put them permanently on your staff from the 1st of July next. Where does the money come from to pay them ?

Mr. SPEAKER. They were already on the list of sessional messengers, and they are merely to be permanent after the 1st of July.

Mr. WHITE. Have you reduced the number of sessional messengers from whom you take these two, or have you appointed the fifty and these two ?

Mr. SPEAKER. There are just fifty, and these two men are among them.

Mr. WHITE. Then I would again urge my hon. friend not to make these permanent appointments. He has made one already. When was that appointment made to the permanent staff, and who is the appointee ?

Mr. SPEAKER. One was appointed about August last. His name is Lalonde.

Mr. HAGGART. How are you paying him ? He is in excess of the number provided for by parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER. We are paying him out of the vote for permanent messengers. If it is short, we shall have to ask for a supplementary vote.

Mr. WHITE. What does the Speaker say in reference to these two permanent messengers who have not yet been appointed ? I suggest to him, that before these appointments be made, a report should be obtained in writing from the sergeant-at-arms as to the necessity of their appointment. Are we to understand that the Speaker will adopt that course, and if the report cannot be obtained from the sergeant-at-arms that there is a necessity for the appointment of these extra permanent messengers, he will not appoint them ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that is reasonable, and I think I can assure the House that I will follow that course.

Mr. BERGERON. I see in the Auditor General's Report, O—20, a number of items that have a very familiar appearance. Such items as books and maps for instance, 35 Canadian Parliamentary Guides, $70 ; Canadian Politics, $5.40 ; Canadian Annual, $3.80 ; Canadian Annual Review, $46.35 ; New Dictionary of Larousse, $43 ; Political Appointments to Parliament and the Judical Bench of Canada, $60, and so on. Who supervises these purchases and who is responsible for seeing that they remain the property of the government ? Then there are considerable purchases of furniture every year. It is most extraordinary what a quantity has to be purchased each year, and one wonders what becomes of all the things purchased. There are purchases of desks and tables and all sorts of things from Bryson, Graham & Co., amounting to $999.13. Also from J. O. Leblanc for desks and lounges and chairs amounting to $421.50. Also from Harris, Campbell & Boyden Furniture Company, desks and tables and chairs to the extent of $157.75. I need not take up the time of the committee in going through the list, but I remember well when years ago pages of that kind were read in the House. Of course we have had some additional rooms opened, but still I cannot understand why we should require each year so much furniture. Where do you put it all? Who is in charge when the House rises and the Speaker goes away, and who is responsible that that furniture is not taken away from the building ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The Clerk of the House is responsible for the purchases of books. He himself has a library belonging to parliament and so have the translators, and from time to time books have to be purchased which they require. As regards the furniture, it is only purchased on the recommendation of the sergeant-at-arms, who must initial all the accounts. The furniture is then under his charge. As regards the desks, I have been Speaker only a few days and in that time have received quite a number of requisitions from gentlemen on both sides to be furnished with desks. No doubt my predecessors have had similar experience. Of course, as in a private house, furniture gets used up and has to be replaced from time to time. I shall endeavour to keep check of these matters and see that no unnecessary furniture is purchased.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Have you, Mr. Speaker, submitted to the members any plan showing the re-arrangement of the rooms ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I have not submitted any final plan, but am considering whether a re-arrangement can be made so as to satisfy the requests of some members. I find it a very difficult matter to deal with.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there not a piano in the Speaker's rooms belonging to the House ? I see we are paying rent for one ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The piano has always been rented, and it is a question whether it would not be better to purchase one outright.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I am sure the members from British Columbia would wish that it were in your power, Mr. Speaker, to enlarge the chambers. We from British Columbia are in the unfortunate condition of not having any recognized room in the House. In this respect we are much less fortunate than some of the older provinces, who seem to have all the good things of this life. I would like it very much if his hon. the Speaker could see his way clear to help out the orphans from British Columbia and arrange to have them domiciled in a fitting room of their own.

Mr. GANONG. Would Mr. Speaker be kind enough to advise me whether there is or is not a room set apart for the New Brunswick members ?

Mr. SPEAKER. No ; I am afraid they are at present as much orphans as the hon. members from British Columbia.

Mr. GANONG. There is no such room, then, I understand ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that the only room that can be utilized by them at present is the Agricultural Committee room, in which certain desks were heretofore placed for the use of the maritime province members.

Mr. GANONG. Walking along one of the upper corridors we find a room whose door is marked 'N.B. Members.' As far as I can learn, that means N.B. Grit members. I would advise Mr. Speaker to have the word 'Grit' painted before 'N.B.' There is a room there, but if a Tory puts his head in, he is apt to be requested to get out.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I can say, on the authority of a former Speaker of this House, that there is no room in this House which any member is not free to enter. And I can remember a case where this former Speaker said that if any person put a lock on any room in the House and any member wished to enter that room, he would send his locksmith to open it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Now that this matter is up, I certainly think it should be made clear that if there are to be rooms for any, there must be rooms for all. It should all be done on some systematic basis, and fair-play should be shown. I trust that Mr. Speaker will see to it that the leader of the Conservative opposition in this House is given an additional room adjoining his own, where his secretary can work.

The SPEAKER.

Mr. LOGAN. This discussion should show us that it is about time for the House to consider how business is to be done. There is, no doubt, just ground for complaint on the part of members on both sides. Many of us have a large correspondence to attend to, and the majority must attend to that correspondence in their places in this chamber or somewhere else, no special accommodation being afforded. We should provide in some way proper accommodations for the members of the House. I understand that in the United States a member of Congress is given an allowance for a secretary and is also given a room in which to do his work. In this House, under the previous administration, I am informed, the members of the Liberal opposition had to do their work in the corridors of the House. Looking over the list of rooms that has been posted in this House, I find that our friends of the opposition have no great reason to complain in comparison with the members on this side. If they complain, I would like them to refer to the distribution of rooms of about ten years ago, and they will see what insignificant accommodation was given to the opposition of that time. I find that at present our friends of the opposition have the following rooms, outside of the rooms provided for the leader and the whips :—Room No. 6, Conservative headquarters ; No. 34, Conservative members ; No. 36, Ontario Conservative members ; No. 37, Conservative ex-ministers; No. 56, Conservative members from Ontario ; No. 72, Conservative members—Messrs. White and Foster. Here we have six rooms in all. On the Liberal side we find that, apart from the rooms occupied by some of the ministers, including the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance, there are the following :—Room No. 16, Liberal headquarters ; No. 48, North-west Territories members ; No. 58, Liberal members from Ontario ; No. 49, Chairman of the Printing Committee and members from Ontario ; No. 67, Liberal members from New Brunswick ; No. 68, Liberal members from Nova Scotia ; No. 69, Chairman of the Debates Committee and some Liberal members ; No. 71, Liberal members of the province of Quebec—eight rooms in all. So that the opposition, with a membership of 76, have six rooms, while the government side, with a membership of 138, or nearly double, have only eight rooms. I think the comparison does not give our friends on the other side anything to complain of. But, outside of the comparison, all the members have something to complain of in the accommodation afforded. I presume that many members have an average mail of from twenty-five to thirty-five letters a day. Where are we to answer these letters ? If we dictate to a stenographer, where is the work to be done ? As you walk about, you see members even sitting in the corridors dictating their correspondence. Go into the Railway Committee

Room, and you find stenographers here and there writing at the dictation of members. This is not in accordance with the dignity of the House or with the work we have to do. We do not come here to play, but each of us bears a certain responsibility and has important work to do. Members on the government side of the House may have a great many questions of patronage arising in their counties, involving a large correspondence, for the carrying on of which there it now no accommodation. This discussion will have done good if it arouses the government and the House to the necessity of providing better accommodation for the members in the immediate future.

Mr. GANONG. Perhaps Mr. Speaker will provide a few desks for Tories in that room he spoke of. If he does, I will take my chances on getting into the room.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The room referred to by Mr. Speaker as affording accommodation for Conservative members from the maritime provinces is sometimes occupied by the sittings of the Committee on Agriculture. Besides, if it is to be lumbered up with many more desks, it will not be possible to do work there any better than at our desks in this chamber. It will be in the interest of the House and of the country to provide better accommodation, for members would then have opportunities for research and study, and could better fit themselves for the discussion of public questions. At least rooms should be provided for the members on either side from the different provinces. New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and other provinces have been named. I will put in a word on behalf of the members from Prince Edward Island. With the work of the country growing every year, and, as the hon. member from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) says, with members receiving an average of from twenty-five to thirty letters a day, it is impossible to do the work unless members are given better accommodation. Outside of the discussion whether the rooms should be given to Liberals or Conservatives, I think it would be well for the government to take into consideration the matter of providing better accommodation for members.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There is another matter to which I wish to draw the attention of the Speaker and the House. At the present moment I am informed the full lights are turned on, and we have practically only twilight in this chamber. A few years ago we had a very good light, and it was changed for some purpose or other, and since then it has been very inadequate. I would respectfully suggest that the candle power should be at least doubled in this chamber. Getting old as some of us are, we find it is absolutely necessary to have the chamber better lighted. I think the old apparatus is still here, and why not combine that with the present system?

Mr. TAYLOR. This being the first session of a new parliament and a new Speaker, I would now venture to make the suggestion that I made when the Conservative party were in power, and which I think would have been acted on had they remained in power another session, that is, to provide more accommodation for the members of both sides, to which I think they are justly entitled. The suggestion I made then, and that I make now, is that we provide accommodation outside the House of Commons for the Speaker, the sergeant-at-arms and the chief messenger. I think the House of Commons should be reserved altogether for the use of members. I do not think it would be any more difficult for the Speaker, the sergeant-at-arms and the chief messenger to go to their lodgings at night than it is for the Prime Minister, the other members of the government and the House of Commons. We all have to make our way home. I do not see the necessity for any of these gentlemen being housed in this building. The restaurant people also—they all have too much accommodation taken away from the members. These gentlemen should have quarters, they should have rooms here; but there is no necessity for the larger part of the House of Commons being taken up by the Speaker, the deputy speaker, the sergeant-at-arms and the chief messenger. These gentlemen should be provided with respectable quarters outside. I know the present Speaker and the former Speakers would prefer living in respectable quarters outside. In this way accommodation could be provided so that every man, or groups of a few members, could have rooms where they could do their private correspondence without being obliged to do it at their desks, as most of us have to do. I make this suggestion to the Speaker and to the Prime Minister, that arrangements be made immediately for removing all the families now living in the House of Commons and putting them in permanent quarters outside, allotting the rooms vacated proportionately between the members supporting the government and those supporting the opposition.

Mr. MILLER. In the constituency I come from we are in the habit of considering the rights of the ladies. I have noticed that there is no general waiting-room in this House for the convenience of ladies. I think there ought to be such a room for ladies who come here from a distance, no matter what may be their political leanings, a room with all the proper conveniences which they would expect to find in connection therewith.

Mr. SPEAKER. I can inform the gallant member who has just spoken (Mr. Miller) that now, for the first time in any session, there has been a nicely furnished cloak room provided upstairs for ladies, and a couple of attendants are there to see that

their wants are provided for. That is a move in the right direction. The whole matter has been very fully discussed, and I can assure the House that I will bring it promptly to the attention of the government, and perhaps make some future reference to it.

Mr. WHITE. Before we pass from this subject I would like to say a word more with reference to the sessional writers. I see by the Auditor General's Report that whilst the general sessional writers are paid $4 a day, Mr. P. A. Stewart and Mr. Taché are paid $600 each for the session. Has there been any increase in the salaries of these gentlemen since this report was published? They have enjoyed that salary for a long series of years, and were getting $600 a year when the sessional writers were only getting $3 a day. I would like to know whether any increases have been made in the salaries of these gentlemen, because we have the curious anomaly here of the two chief sessional writers getting $600 a year each, and their subordinates getting a larger sum during the session of 1904. That should not continue. These chief sessional writers ought at least to get a larger pay than the ordinary sessional writers.

Mr. SPEAKER. There has been no permanent increase in the salaries for the last two sessions. The sessions of 1903 and 1904 were very long, and an extra allowance was made on that score of $300 each.

Mr. WHITE. Would it not be better that a permanent addition be made to the salaries of these gentlemen than that they should be dependent upon the will of the Speaker for an increase? They are both good men, at least they were in former times. I suppose Mr. Stewart must be pretty well advanced in years, but they both discharge their duties efficiently. Yet it seems anomalous that, according to the Auditor General's Report, they are receiving a less sum than their subordinates. It seems to me that these two gentlemen, instead of being dependent upon getting a bonus whenever it pleases the Speaker or the Committee on Internal Economy to give them a bonus, should have a permanent addition to their salaries.

Mr. SPEAKER. The suggestion is worthy of consideration, and will be considered.

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to the books, as I understand, Mr. Speaker, these books which were purchased under the direction of the clerk go towards filling out the clerk's personal library, I mean his official library.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, and the translators' library. Some are transferred to the library.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice in some cases there are a number of copies of the same book, as for instance of the Canadian Annual Review, a very good book, and I dare say it is well used. There are a dozen copies of that document.

Mr. SPEAKER. These are distributed to the leading officials of the House as being useful to them in their work.

Mr. BERGERON. I agree with the opinion of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), except that I do not think we have as much accommodation as he says. Only a few of us have a room to work in. We are eleven members of the opposition from Quebec, and not one of us has a room to himself. The whole opposition has room No. 6, and those who were there in the old time know how inadequate is that room for seventy-five members. I think that this practice of separating the members in that way does more harm than good. Why not move them together more? Instead of having one room for the Liberal members and another for the Conservative, why not let all the members from New Brunswick, say, have one room, and the same with the members from Quebec, and with every other province? There is no reason why the members on both sides of the House should not be perfectly friendly and near one another while attending to their private correspondence. I am afraid it will lengthen the session if we do not get a room. We have to stay here. I am very glad to be able to state publicly what the conditions are so that the people who have correspondence with us will know why it is that they sometimes do not get answers. I cannot write letters here. I can go to No. 6, but I cannot do any work there because there are so many gentlemen speaking in the room. I cannot be here five minutes until gentlemen come and engage in conversation so that it is impossible to do any work here. We should have some quarters where we could work. I ask the right hon. Prime Minister how a member can prepare any serious work in a place like this. It is impossible to do it. The consequence is that if we are not well prepared with our work we may delay the House, because our speeches may be longer than they would be if we had an opportunity of preparing them more thoroughly.

Customs—salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports in the various provinces and in the Northwest Territories, including pay for overtime of officers, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $1,214,865.

Mr. BERGERON. There was a question raised some time ago in Montreal in regard to the appointment of a deputy collector. I have not yet heard whether the question has been settled or not.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). No, there has not been any deputy collector appointed.

Mr. BERGERON. Was there a demand or a suggestion to that effect?

Mr. PATERSON. Well, I have heard it suggested, but I would not call it a demand. There has been no deputy collector since Mr. O'Hara died. The department has not felt the necessity of it. We have no deputy anywhere.

Mr. BERGERON. Did my hon. friend get a demand from the trade of Montreal to the effect that Mr. White, the collector, had not time to answer all the questions which were put to him in the custom house there as the business of the port is very extensive ? A petition was presented by the trade of Montreal to that effect. I understand it was supported by the present collector and that it contained the statement that it would be in the interest of the trade at that port to have a deputy collector appointed.

Mr. PATERSON. Perhaps there has been a petition. If there has been it has been lately. It has been running in my mind that I had seen something in the papers about it, but there has been no action.

Mr. BERGERON. There has been no decision ?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. minister take this item up by the different provinces and tell us what are the increases in each—or by ports, whichever he chooses ?

Mr. PATERSON. We have not the estimate in that way.

Mr. FOSTER. In what way has the hon. minister the estimate ? Everything is lumped here. You have simply a line or two and a million and a quarter of dollars at the end of it. What is the system of explanation there ?

Mr. PATERSON. Largely comparing one year with another. The only increase asked for this year is for the salaries and contingencies of the various ports. We are asking $20,000 more.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. minister take it up by ports ?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. FOSTER. How then ?

Mr. PATERSON. In a general way. If the hon. gentleman wants to know what has been expended last year in the different provinces by way of increase, I can give him that, and as it has been done in one year the presumption is that you may require to have something done in that way during the coming year, either in the way of new appointments which have been found necessary or in the way of increases that may have been given in the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. minister say that he is not able to take it up by ports ? That seems to be the only way in which it can be fairly followed. Which province will the hon. minister take up first ? I suppose as Ontario occupies a very prominent position in the eyes of the world the hon. minister might take up Ontario first.

Mr. PATERSON. Last year we asked for an additional vote of $35,000.

Mr. FOSTER. For Ontario ?

Mr. PATERSON. No, for the whole Dominion. There was absorbed of that by increases $22,000 in round numbers. I have a list of how they were distributed if the hon. gentleman wants it. Does he want the individual names or does he want the bulk sums ?

Mr. FOSTER. That is for the increased expenses of last year ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, for the increases in salaries last year. I can give it to him by provinces if he desires it with all the names.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose that is the way we will have to get at it.

Mr. PATERSON. In that way or will the hon. gentleman take it in bulk at so much ?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, it is much easier for the hon. gentleman if we take it in the bulk, but I am afraid we would not get much information.

Mr. PATERSON. If I read the names would the hon. gentleman know the officers anyway, or would it assist him in any way?

Mr. FOSTER. I have here the towns and ports and officers and everything in connection with each port. The only way you can follow it is to take them as they appear in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. PATERSON. I will give merely the bulk sums to the hon. gentleman and then if it will help him, I will give him the names of the officers at the differents ports. In the province of Ontario we increased the salaries of 72 officers.

Mr. FOSTER. That is last year ?

Mr. PATERSON. Out of the amount voted last year—the increase being $5,060. In Quebec we increased the salaries of 77 officers, the total increase being $5,076. In New Brunswick seven officers have been increased, making $500 in all. In Nova Scotia 37 officers had an increase.

Mr. FOSTER. New Brunswick seven, and Nova Scotia thirty-seven, and yet somebody wonders why Nova Scotia went solid.

Mr. PATERSON. New Brunswick went pretty nearly that way too.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no.

Mr. PATERSON. The thirty-seven amounted to $3,210, in Manitoba there were

twenty-two increases totalling $3,050, and in British Columbia forty-nine increases amounting to $5,180. In Prince Edward Island we had eight increases coming to $450, in the Northwest Territories we have six increases amounting to $600. That it to say we were able last year to increase the salaries in all of 278 officers at a cost of $22,186. We are asking for $20,000 extra this year.

Mr. FOSTER. You had an unexpended vote last year of $11,000.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, there was that amount unexpended. So this year we are only asking $22,000 out of which we will make our increases, although of course I may have to ask for a supplementary vote as we can judge better towards the end of the session.

Mr. FOSTER. On what basis are these increases made? There are such things as regular increases and special increases.

Mr. PATERSON. In the outside service there is no regular increase.

Mr. FOSTER. But there is the custom.

Mr. PATERSON. The custom is efficiency and the work performed. Last year we gave increases chiefly to the men who were getting small salaries of $500 and $600. We were not able to do so much for the higher classes of officers some of whom of course deserved it, and in some cases these increases were given.

Mr. FOSTER. How does the minister get his information as to the officers to whom increases should be given? On the report of what officers?

Mr. PATERSON. The collectors and the inspectors. Of course we can see for ourselves where a salary is only $500 or $600, and the commissioner has often reported to me verbally that in his view no officer should be paid less than $600. It has been urged upon us that the cost of living has increased lately and we now have most of our officers up to the $600 mark.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not suppose the minister, for instance in Ottawa, takes his list of officers and finding a man who last year was getting $450 would say to his secretary, 'now increase that man to $500' because he might be increasing a man who is altogether inefficient, and even if a man has a low salary if he is inefficient in his work he is scarcely deserving of an increase. There must be some method by which information comes to the head of the department here, the minister, on which he makes his decision as to the increase so as to be able to know that undeserving men do not get increases. Of course in the statistical branch the minister would have the information here. He knows when the officer is appointed and how many years he has been in the service. How does the minister acquire information as to outside officers.

Mr. PATERSON. We confer with the collectors and inspectors with respect to that. I might say to the hon. gentleman that we are communicated with by the officers themselves, and we make inquiries in reference to them and ascertain from our inspectors as to the services they are rendering, and upon that information we make up our minds whether we should grant the increase.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that all the information my hon. friend has, is that the only system?

Mr. PATERSON. That is the only system.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend never receives letters or representations?

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. FOSTER. These count?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, but we cannot trust to these, you know; we must have the official information.

Mr. FOSTER. Take for instance Halifax. Is there a report required by the minister's department here as to the general condition and efficiency of the work in the port of Halifax, say in the customs house? Are these things reported on to Ottawa where the salaries are ultimately decided.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, there is such a system.

Mr. FOSTER. From all ports.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, we have in Nova Scotia, Mr. Bremner and Mr. McDonnell. Mr. Hill was with us for thirty-five or forty years but he has passed away, and Mr. McDonnell was appointed in his place. We have also had for many years Mr. Bremner. They visit all the ports and we expect a report from every port in the Dominion at least once a year. I think we have it oftener in some cases. We have in Ontario now a chief inspector and three officers.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I would ask the Minister of Customs what salary the customs collector at Coatsworth, in my own constituency of West Kent, receives and what the returns for the last fiscal year for that port were?

Mr. PATERSON. What is the name of the port?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I do not know. It is a few miles from Romney.

Mr. PATERSON. Thomas Robinson is the collector, and he receives $400.

Mr. CLEMENTS. What are the revenue returns from that office?

Mr. PATERSON. $19.32.

Mr. CLEMENTS. While I think a port is necessary in that district, I think it is in the wrong place. I think the town of Wheatley, about five miles from there, is the proper place. I would ask the hon. minister to take that into consideration.

Mr. PATERSON. I shall be very glad to inquire as to that. I judge, from the small amount of revenue returned that it must be largely a preventive station. Does the hon. gentleman say that Wheatley would be a better point to prevent smuggling than where the office is now ?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Yes.

Mr. CLARE. What increases of salaries were made at the Galt customs house ?

Mr. PATERSON. The salary of Mr. Denis, the preventive officer, was advanced from $600 to $650. The collector has asked for an increase, but it was not given last year. It is under consideration.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. I represent a large district, the district of Muskoka, in which there is no custom house at all, and we find it very inconvenient in getting goods in. I am sure that the revenue of that district is much larger than that of many others which have custom houses.

Mr. PATERSON. We have had strong representations from portions of Muskoka on that subject, among others from Bracebridge, a large and thriving place. During the summer months, when there is a good deal of traffic, we have an office at Gravenhurst. We have had applications for new offices from thirty or forty places, but it is difficult to accommodate them all. The opening of every new port means an additional expenditure. Then, while we are very anxious to oblige the business community as far as we can, we are not able to secure the same judgment with reference to values and as to whether invoices are correct, at many of these points that we can at larger points, where we can afford to pay larger salaries and have men especially delegated for the work. In the United States there are only a few very large ports. I believe it is a fact that for their 80,000,000 people, they have not as many ports as we have in Canada—not relatively, but absolutely. But the people of Canada have been accustomed to having conveniences nearer home. I can well understand what the hon. gentleman says as to the strong claims of the district he represents; but the department feel that the fewer ports we can have, with due convenience to the people, the greater uniformity in values we can secure.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. Have you any system for opening new offices, with reference to size or population ?

Mr. PATERSON. When we get applications of that kind, one of the inspectors makes inquiry personally, then the department gets a statement from the office at which it is probable the entries were made. For instance, we would get from the collector at Orillia a statement of the goods entered for consumption in the town of Bracebridge, and in that way arrive at the amount of revenue that might be expected.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. gentleman propose to make any increases in the staff at Hamilton ?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not think there is any pressing demand for increases there. I think we are pretty well manned there.

Mr. BARKER. I think so, too ; but there will be a great deal of disappointment if some appointments are not made.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Would it be a disappointment to the sitting members ?

Mr. BARKER. No, but to some very strong supporters of the right hon. gentleman who expect offices.

Mr. FOSTER. In the United States, where there is a small number of ports comparatively, taking into account its population, how do they overcome what seem to be great difficulties to us ?

Mr. PATERSON. I suppose the business is done through brokers, with power of attorney.

Mr. FOSTER. That system is also in vogue here.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, in the larger cities, but we are under no responsibility to the brokers.

Mr. FOSTER. I see there are very large increases in Nova Scotia compared with New Brunswick. How does my hon. friend account for that ?

Mr. PATERSON. In New Brunswick the officers were better paid, and in raising the pay in Nova Scotia we are bringing the officers there on a footing more nearly equal to those of New Brunswick.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT — AUTONOMY OF NORTHWEST TERRITORIES.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the Prime Minister give us any information as to the probable time when the Bill for the establishment of the Northwest province, or provinces, will be ready ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot give any definite information to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose it will be as soon as possible ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes ; I am very anxious to do so. I suppose that next week we shall commence a more regular

course of business than we have had up to this time. I should think that the bill referred to could be introduced probably during the second week in February.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, January 30, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 9) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, the object of the proposed Bill is to broaden the application of section 112 of the Election Act. That is the section which defines undue influence for the purposes of an election. It applies to acts by way of force, violence, restraint, or threats of the same, for the purpose of intimidating electors or of influencing their votes for any candidate. The proposed amendment goes a little farther than the present section, and provides against the canvassing or soliciting of votes by employers from their own workmen, leaving it open to any employer to canvass the rest of the world if he so chooses, but restricting him in the case of his own workmen. It is general in its application, including all persons who employ labour—mercantile men, professional men, manufacturers or large corporations—all kinds of corporations.

Mr. MACLEAN. What about the farmer and hired man ?

Mr. GUTHRIE. The farmer and hired man will be included also. I think the general section 112 does not go quite far enough to meet this case. The mere fact that an employer canvasses his men involves some intimidation, if not direct, at all events, indirect.

Mr. BRODER. Does it include the civil service ?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I have not made it apply to the civil service, but I fancy it might be made to apply to them, too. Anything in that direction, I think, would improve the condition of affairs which exists to-day. That, in brief, is the object of the proposed Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

QUESTIONS.

RETIREMENT OF J. B. SHAW.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. On what date did Mr. J. B. Shaw first enter the government service in the Customs Department at Regina, and at what salary ?
2. On what date did he retire from the service, and what salary was he receiving when he did retire ?
3. During what period in 1904, if any, was he not employed in the service of the government?
4. On what date did he re-enter the service of the government in the Customs Department at Regina ?
5. On whose recommendation did he re-enter the service of the government, and at what salary ?
6. What position did he occupy during his first period of service, and what position does he occupy since re-entering the service ?
7. What was the cause of his retirement ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. Mr. J. B. Shaw entered the Customs service at Regina, April 4, 1903, at a salary of $700 a year.
2. His resignation from the service was accepted September 30, 1903, at which time he was receiving a salary at the rate of $700 a year.
3. He was not employed in the customs service from October 1, 1903, until December 1, 1904.
4. Mr. Shaw re-entered the customs service at Regina December 1, 1904.
5. The Minister of Customs authorized Mr. Shaw's re-employment in the customs service at a salary of $900 a year.
6. Mr. Shaw's position during his first period of service and since re-entering the service was that of acting preventive officer of customs, but subject to the performance of such duties as the collector might direct.
7. The officer has not stated any cause to the Customs Department for his retirement.

RETIREMENT OF P. G. FISHER.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. Is Mr. P. G. Fisher at present employed in the Customs Department at Regina ?
2. If so, in what capacity, and at what salary?
3. If Mr. Fisher is not in the employ of the Customs Department, when did he retire ?
4. What was the cause of his retirement ?
5. What salary did Mr. Fisher draw for his services for November, 1904.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. P. G. Fisher is at present employed in the customs service at Regina.
2. His position is that of an acting landing waiter, but subject to perform such duties as the collector may direct. His salary is $700 a year.
3. Mr. Fisher has given notice of withdrawal from the service to take effect January 31, 1905.

4. His reason for withdrawing from the customs service appears to be that another customs officer recently employed at the port receives $900 a year.

5. Mr. Fisher received for salary from the Customs Department for November, 1904, $58.18.

EMPLOYMENT OF P. M. BREDT.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. Is Mr. P. M. Bredt at present in the employ of the Dominion government ?

2. If so, since when, in what capacity, and at what salary ?

3. On whose recommendation was Mr. Bredt appointed to his present position ?

4. Was Mr. Bredt in the employ of the Dominion government in 1904 ? If so, during what period or periods, and in what capacity or capacities ?

5. Did Mr. Bredt retire from the service of the Dominion government in 1904 ? If so, on what date ?

6. What was the reason for his retirement ?

7. On whose recommendation was Mr. Bredt appointed to the position he occupied with the government during 1904, and prior to that year?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

1 and 2. Since December 31, 1904, Mr. Bredt has been employed as colonization agent at $125 per month.

4. Yes, from January 1 to October 4, 1904. From January 1 to June 1, he filled the position of local immigration agent at Regina ; from June 1 to October 4, he was colonization agent.

5. Yes, on October 4, 1904.

3, 6 and 7. He was employed on recommendations satisfactory to the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Clifford Sifton).

MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. Has the Murray Harbour branch line of railway in Prince Edward Island been completed ? If so, when ?

2. If not, what remains to be done, and what is the estimated cost of same, including rolling stock ?

3. How many of the bridges are wooden, or partly wooden structures ? Are they to be replaced by stone or steel ? If so, when, and what is the estimated cost ?

4. How many booking and other stations are now built on this line, and where ? How many more are proposed to be built, and where ?

5. Is a station to be built at Grand View or Newton Crossing on this line ? If so, is it to be a booking station ?

6. Has the delegation from Prince Edward Island waited on any member or official of the government during this session of parliament, asking for this station ? If so, of whom composed ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. The Murray Harbour Branch of the Prince Edward Island Railway has not yet been completed.

2. The work remaining to be done is as follows, viz :

Hillsboro' Bridge.

Rip-rapping, completion of approaches, rip-rapping piers, erecting and placing in position five fixed spans and one swing span, building rest piers, tracklaying and flooring of whole structure.

On the line.

Three iron bridges to be erected to replace temporary wooden trestles, station and terminal facilities to be completed, water tanks to be erected, rolling stock to be provided.

The estimated cost to complete above mentioned works is $561,253.93.

3. There are three temporary wooden bridges which will be replaced by iron or steel, probably during the current year, and the estimated cost is about $8,000.

4. There are two booking stations built, one each at Hazel Brook and Vernon River, and two under construction, viz.: Melville and Wood Island.

Two way stations are built, one at Albion and one at Lake Verde. Four shelters are built, viz.: Southport, Bunbury, Mount Herbert and Hermitage, and one under construction at Hopefield.

Three booking stations are proposed to be built, one each at Uig, Murray River and Murray Harbour.

One way station is proposed to be built at Fodla.

Two shelters are proposed to be built, one at Surrey and the other at Bell River.

5. The question as to building stations at Grand View and at Newton Crossing is under consideration.

6. Messrs. A. B. Warburton and L. E. Prowse of Prince Edward Island interviewed the Minister of Railways and Canals recently on the subject of stations on this line.

SHERBROOKE ARMOURIES.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

Is the government aware that the four different branches of the military service which exist in Sherbrooke have for some time past had no suitable premises for the retention of arms and accoutrements ?

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

Quarters have been provided for all the branches of the militia service referred to.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY BRANCH.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. Has the survey of the proposed railway line in the province of Prince Edward Island between Stanley Bridge, New London, and the main line of the Prince Edward Island Railway been completed ? If not, what are the reasons for the delay ?

2. Was there more than one route surveyed, and what were the terminal points of each ?

3. Are tenders for construction to be called for, and when ?

4. When was the survey begun ?

5. What is the length of the line, and the estimated cost of construction ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Yes, the survey has been completed.

2. Two routes were surveyed. One via Clifton and one further east, with terminus at Emerald Junction and Stanley Bridge.

3. No decision can be reached until the engineer's report is received.

4. August, 1904.

5. This information cannot be given at the present time because the engineer, who made the surveys, has since been seriously ill, and he has not completed the plans, nor made his reports.

ADVANCES BY ORDER IN COUNCIL.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Perley—asked:

What is the total amount of the advances that have been made by the Governor in Council to date under the authority of Act 3, Edward VII., chapter 36, section 1 ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). $800,000.

IMPORTS FROM UNITED KINGDOM.

Mr. DANIEL asked:

1. What amount of goods from the United Kingdom was imported into Canada during the years 1902-3 and 1903-4, (a) through St. Lawrence ports, (b) through Canadian Atlantic ports, and (c) through United States ports ?

2. In the case of the United States ports referred to, what were the ports, and what was the amount of goods imported through each such port ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. The total value of goods imported into Canada from the United Kingdom was as follows :—

Direct to Canadian ports—

Fiscal year	1902-3..	$46,271,934
"	1903-4..	49,275,031

Imported through United States ports:—

Fiscal year	1902-3..	$12,796,772
"	1903-4	12,685,878

Customs returns have not been compiled for these imports separately via the St. Lawrence route and via Atlantic ports. Such compilation would take some time to complete.

2. The customs returns used for statistical purposes do not indicate the United States sea-board ports through which goods have arrived from the United Kingdom for Canada.

My deputy tells me that it is possible for us to obtain that information for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Daniel) should he desire it, and should he deem it of sufficient importance to ask for it. It would require about a month however to get the information as search would have to be made. With reference to customs returns for the separate ports in the United States through which goods have come in, we have no means of obtaining information, as we take cognizance of them only at the border.

Mr. DANIEL. I would be glad if the hon. minister would furnish the information which he says he would be able to furnish a little later on in connection with the reply to the first question.

Mr. PATERSON. If the hon. gentleman will be content to drop the question with this I will ask to have the information procured and will bring it down as soon as I can get it.

CENTRAL TRAINING CAMPS.

Mr. WHITE asked :

Has the government selected a site for the central military training camp ? If so, where will it be located ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). No, the matter has not been finally determined.

AGRICULTURAL MEETINGS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government, through the Department of Agriculture, to hold in co-operation with the farmers' clubs of the province of Quebec a number of agricultural meetings ?

2. For what purpose will these meetings be held ?

3. In what counties in the Eastern Townships will these meetings be held, and in connection with what agricultural societies or farmers' clubs ?

4. Is it the intention of the Department of Agriculture to hold one of these meetings in the county of Sherbrooke ? If not, why not ?

5. Is it the intention of the Department of Agriculture to hold in addition to these regular annual meetings a series of large conventions? In what county in the Eastern Townships will this convention be held ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. Yes. In co-operation with various agricultural organizations.

2. The purpose of these meetings is to give instructions by experts regarding the breeding and arrangement of live stock and poultry, the cultivation of the soil, the care of milk, selection of seeds, management of orchards, &c.

3. The meetings will be held in the Eastern Townships, as follows :

One meeting in Huntingdon county, in connection with the Agricultural Society of 'A' Division.

Two meetings in Chateauguay county, one French, in connection with the Farmers' Club at Ste. Martine, and one in English at Ormstown.

One meeting in Brome county, in connection with the Farmers' Club at Sutton.

Two meetings in Shefford county, one French, in connection with the Farmers' Club at Roxton Falls, and one English, in connection with the Farmers' Club at Waterloo.

One meeting in Missisquoi, in connection with the District of Bedford Dairymen's Association.

Two meetings in Stanstead county, one English, in connection with the Agricultural Society of that county, and one French in connection with the Farmers' Club at Coaticook.

Two meetings in Wolfe county, one English, in connection with the club at Bishop's Crossing, and one in French, in connection with the Farmers' Club at Weedon.

Two meetings in Compton county, one French, in connection with the Club at La Patrie, and one English, in connection with the Farmers' Club at Bury.

Two meetings in Drummond county, one French, in connection with the club at St. Germain de Grantham, and one English, in connection with the Farmers' Club at Ulverton.

One English meeting in Richmond county, in connection with the Farmers' Club at Danville.

Two meetings in Inverness county, one English, in connection with the Farmers' Club at Inverness, and one French, in connection with the Farmers' Club at Plessisville.

One meeting in Beauce county, in connection with the Farmers' Club at St. François.

One meeting in Arthabaska county, in connection with the Farmers' Club at Victoriaville.

The agricultural societies in each county are also lending their co-operation.

4. The above programme was prepared by the officers of my department, and when submitted to me it met with my approval, and I considered it the best that could be made under the circumstances.

5. Yes. The convention for the Eastern Townships will be held in Missisquoi county, at Cowansville, in connection with the District of Bedford Dairy Association.

THE SALMON FISHERIES OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. SPROULE asked :

1. Have any representations been made to the government, or any member thereof, asking for the suspension of salmon canning operations in British Columbia during the years 1906 and 1908 ?

2. From whom do these representations come ?

3. Is there any truth in the statement published in the newspapers that United States canners located on Puget Sound have instigated this movement ?

4. Have any protests been received by the government against the closing down of the salmon canning industry during the years named ? If so, from whom ?

5. What action does the government intend to take upon this matter ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes.

2. The Fraser River Canners' Association, Honourable E. G. Prior, Victoria, and the bank managers and principal business men of Vancouver.

3. No. The Fraser river canners, alarmed at the rapid decrease in the catch of Sockeye salmon during the last four years—962,652 cases in 1901, 293,477 in 1902, 204,809 in 1903 and 72,688 in 1904—stated in petitions to the government that the industry will be ruined unless the suspension referred to is carried out immediately. To secure concerted action with the United States canners on Puget Sound, a conference of Puget Sound and Fraser river canners was held at Seattle on December 21st, 1904, and a second conference on the 29th of that month, which resulted in memorials being forwarded urging immediate action by Canada, conditional on similar action by the state of Washington.

4. Yes ; from the Victoria Board of Trade, New Westminster Board of Trade, British Columbia Fishermen's Union, City Council of New Westminster, J. H. Todd & Sons, Victoria ; Henry Doyle, Vancouver, and Richard Hall, M.P.P., delegated to Ottawa for such purpose.

5. No decision has yet been reached.

THE ATLANTIC FISHERIES.

Mr. GANONG asked :

1. Has the report of the committee appointed to investigate the Atlantic fisheries been received ?

2. If so, when was it received ?

3. Has the committee finished their work ? If not, when will they resume the investigation ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. No.

2. Answered by above.

3. The investigations on the ground have been finished.

VICTORIA, B.C.—COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Mr. SPROULE asked :

1. What was the date of the demise of A. R. Milne, C.M.G., collector of customs at the port of Victoria, B.C.?

2. Has the position of collector of customs at Victoria, rendered vacant by the death of Mr. Milne, been filled ?

3. If not, what is the reason of the delay in making the appointment ?

4. Who has been acting collector of customs at the port of Victoria since Mr. Milne's death?

5. Have any representations been made by public bodies in favour of the filling of the vacancy ?

6. If so, on whose behalf were these representations made ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Mr. Milne, the late collector, died on January 17, 1904. Mr. John C. Newbury, who was chief clerk under Mr. Milne, has been acting as collector since Mr. Milne's death. The question of appointing him permanently to the position is now before Council.

OTTAWA DRILL HALL.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked :

1. Is the government aware that the accommodation in the present Ottawa drill hall is regarded as totally inadequate for the purposes of the Ottawa brigade ?

2. Does the government know that by reason of this lack of accommodation the sergeant's mess of the 43rd regiment has for some time been compelled to occupy quarters in another portion of the city ?

3. Is the government aware that one or both of the present members for Ottawa, Messrs. Belcourt and Stewart, gave assurances during the last Dominion election campaign that a new drill hall would be erected in Ottawa in the near future if the Liberal government was sustained on the 3rd of November ?

4. Is it the intention of the government to give effect to the pre-election promises of Messrs. Belcourt and Stewart by placing a sum of money in the supplementary estimates for the next fiscal year, with a view to the erection of a new drill hall in Ottawa ?

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

1. While the accommodation in the present Ottawa drill hall is not all that could be desired, it compares favourably with that of other cities in the Dominion.

2. Yes ; and the government pays for the accommodation of the sergeants' mess of the 43rd regiment.

3. No.

4. The question of increased accommodation is under consideration.

LINDSAY DRILL HALL.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked :

Is it the intention of the government to erect a new drill hall in Lindsay for the use of the militia of the riding of Victoria and Haliburton ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). The matter is under consideration.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Partial report of the Auditor General.—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the remaining half ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, there is more to come.

Report of the Department of Justice respecting Penitentiaries—Hon. Chas. Fitzpatrick.

Mr. SPROULE.

LABOUR UNION LABELS.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Nanaimo) moved that the House go into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

That it is expedient to provide for the registration of labour union labels, and to provide pecuniary penalties for the unlawful use of such labels when so registered.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it will be necessary for me to occupy the time of the House for many minutes on this question, as the principle of this resolution has been before the House of Commons since 1897. Every session since that time, a Bill embodying this principle has been introduced, and in 1898, and again in 1900, the Bill was passed through the House ; but on each occasion it was rejected by the Senate. The people who consider that they have a grievance in connection with the desire to register union labels have made up their minds, since the House of Commons agrees to the principle of this Bill, and since the principle itself is so reasonable and fair, to press for this legislation as long as it is necessary to do so. In my opinion, the majority in the Senate at the present time will be quite prepared to confirm any legislation along these lines if the House of Commons passes it. The object of this legislation is very simple and plain : it is to provide for the registration of union labels. Now, union labels are more extensively used in Canada at the present time than the members of this House are perhaps aware. I have a list of manufacturing interests in Canada which are operating, and have operated for some time, under union labels, and I think it is necessary that these names should be placed on record, in view of the fact that the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the chief opponent of this measure, has fought it from the very beginning. In my opinion, they have very much misunderstood the object and operation of the Bill. I do not know that it is necessary for me to read all of these names. There are nearly 100 manufacturers in Canada, from Vancouver to Quebec, who are working harmoniously with the trades unions and using the union labels.

Maddocks & Company, 246 Spadina Ave., Toronto.
John Moses, 354 Spadina Ave., Toronto.
J. D. Hamilton, Stratford.
G. F. Kimberley, St. Catharines.
Havana Cigar Company, Toronto.
C. Blankstein, Berlin.
Weis Brothers, St. Catharines.
Timmons & McIlwain, St. Catharines.
James Crawford, St. Thomas.
Kressler & Kraen, Berlin (heartily in accord)
Guelph Cigar Company, Guelph.
John McHugh, St. Catharines.
Cuban Cigar Company, Galt.
William Atkins, London.

William H. Skelly, Galt.
M. K. Halloran, Brantford.
Begg Brothers, St. Catharines.
E. J. Winter, Brantford.
Charles F. Tansey, St. Catharines (would be beneficial to all).
B. Willberg & Company, New Westminster, B.C.
Geo. Levett, Stratford.
Inland Cigar Manufacturing Company of British Columbia, Kamloops, B.C.
Cuban Cigar Company, Toronto.
John Knowlton, 150 King Street East, Toronto
Kurtz & Company, Vancouver, B.C.
Tuckett & Company, Hamilton.
Spilling Brothers, Toronto.
Stratford Clothing Company.
John Watt & Son, Hamilton.
A. E. Buscombe, Hamilton.
J. W. Flemming, Galt.
McKinnon & Company, Galt.
J. G. Thomson, Hamilton.
G. L. Mullens, Hamilton.
C. R. Davison, Hamilton.
McPherson & Drope, Hamilton.
The 'Times,' Hamilton.
James Ennis & Company, Hamilton.
John J. Burns, Hamilton.
Duncan & Company, Hamilton.
J. P. Macleod, Hamilton.
Hamilton Printing Company, Hamilton.
The 'Expositor,' Brantford.
John Watt & Son, Hamilton.
Petition from Vancouver, B. C., merchant tailors, seven merchants.
'Herald' Printing Company, Hamilton.
James A. Cox, printer, Hamilton.
McRae & McDonald, tailors, Vancouver, B.C.
Adam Cook & Company, printers, Hamilton.
Petition from tailors, Toronto, six sign.
W. & D. Dineen, hatters, Toronto.
'Pioneer' Publishing Company, Phœnix, B.C
The 'Evening Sun,' Columbia, B.C.
Grand Forks 'News-Gazette,' Grand Forks, B.C.
T. Lewis & Company, Montreal (cigars).
A. LaRue, Montreal (cigars).
Martin Brothers, Montreal (cigars).
J. A. Allard, Sherbrooke, Que. (cigars).
Empey & Company, Brockville (cigars).
The Happy Four Cigar Company, Montreal.
Unique Cigar Company, Montreal.
Hart & Morris Cigar Company, Montreal.
Robt. Raw & Company, Hamilton.
L. V. Hodd, Montreal (cigars).
E. N. Cuson & Company, Montreal (cigars).
Pelletier & Company, Montreal (cigars).
Girardin & Company, Montreal (cigars).
L. Z. Boudreau, printers, Montreal.
A. P. Pigeon, printers, Montreal.
List of 318 firms using shoe labels.
Co-operative Broom Company, Berlin, Ont.
Jones Brothers, Woodstock (cigars).

This list comprises some 90 firms doing business in Canada who have been working harmoniously with the trades unions, and all that they ask is that these labels should be registered. If a manufacturing firm agrees to work with a union the placing of the union label on its goods is an indication that the union is perfectly satisfied with the conditions under which the men work. But should there be a manufacturer across the street, who is a competitor and not prepared to work in harmony with the union, there is still nothing to prevent him fraudulently using the union label on his goods and the union has no remedy. The object of my resolution is to enable any trades union to apply, in the name of some of its officials to the Department of Agriculture and have any particular design adopted by it registered in the names of its officials. I have in my possession some letters from manufacturers with regard to this matter.

Mr. HAGGART. Cannot any person have a label registered at present ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I am not aware that he can. As a matter of fact the unions did try to get amendments to the Trades and Marks Act for the purpose of accomplishing this, but the Senate threw out the Bill as they did not consider it wise to interfere with the Act.

Mr. CLARE. What difference between this Bill and the one that went through this House.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. The Bill I propose to introduce is not an amendment to the Trades and Marks Act, but a separate and distinct Bill providing for the registration of labels.

Mr. CLARE. Was the Bill before the House last year ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. This is an exact copy of it.

Mr. CLARE. Was it thrown out by the Senate ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. It only passed its first reading in this House and was laid over with a large number of Bills for the purpose of shortening the session.

Mr. CLARE. But did you not say it was thrown out by the Senate ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Not the Bill of last year, but a Bill introduced in 1901, providing for an amendment to the Trades and Marks with the same object.

Mr. GANONG. Does the hon. gentleman say that you cannot now register a label under the present law ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I understand it is not possible to register a Trades Union mark at present. The late Mr. Bertram, who was formerly member for Toronto Centre, and a very large manufacturer, introduced a Bill to the same effect in 1898 and had it passed through this House. I would ask permission to read a short extract from what he then said :

Instead of raising objections to a union workman using a label or mark, I think it should be encouraged, for the simple reason that the fact of the goods they manufacture bearing such a label or mark is an incentive to them to produce a higher and better class of goods : otherwise the label would be of no value to them. I am satisfied that the evils resulting from this practice as indicated by the speeches of some

of the honourable members of the Senate are entirely imaginary.

Again Mr. Levitt, manufacturer of cigars in Stratford, Ontario, writes as follows, in answer to a request from a labour union :

I take the opportunity as a manufacturer of union-made cigars, to offer my full support to the passing of such a Bill (that is, our present Bill D.). It would not only mean a protection to the union, but also to the employer who is using the same and paying a fair living wage to his employees. It is something that is greatly needed, as it not only protects employers and employees, but the public at large from unscrupulous manufacturers. Many of the non-union-made goods are made by child labour or the employees receive such small wages that it makes them anything but admirable citizens to have in our midst. Wishing you every success in your undertaking and that the members now in session at Ottawa will look on the passing of said Act as a benefit to all.

I would like to read the following opinions from large manufacturers :

We beg to state that we are in favour of the granting of such legislation, as we are of the opinion union labour being done by skilled mechanics is justified in the issuing of a mark or token attached to the product of such labour designating it in union labour. Wishing you success.—Simmons & McIlwain Manufacturers, St. Catharines, Ont.

We heartily endorse your efforts.—Maddocks & Co., Mfrs., Toronto.

In answer to your favour, whether registration of labels should be granted to union labels, I should say decidedly yes, as I can in no way see that the granting of such a right to labour would interfere with those of others, and further, in my experience of 30 years, I find that the better conditions obtaining in union establishments, as to wages, hours, &c., have a decided tendency to draw the most skilled workmen to those factories, and I see no reason why this should not be expressed in the form of a union label attached to the product of such labour.—M. K. Halloran, Brantford, Ont.

We will state that during our ten years of cigar manufacturing in Ontario it has been our experience that protection to the union label means less child labour, better sanitary conditions and a great preventive to the unwholesome conditions now existing in many of the unfair factories. Consequently we appeal to the government to protect the union label in every particular.—Beggs Bros., St. Catharines, Ont.

We are pleased to learn that application has been made to the government providing for legislation for registration of union labels, and trust that the government will look upon it in a favourable light, and grant your petition. As we have used the union label for years, we know that it is a good thing in protecting trained and efficient workmen, and the public, against sweat shops, child labour, &c.—Kurtz & Company, manufacturers, Vancouver, B.C.

We consider that our employees are entitled to have their work distinguished by their label, and that label protected by law.—The Geo. E. Tuckett & Sons Company, Limited, Hamilton, Ont.

We are heartily in sympathy with your movement.—The Stratford Clothing Company, Limited.

We have no doubt that the passing of an Act would have a good effect on every one concerned. —Spilling Brothers, Toronto.

We are heartily in accord and hope your efforts will be successful.—Inland Cigar Manufacturing Company, of Kamloops, B.C.

We are favourable to the use of the union label, because it represents a better class of work produced under fairer conditions of labour.—The Times Printing Company, Hamilton, Ont.

I thoroughly approve of the Bill now before the Dominion parliament authorizing the registration of union labels by the organizations concerned.—The Expositor, Brantford, Ont.

I have a large number of letters from these manufacturing interests that are working with the unions in the application of the union label, agreeing that some provision should be made for the registration of the label.

In asking for this legislation, we are not asking for anything new. Only after very serious consideration would I bring before this House any proposition for which no precedent could be given. This legislation was passed in England twelve years ago. In that country, the unions connected with any manufacturing interest can create a design, have it registered as a trades union label under the Copyright Act. And I have here a list of the states of the neighbouring union in which this principle of the union label is established by law, and in that list are the names of no less than thirty-one states. The Bill I propose to introduce is an exact copy of the law that has passed these state legislatures and has been in operation for years. These facts, I think, should be a sufficient guarantee to members of this House, that there is nothing in this legislation that would prejudice the rights or interest of the public.

As I say, the chief opposition to the registration of the union label in the past has emanated from the Canadian Manufacers' Association. The Canadian Manufacturers' Association make no discrimination in their opposition to this class of legislation. With them it is not a question of whether the principle of a measure is or is not important; but, as can be seen by their weekly journal, they oppose every kind of legislation that has for its object the bringing about of better conditions for the industrial classes.

An hon. MEMBER. Gammon.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. That is the fact, whatever the hon. gentleman may say. And to prove that it is a fact, I may remind the House that the Canadian Manufacturers' Association have legislative committees which visit all the legislatures of the Dominion, including this parliament. And, last year, when a Bill was proposed in the legislature of the province of Quebec em-

bodying the principle that has been established in the law of England for ten or fifteen years, the well-known principle of compensation for workmen, the committee of the association appeared and bitterly opposed that Bill and secured its defeat. The Canadian Manufacturers' Association want high protection for the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and absolute free trade for everybody else. I quite understand that it may have been necessary and wise on their part to oppose certain extreme legislation; but they do not discriminate; they oppose whether the legisation is reasonable or not.

Now, before I take my seat, I wish to refer to two or three objections that have been brought forward by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association to this measure. The first is that it would be injurious to the manufacturers of this country. Well, for my part, I do not wish to do anything to injure our manufacturers; I will not be the promoter of any legislation or of any principle that will injure the manufacturing interests of this country. But I am sure the manufacturers have not given the consideration to this matter that it deserves or they would not view it as they do. Under the legislation I propose, the label cannot be used without the consent of the manufacturer himself. The Bill is entirely permissive. For instance, if the Cigar Makers Union create a design and have it registered under the law, and they come to the manufacturer, the owner of the industry in which they work, and say : We are perfectly content with the conditions under which we work, and, if you like you can place this label upon your product—if the manufacturer declines, that is an end of the matter; the label cannot be used at all.

Mr. SPROULE. But would not the legislation be a means to enable them to boycott the manufacturer ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I was just coming to that, for this also is one of the extraordinary arguments put forward by the Manufacturers' Association. Unions using the label under this proposed law could not carry on a boycott against any manufacturing interest any more than they can to-day. If a manufacturer to-day refuses to work with the union, there is an opportunity to boycott him. But it is not done. This Bill provides no machinery that will give the unions a better opportunity to boycott a manufacturer than exists to-day. It is necessary for the members of this House to have the Bill in their hands before they can discuss the subject fully; but I am convinced that when hon. members have an opportunity to read the Bill, they will agree that the Manufacturers' Association, who are fighting this principle so strongly, have an erroneous conception of the legislation proposed. I move the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. SPROULE. Can a factory use that union label without being compelled to have nothing but the union labour in its employ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. There is nothing in the Bill to compel a factory to employ nothing but union labour. In fact, the union label could be operated without a union at all. If the workmen in a certain factory agree that the conditions under which they work are good, and unite for the purpose of having a registered label, that is all that would be necessary.

Mr. SPROULE. Would this apply to the Government Printing Bureau ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I do not know what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is driving at.

Mr. SPROULE. I asked what I regard as a perfectly fair question. Just as we wished to know whether the Railway Act would apply to the Intercolonial Railway, so we wish to know whether this Bill will apply to the Government Printing Bureau.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I did not catch the hon. gentleman's question. There is nothing in the Bill to make it specifically applicable to government work. But there is no objection to that, and I would be glad to see that provision inserted, so far as I am concerned.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. Perhaps it is because I have not paid particular attention to this matter, but from the hon. gentleman's statement, I do not clearly understand the position. I do not understand why any corporation have not a right to register a trade mark or a design, and why they have not a right to enter into any arrangement they choose to make with parties who are manufacturing any article, as to whether they shall use the design. I do not think there is anything in the law at present that prevents that. I think that the Registration, or Design Act is broad enough to allow it. But if the object which the hon. gentleman has in his mind is to allow other than corporations, men who are not responsible parties, to register a design, in order that he may receive a benefit from it without being liable in any way to penalties to other parties—if that is the object, it would be objectionable. But if the object of the hon. gentleman in introducing the resolution is merely to give to a corporate body the right to register a design and to enter into arrangements with a manufacturer to use that design if he likes, there cannot be any possible objection to it.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. But the application covers every organized body. The hon. gentleman must remember that the majority of trades unions in this country are not incorporated. The application of this label will be allowed to all these bodies.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Would the hon. gentleman say whether similar legislation has been introduced in any other country?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Yes, legislation of this kind was passed twelve years ago in England, under the Copyright Act, covering every union incorporated or otherwise. The same provision is also made in an Act of the Congress of the United States.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). As I understand, the chief object of this legislation is to provide penalties against the unlawful use of this label. I would be disposed to agree with the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart); I do not see any necessity for it. But as I understand the principal object of the Bill is to provide penalties against the unlawful use of such a label. We are at the present moment committing ourselves to nothing in passing this resolution, and until we have the Bill before us founded upon this resolution, it is not possible to discuss the matter intelligently.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM. This Bill has been before this House on a good many occasions. It has passed this House on two or three different occasions, and was sent to the Senate, where it was thrown out, both when the Conservative party were in power and since the Liberal party have been in power. It seems to me a useless waste of time to introduce legislation of this kind from year to year as long as the government look upon it so unfavourably as they have done in the past. So far as the Bill itself is concerned, I do not wish to discuss it at this moment, but it strikes me that the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) will make very little headway with his Bill, judging from the tone of the House at the present moment. I think the government ought to give an expression of opinion as to whether they are favourably disposed towards the passing of this legislation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We must see the Bill first.

Mr. INGRAM. It is the same old Bill.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time and agreed to.

Mr. RALPH SMITH moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 10) respecting Labour Union Labels.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing the value of vegetables imported from the United States, and entered at the ports of Montreal and Toronto, during the fiscal year ending the 30th of June, 1904; giving separately the values for the first and last six months of said year. Also a statement showing the value of canned, preserved or dried vegetables entered at said ports for the fiscal year; and the amounts of duties collected at both ports in the above cases.—Mr. Monk—by Mr. Bergeron.

For copies of all circulars or advices issued by the Intercolonial Railway governing the transport of hay, under the free transport Order in Council of 1904, and of all certificates signed by municipalities or individuals to whom hay was delivered thereunder.—Mr. Foster.

COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND MAINLAND.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the government to the delay which occurs in the transmission of the mails from Prince Edward Island to the mainland. We find only to-day on the files in the reading room the newspapers published in the island a week ago, which means that for nearly a week the people of the province are without mail communication with the mainland. This I know is an old complaint, we have suffered from it for years. It seems to me that it was the duty of the government, seeing that the winter boats were unable to effect a crossing to have the route at the Capes in readiness. There appears to be the same unreadiness every year, to the great loss of the people of the province.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Will my hon. friend pardon me? If he has any lengthy remarks to make, I would suggest to him that it would be more in order if he were to reserve them until the House is moved into committee. Of course, if he only wishes to put a question, there can be no objection to it.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN. The question is whether the government are going to make further provision for improving the unsatisfactory communication between the province and the mainland? We have two boats, the 'Stanley' and the 'Minto.' The 'Stanley' is now getting very old. Every one knows that the 'Stanley' is not able to perform the work. I would like to know if the government intend to proceed with the construction of a new boat and if those yearly troubles are to be remedied.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to hear that the service is not satisfactory. I was led to believe that is was more satisfactory than ever before, but if it has become unsatisfactory by reason of the fact of one of the boats getting old the matter will have to receive some consideration. Perhaps latter on I will give some answer to my hon. friend on this matter.

ICE JAM IN THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER (Dundas). Mr. Speaker. before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to refer to a matter that I think should have the attention of the gov-

ernment. In the St. Lawrence river, below the village of Morrisburg, where I live, there is a very serious blockade of ice about seven miles long, the water has risen some six feet and unless something is done to avert it, serious damage will be occasioned to a great deal of property belonging to people who live adjacent to the river. In 18 years, I think, this is the fourth serious ice jam they have had in that vicinity, and once or twice considerable damage has been done. The dangerous feature of the present blockade is that it has occurred so early in the winter that if the cold weather continues and a heavy fall of snow comes it is difficult to tell what may happen. Previous to this the ice jams have occurred later in the winter and the spring coming soon after the commencement of the block the ice rotted and broke away. But, this ice jam commenced to form on the 9th of the month and now it extends from Woodlands to west of Aultsville, the channel being closed for a distance of seven miles. The snow comes down and forms what is called anchor ice and this blocks the river. The water is rising and endangering property along the banks of the river. It seems that the ice forms in the bays, and when it breaks it floats across the river, catches on the opposite point and then the formation of a bridge takes place. I was told by an individual who seems to have the facts in his possession that the ice has been cut on the American side in the bay and allowed to swing round. I do not know as to the truth of this statement, but this gentlemen told me that a day or two ago, and if it is so there ought to be some understanding between the Canadian government and the American government that this thing should not be allowed to reoccur. Those who understand the remedy say that if piers were built in the bay on the American side, the ice would not float out and this danger would be averted.

I take this opportunity of bringing this matter to the attention of the government. They ought to have an individual visit the place and see what the conditions are anyway.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 2) to Amend the Railway Act, 1903.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. (Translation.) I notice by the Orders of the Day that this Bill is not yet printed in the French language. In this case, I would advise the promoter of the Bill not to move the second reading until we have the French copy before us. It is desirable that we should have this Bill in French so that we may know its purport before discussing it.

Mr. LANCASTER. I may say in regard to that matter that I was informed by the translator to-day, who came to me for the purpose of telling me, that although the Orders of the Day showed that the Bill was not printed in French it was actually printed in both languages, and he wanted me to know it, so that I would not hesitate to go on with it this afternoon. The French translator said that although the Orders of the Day did not show it to have been printed in French it was as a matter of fact printed and distributed in both languages and he thought it was right I should know it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I can only accept the paper as I find it in my hands.

Mr. HAGGART. Several times Bills when printed in French and distributed, although not shown on the order paper, have been proceeded with.

Mr. LANCASTER. The French translator came to me in the library where I was looking up some books and said to me: 'Are you in charge of that Bill?' And when I told him that I was, he told me he thought it was right that I should know that the Bill had been printed in French and distributed several days ago, although the Orders of the Day did not show it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no object in delaying this Bill whatever. If the Bill is printed in French I do not see why the matter should not be proceeded with, but, of course, Mr. Speaker, may only have the official paper before him and it may not show that the Bill has been printed in French. Can we not take up the next item and in the meantime ascertain whether the Bill is printed in French?

Mr. LANCASTER. I have been asked to allow the next Bill, to amend the Act respecting the Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships, to stand.

Mr. SPEAKER. It appars from a copy produced that the Bill is printed in French. The hon. gentleman may proceed.

Mr. LANCASTER. Mr. Speaker, this Bill is to remedy a state of affairs, which, I think, every hon. gentleman in this House will agree must be remedied in some way. The Bill is aimed at protecting the lives of and preventing injuries to people upon highway crossings where railways cross upon the level of the highway. The law was laid down decisively a year ago last autumn by the Supreme Court of Canada in the case of McKay vs. the Grand Trunk Railway, which practically renders the section which I am seeking to amend by this Bill nugatory and of no effect at all. The section which I am dealing with is a section which has always provided for protection of some kind to people upon the highway on the rail level in thickly populated portions of cities, towns and villages and that legislation has existed since 1857. The first enactment was in 20 Vic., chap. 12, sec. 11:

——and that no locomotive or railway engine shall pass in or through any thickly peopled portion of any city, town or village at a speed greater than six miles per hour, unless the track is properly fenced.

That enactment was continued year after year in every consolidation of the railway law until 1892, when it was changed by substituting for the words 'unless the track is properly fenced' the words 'unless the track is fenced in the manner prescribed by this Act.' Hon. gentlemen will see that there was no practical change although there was a verbal change.

Mr. HAGGART. Is that the law now?

Mr. LANCASTER. Practically. The Supreme Court decided in the case of McKay vs. the Grand Trunk that it meant, that if they fenced the track against the adjoining owners of land and did not provide any protection upon the highway at all, they could still run as fast as they liked unless an order was obtained from the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, whose place is now taken by the Board of Railway Commissioners. The law was changed verbally, but not in effect in 1903, in consolidating the Railway Act so as to read:

No train shall pass in or through any thickly peopled portion of any city, town or village, at a speed greater than ten miles an hour,——

You will observe that they were permitted to run at the rate of ten miles an hour instead of six.

——unless the track is fenced or properly protected in the manner prescribed by this Act, or unless permission is given by some regulation or order of the board. The board may limit such speed in any case to any rate which it deems expedient.

Mr. HAGGART. What clause is that?

Mr. LANCASTER. Clause 227 of the Consolidated Railway Act, 1903, chap. 58. It is quite obvious that the decision of the Supreme Court still applies, the only difference as you will see being in the wording of the Act. They are not permitted to run at a greater speed than ten miles an hour unless the track is fenced as required by the Act, or as it now reads 'unless the track is fenced or properly protected in the manner prescribed in this Act.' This matter was discussed at great length last session when this Bill was sent to the Railway Committee and back again to the House, but nothing was done to remedy the evil. It is a very serious evil and the number of lives that are being lost and the number of people who are being injured in cities, towns and villages, by railways at unprotected railway crossings is very great. Although this Bill did go to the Railway Committee and although it was discussed in the House last session, I am afraid I shall be compelled in the discharge of my duty here to go into this matter a little more fully than I otherwise would, owing to the fact that this is a new parliament and that many of the gentlemen who are here were not here last session and would perhaps desire to hear this discussed at greater length than would be necessary if I were speaking only to those who were here last session. The decision of the Supreme Court is that all the protection we can get under this section is a special protection which the Railway Committee might order. It is true that in the case decided, the Supreme Court refer to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, because at that time the Railway Commission was not in existence, and the Railway Committee of the Privy Council had the same jurisdiction as is now possessed by the Railway Commission. The Railway Commission is bound by exactly the same rules as those laid down by the Supreme Court, that is that they can give any protection they like at any place or any kind of crossing, but according to the decision in this case unless you get a special order for special protection at every crossing we are entitled to no protection whatever, at that place of intersection where the danger exists and where people are being injured or killed. This is the way the section has been construed by the Supreme Court as will be seen in Volume 34 of Supreme Court Reports, in the judgment of Mr. Justice Davies who gives his decision at page 94. I shall read one or two extracts from that decision in order to show that I am not taking a wrong view of that decision. I shall, however, preface this by saying that the effect of the decision is, that unless the track is fenced as against adjoining owners the company is liable, but if it is fenced as against adjoining orders, then there is no liability for an accident at a crossing no matter how fast the train may run unless an order has been obtained for special protection at the particular crossing. Mr. Justice Davies said:

The negligence which did cause or lead to the accident was found by the jury to be the speed at which the train was running over the street crossing and the absence at such crossing of a flagman or gates.

The contention of the plaintiff is that the speed at which the train was running was a violation of the statutory provision of the Railway Act because it was of greater speed than six miles an hour through a thickly peopled portion of the town of Forest, the railway track at the crossing of the street not being fenced as he contended in the manner required by the Act. The plaintiff further says that even if the Act has been complied with as regards fencing, the rate of speed in the absence of gates or watchman at the crossing was a matter at common law open to the jury to pass upon, and if they found it, under the circumstances, a dangerous rate and a cause of the accident the defendant company would be liable.

The Court of Appeal reached the conclusion that the proper construction of the statutory provisions with regard to the fencing prescribed

at the crossings and the rate of speed at which a train could run through a thickly peopled portion of any city, town or village, requires either a fencing across the highway at the crossing, so retaining the travelling public in a place of safety while the train is passing, or the stationing of a watchman or the maintenance of a reasonable fence sufficient for the purpose, or the reduction of the speed of the train to the permitted maximum of six miles an hour. As the company had not adopted any of these precautions which the court decided were obligatory by statute they held it liable under the finding of the jury and dismissed the appeal.

I pause here to remark, Mr. Speaker, that I think nine out of ten lawyers in Ontario at all events understood the law to be as the Court of Appeal pronounced it, that this section was not idle, was not meant to be nonsense, was not placed on the statute-book and reiterated from year to year from 1857 for the mere sake of employing someone to print a few more words; that it was intended to mean something and did mean something, and that it laid down the rule that a train should not exceed six miles an hour unless the track was properly fenced, and that a proper fence would be a fence to protect the people in regard to the subject-matter of the section, which is the protection of life upon the highway, because the section is dealing only with the danger of travelling along a highway where railways intersect the highway at rail-level. Every one believed that the Court of Appeal of Ontario decided that the section meant this, and as the railway had exceeded six miles an hour and had provided no protection therefore they were liable.

I am here to say that we must be practical in this House, and that our legislation must deal with things as they are. You may argue that a railway does not want to kill people, but unless you pass a law making a railway liable the railway will not worry much whether it does or does not kill people. There is no sentiment about a railway except the wish to make all the money they can, and they will run their trains as fast as the public demand in order to make them pay and will not bother about any ones life unless you have a law which will take some money from their pockets, and unless there is imposed on the railways a liability, definite, clear and certain which can be enforced without the necessity of having to go across to England as the parties in the McKay case started to do; they will not adopt precautions. A person injured or the relatives of a person killed should be able to recover damages as in other cases of negligence when the company does what it ought not to do, and unless you have such a definite and clear responsibility as I have indicated you can get no practical benefit in regard to the regulating of the speed of trains.

Mr. Justice Davies in reversing the judgment of the Court of Appeal goes on to say:

A careful reading and consideration of the whole Railway Act and its general scheme and purpose has lead me to the conclusion that the construction placed upon these sections by the Court of Appeal in this case was not the proper one, and that the sections relied upon by that court in its judgment do not either require or authorize railway companies, without the previous order of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, to fence highways or place gates across them where they are crossed at the level by the railway, or compel them to place flagmen at these crossings to warn the public when trains are crossing.

In my judgment parliament has by the 187th section of the Railway Act vested in the Railway Committee of the Privy Council the exclusive power and duty of determining the character and extent of the protection which should be given to the public at places where the railway track crosses a highway at rail-level.

That brings us to the issue which is really the serious thing in this matter. According to that decision—and I am not here to say that it is not the correct construction of the law and a correct decision, although I have heard it questioned—it is a decision of the Supreme Court of Canada, and every court in Ontario and every other province is bound by that decision until it is reversed. It can be reversed in two ways, either by the judicial committee of the Privy Council in England or by parliament reversing it as I am indicating in my amendment. The issue is: Is it intended that there shall be no more protection in the thickly peopled portion of cities, towns and villages than there is anywhere else? That is what that decision amounts to, that is unless you get a special order for a special protection at every street in every part of every city, town and village where life is endangered by the rapid running of trains; they can run as fast as they like, can exceed the statutory limit which used to be six miles and is now ten miles an hour, can absolutely ignore all rights of the people and yet evade all liability. The section is nugatory, because it is dealing entirely with the protection of people at crossings where railway trains run through thickly peopled districts.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the wording of the section in the present Act, the Act of 1903, similar to that of the Act on which the Supreme Court gave its decision?

Mr. LANCASTER. The operative part is the same but the statute of 1903 has some other words added explicitly saying that the board can order any protection they like and regulate the rate of speed. But I point out that the only serious objection made to this section of the Bill in the Railway Committee last year by the representatives of the railway was that that could be accomplished by other sections of the Railway Act. It was pointed out that there is a portion of the Railway Act devoted to the powers of the board and that they have ample power

to order protection without these words. The effect of the legislation is exactly as it was when the Supreme Court decided this case a year ago last December.

The result is that in the laws of this country, as construed by the Supreme Court of Canada, there is no protection to-day for the public in the thickly-peopled portions of cities, towns and villages, unless you get a special order from the Board of Railway Commissioners in each particular case. Now, what does that involve ? In the first place, every city, town or village has to make a special application in regard to every crossing—practically to bring a lawsuit against the railway company in regard to every crossing where there is not now protection, and the railway company can oppose the application and fight it out here in the city of Ottawa before the Board of Railway Commissioners ; and then there may be an appeal from that body to the Governor in Council. There must be a separate application in regard to every crossing. We have no law to meet the case unless my amendment, or some amendment like it, is adopted. You have to file plans and bring your witnesses and fight out your application for each particular crossing. That, I repeat, was not the intention of parliament. In my opinion, the Court of Appeal properly construed the object of parliament in making the law from 1857, when it laid it down that in the thickly-peopled portions of every city, town and village the railways should not exceed a speed of six miles an hour unless they afforded some kind of protection. By this section of the Act parliament intended to deal with that class of case which is so common that it requires a general rule. The thickly-peopled portions of cities, towns and villages require more protection than the open country, where the same obstructions to the view do not exist, and where there are not the noises which prevent approaching trains being heard. I said at the outset, and I repeat it, that there are too many lives being lost and too many people being injured by the railways at these crossings—a great many more than are necessary. This would not be the case if the railways were required to put in some protection. My Bill of last session was sent to the Railway Committee against my desire, but by the decision of the majority of the House ; and what were the objections urged against it there ? There were three objections, two of which, I am glad to say, I have been able to avoid by my present amendment. The first was this. I thought we should define what a thickly-peopled portion of a city, town or village was, that is we should say, within the incorporated limits of every city, town and village. But it was said that there were sections within the corporate limits of every city, town and village which were not so thickly-peopled as to make that necessary—that there were open spaces where crossings did not require any greater protection than in the country. And so the section, as I propose to amend it, will read :

> No trains shall pass in or through any thickly peopled portion of any city, town or village, at a speed greater than ten miles an hour, unless the track is fenced and properly protected in the manner prescribed by this Act.

My amendment is first to strike out the word 'or' and insert the word 'and' instead. By the decision of the Supreme Court the railway company has only to fence against the adjoining owners ; and unless you get a special order from the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, or from the Board of Railway Commissioners, you are not entitled to any other protection. I contend that unless the word 'or' is struck out and the word 'and' is substituted, the railway company is not obliged to provide protection so long as the track is fenced against the adjoining owners, though that may have nothing to do with the proper protection of the crossing. I cannot help saying that I think it was unintentional on the part of the Hon. Mr. Blair, who was in charge of the Railway Bill during its passage through this House, that the word 'or' was used instead of the word 'and' ; because, according to the decision of the Supreme Court, it does not compel the railway company to afford any protection at the crossing at all. Even if you get an order from the Railway Commission requiring the company to erect gates or put a watchman on, or afford some other kind of protection, and the company does not comply with that order, but only fences the track against the adjoining owners, it is not liable. Therefore, I propose, by my amendment, that the railway company shall be bound to fence the track against the adjoining owners and shall also be bound to afford protection at the crossings in whatever way the law directs.

The second objection urged against my Bill of last year in the Railway Committee was that it made provision only for a watchman or a flagman, who was, I thought, the best possible kind of protection—not an inanimate gate, but a man who, on the approach of a train, could direct the traveller's attention to it, and say : 'Hold on, the express is coming down in a minute or two.'

That would be the best protection. But it was argued by the usual representatives of the railways in the Railway Committee that it would be a fearful expense to provide these watchmen, that there were cheaper ways of affording protection, such as automatic or other gates. They said my Bill should not pass, because it limited the protection to watchmen. The Minister of Railways raised that objection in this House, and said there were better means of protection than watchmen. True, these gentlemen did not suggest or point out any other remedy. But I recognize the force of the suggestion that the railway companies

should have the right to provide either gates or watchmen, as they see fit.

I have given into them this year, and am only asking that the railway companies should provide either watchmen or gates. Where they put in gates, they need not employ watchmen, but if they do not want to use gates they must employ watchmen. They have to do either the one thing or the other or else keep their speed down to ten miles an hour. If they keep their speed below ten miles an hour then they will not be responsible should they run into anybody, and they need not put up a gate or employ watchmen. The railway companies, however, urged very strongly that they must run at a fast rate of speed, and consequently the minimum rate was raised from six to ten miles an hour. I am willing to take that rate as the minimum, but if they run beyond that rate they must provide some protection. In every case, the accident is due to the fast rate of speed which prevents people from seeing or hearing a train coming in time to avoid it. In the village of Grimsby, two years ago, three young people who were walking home from church at eight o'clock in the evening, shortly before Christmas, were hurled into eternity by a train which was running over fifty miles an hour. The train hands admitted a speed of forty-five miles and we may safely conclude that it must have been at least fifty. These young people were waiting for a freight train to cross, and were struck by another train coming in an opposite direction. There could be no suggestion of suicide, they were all trying to keep out of the way, but could not see or hear the coming train in time to avoid it. Had it been going at the rate of ten miles an hour they would certainly have escaped. In the Mackay case the rate of speed was about twenty miles an hour, which the jury found unreasonable, and if it were not for the construction put upon the law by the Supreme Court, the verdict would have stood. This matter is one of great importance. Last year my hon. friend the Minister of Justice acknowledged that there was a grievance and that something should be done, but another twelve months have rolled around and nothing has been done, and nothing will be done until you force the railways to furnish adequate protection under severe penalty. We frequently have the contention raised that all railways should be compelled to get off the level—that they should either go underneath or bridge over the highways. Were I to go that far, I would be told that that would be imposing on the railway companies an enormous expenditure. Mr. Justice Davies, in giving his decision, acknowledged that in England the law is what we would like to have it here, but he added that as the population there is more dense and the railways longer in existence, greater precautions are required. He went on to say:

No negligence was found or proved with regard to the fencing and if my construction of the Act is correct there was none, it being admitted that on this construction the fences were all right. That being so the rate of speed at which the train could run across the level highway crossing was a matter solely for the determination of the Railway Committee, as was also the determination of the kind, character and extent of the protection which either by gates, watchman or otherwise, should be provided for the travelling public.

In England the railways are not allowed to run at all on the level across a public highway. I do not say that we should go that far, although I know that if I did I would be more popular with many newspapers, which take that view. There is another view to be considered, and that is the desirability of having some clearness and certainty in our legislation. People should not be compelled to go from court to court and even across to England in order to find out what an Act of parliament really does mean. We want our legislation so drafted that any man of ordinary intelligence can tell without doubt what is the law. But in this Mackay case, what happened? Mr. Justice McMahon, a pre-eminently able judge, decided in favour of the plaintiff, and his decision was upheld by the full Court of Appeals of Ontario, comprising five judges. Mr. Justice Girouard of the Supreme Court took the same view, but the other four judges of that court reversed the decision. It appears now that the Mackay case has been settled. It appears that when the plaintiff undertook to appeal to the Privy Council, the railway company thought it better to settle his claim rather than run the risk of having the decision of the Supreme Court reversed. They knew the case, and they were afraid that the Privy Council would decide that the Court of Appeal in Ontario was right. They did not want the judgment disturbed, and they paid the claim. But the effect of it is that, even though a person is killed or injured by a train running at more than ten miles an hour through the thickly peopled portion of any city, town or village, his administrators or he cannot recover damages unless a special order was passed for protection of the crossing at which the injury took place.

Suppose that a man is accustomed to drive into this city by Wellington street. And suppose that, on Wellington street, there is a railway crossing which is protected by gate or watchman under order of the Railway Commission. But one morning the man, instead of driving in by Wellington street, drives in by another road where also there is a railway crossing. Is it not reasonable that he should expect the same protection and to be stopped at that crossing by a gate or watchman as in the case of the road to which he is accustomed ? May he not fairly suppose that streets leading into the same city will

be protected in the same way, and that the lives of passers-by will not be dependent upon their knowledge of the special local conditions ? To whom does the highway belong ? Who has the first right in the highway ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The King's subjects.

Mr. LANCASTER. Certainly, the King's subjects, as my hon. friend says. If you draw an indictment against a person for obstructing the highway, you charge him with preventing His Majesty's liege subjects from having free access to and free passage on and along that highway. The whole object of the highway is to benefit the King's subjects. When, to open up the country, we encourage railways to build and allow them to cross highways on the level, we give them license to use the highway—not to control or obstruct it. The people passing along the highway have the right to pass there safely. If the railway is given a license to cross, it should be compelled by parliament to make the crossing as little unsafe as possible. Of course, it cannot be made absolutely safe, but nothing that can be suggested by any person in this House or out of it should be left undone to make the highway safe for the people who have to use it.

The section as it stands means nothing—it has no practical effect. Crossings need not be protected unless there is a special order of the Railway Commission to that effect. And, before such an order can be had, what must be done ? I have here the rules of the Railway Commission, issued recently. They are rules such as those of the High Court of Justice of Ontario. You must practically make out a statement of claim, employing a lawyer to draught it so that it will not be demurrable, but will stand attacks from the keenest railway lawyers; this must be served and filed; they put in their answers; you put in a reply; and a time must be fixed for the hearing, and you must come to Ottawa and press and try the case. I contend that the members of this House ought to be able to pass a section such as the one that I propose that will cover the cases and give effectual protection to the people without all that expense and trouble.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). The consideration of this section of the Railway Act has claimed a good deal of the time of this House in a former parliament, and certainly consumed a great deal of the time of the committee to which the Bill at that time was referred. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) makes too much of the idea that if one wants the Railway Commissioners to deal with this subject, which is entirely within their jurisdiction, he would have to come to Ottawa and make a special application in every case. I am surprised he has not referred to the Act which created the Commission. He certainly has not studied its provisions. Parliament, in its wisdom, delegated to the Railway Commission the powers which were formerly exercised by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, among them the power to deal with this subject of crossings. Section 227, which my hon. friend seeks to amend, states in very clear terms :

> No train shall pass in or through any thickly peopled portion of any city, town or village, at a speed greater than ten miles an hour, unless the track is fenced or properly protected in the manner prescribed by this Act, or unless permission is given by some regulation or order of the board. The board may limit such speed in any case to any rate which it deems expedient.

This section recognizes the jurisdiction and the duty of the Commissioners to deal with this point. And, when giving that power to the Commissioners, parliament saw fit to make further provision in connection with the exercise of the powers thus given. Under section 24 of the Railway Act, it is provided :

> The board may, of its own motion, or shall, upon the request of the minister, inquire into, hear and determine any matter or thing which, under this Act, it may inquire into, hear and determine, upon application or complaint, and with respect thereto shall have and may exercise the same powers as, upon any application or complaint, are vested in it by this Act.
>
> 2. Any power, or authority vested in the board under this Act, though not so expressed in this Act, be exercised from time to time, or at any time, as the occasion may require.

Section 23 of the Act, preceding the section I have just read, says:

> The board shall have full jurisdiction to inquire into, hear and determine any application by or on behalf of any party interested.

I need not take up the time of the House by reading the section, which recites the full powers of the board. But as will be seen by section 23, it was recognized by parliament that this matter could be dealt with outside and apart from any particular application; that in a sense it did not require an individual, or individuals, or even communities, to make application to the board; but that of its own motion the board could take into consideration the whole subject, and make special provision regarding this or that particular crossing. Now it would be absurd to expect that you could frame a section that would be properly applicable to every railway in this country, it would be absurd to require that it should be so applicable. Because we have railways and railways; we have railways in many sections of the country where there is only one train a day, we have other railways along which scores of trains pass daily. This House could not expect to frame a regulation or a section of the Act that would be applicable to all alike.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Why not ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Because the conditions are different, because circumstances do not require it; and under the law and policy adopted by this parliament in the Railway Act of 1903, they gave to this board the special power of dealing, or legislating, if you will, respecting the different crossings and different railways throughout the land. They practically gave the board the power of legislating, with the circumstances of each particular case before them; and the board, with full knowledge of the requirements and needs of the locality in question, can very easily and very readily frame a regulation or pass an order to meet the difficulty, and the circumstances and conditions of each case, removing any grievance and making the lives of the people safer. In this way the board could gain its object without doing any great injury, as would be the result if you had a hard and fast law applicable to every railway in the country. The Act says: 'The board may of its own motion, or shall upon the request of the minister' deal with any grievance arising with respect to any crossing. Previous to passing the Act of 1903, the usual course was to make application direct, I think, to the Department of Railways and Canals, and then these matters were referred to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. The evidence could be heard, either orally, or written documents could be placed before that committee dealing with the matter. They had full knowledge of all the circumstances, they could make special orders, and in that way this difficulty has been solved in the past. The law of 1903 merely created another tribunal, giving them even greater power, giving them full power to deal with these questions, and charging them with the duty of dealing with any alleged grievance after inquiring into all the circumstances of the case. Now last winter exception was taken to this fact because it required you to deal at once regarding the rate of speed. There is no one at all familiar with the running of railway trains who is not aware that there are towns and communities where the number of crossings is so great that it is necessary to take special care, that special safeguards should be provided, that special watchmen should be required; while a neighbouring crossing would not need the same care or attention. The conditions, I say, are different; and I think that parliament very wisely created a body to deal with this very question, a body that can have expert evidence before it, a body whose officers are charged with the duty of inquiring into grievances such as my hon. friend would seek to remedy by his amendment. Of course it is important in the public interest that great care should be taken by parliament in making regulations for railways that run through cities and towns. Parliament has recognized that, and has provided means whereby the public can be protected, and is protected, whereby the lives of the people are protected. It seems to me there could be no more efficient way of doing this than the mode that parliament has provided in this instance.

It is only two years ago that parliament decided on this policy of regulating railway crossings by a board of commissioners. That board has only been in existence a year and a half, and I think it has discharged its duties well and wisely, and has given very great satisfaction. I do not think my hon. friend has shown any cause why the powers of the Railway Commission should be in any way limited or restricted. There has been no good reason shown by him why we should take from them the right to regulate this very matter. You might as well say that here we shall have a special Act relating to freight tariffs. Provision is made whereby that commission can regulate freight and passenger tariffs. Surely that board is much more competent to deal with that matter, surely that board can deal with it much better than either this House or a committee of this House. The policy has been adopted. Why should it be changed? I think my hon. friend has entirely failed to give any good or substantial reason why it should be. We have listened to him with pleasure this year as we listened to him last year not merely on the floor of this House but in the Railway Committee room. He certainly entertained us and——

Mr. LANCASTER. He wants to convince not entertain you. Entertaining is no good.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend has entirely failed to convince us, but I was willing to recognize his success in entertaining us.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It was fine entertainment for that family of three people who were killed at St. Catharines.

Mr. EMMERSON. Unfortunate accidents occur unquestionably and I am not in any sense seeking to avoid protecting the public in respect to railway accidents. I am not doing that but I am endeavouring to point out that parliament has provided the machinery and the means whereby the public can be protected.

Mr. LANCASTER. The machinery is not working.

Mr. EMMERSON. The machinery is in excellent working order.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is not doing anything.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Act is there; the power is there. The question, of course, as to whether there could be a general section that would apply uniformly to the whole country I think is one that would be very difficult to solve.

Mr. HAGGART. What would ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It would be very difficult to have a general law affecting crossings and the speed of trains that would be applicable to the various conditions that are to be found in connection with the railways of Canada. There are always questions arising as to the interpretation of Acts of parliament. My hon. friend has read to us to-day the decision of the Supreme Court, and in that way he has demonstrated that able jurists differ as to the interpretation to be put upon statutes.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then why not make it clear ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Precisely ; we have made it clear. It is clear because we have given power to the Railway Commissioners to deal with the matter. They can make special order. Section 227 of the Railway Act specially says :

The board may limit such speed in any case to any rate which it deems expedient.

They may go below the ten miles an hour limit ; in fact, the board have every jurisdiction and control over speed, and under these conditions I do not see why we are called upon to in any way interfere or limit their powers in that respect. They can certainly deal with the special conditions and circumstances very much better than the members of this House can. If we could have every type of conditions, and if we could have all the circumstances relating to each particular crossing in the country, we might classify them and apply to certain conditions certain kinds of protection and safeguards while in reference to another classification of conditions there would be an entirely different set of safeguards.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. minister hold that the board can alter or amend by regulations or rules clause 227 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) understood me to make that statement he certainly misunderstood me.

Mr. HAGGART. I understood the hon. gentleman to say so.

Mr. EMMERSON. What I was trying to point out—perhaps I was doing it very imperfectly—was that the board have power to legislate in respect to every particular crossing in Canada in connection with every particular railway. They have complete power under that section 227 to go further than does my hon. friend with his amendment. Under section 227 the board can pass legislation in respect to the speed, they can legislate upon conditions, they can widen out their orders, they can impose terms and they can make the conditions more binding than even the section of my hon. friend. That in no way amends section 227, but when section 227 delegated and wisely delegated to the commissioners these legislative powers, because they are in a sense legislative powers and powers that can be exercised or legislation that can be enacted with a full knowledge of the conditions and circumstances, it enabled them more successfully to frame their regulations than we could by any general regulation such as is proposed by my hon. friend. Section 23 of the Railway Act provides :

The board shall have full jurisdiction to inquire into, hear and determine any application by or on behalf of any party interested ;

(a) Complaining that the company, or any person, has failed to do any act, matter or thing required to be done by this Act, or the Special Act, or by any regulation, order or direction made thereunder, by the Governor in Council, the board, the minister, or any inspecting engineer, or has done or is doing any act, matter or thing contrary to, or in violation of this Act, or the Special Act, or any such regulation, order, or direction ;

(b) Requesting the board to make any order, or give any direction, sanction or approval, which by law it is authorized to make or give ;

And the board may order and require any company or person to do forthwith, or within or at any specified time, and in any manner prescribed by the board, so far as is not inconsistent with this Act, any act, matter or thing which such company or person is or may be required to do under this Act, or the Special Act, and may forbid the doing or continuing of any act, matter or thing which is contrary to this Act, or the Special Act, and shall have full jurisdiction to hear and determine all matters whether of law or of fact, and shall, as respects the attendance and examination of witnesses, the production and inspection of documents, the enforcement of its orders, the entry on and inspection of property, and other matters necessary or proper for the due exercise of its jurisdiction under this Act, or otherwise for carrying this Act into effect, have all such powers, rights and privileges as are vested in a Superior Court.

Now under that clause it will be recognized that parliament intended that this board should have ample power to not merely frame regulations, but to enforce them.

The decision of the board upon any question of fact and as to whether any company, municipality or person is, or is not, a party interested within the meaning of this section, shall be binding and conclusive upon all companies and persons and in all courts.

My hon. friend goes on to say that you must make application, you must employ lawyers, you must go before them as you would before any court. Under the section which follows, the board may act of its own motion without any application, if it comes to their knowledge in any way either by the report of its engineers, a simple letter or a verbal utterance that a grievance exists. A verbal utterance would be sufficient to put the machinery in motion or—

They shall upon the request of the minister, &c.

If an applicant were to come to the Department of Railways and Canals, if com-

plaint were made with respect to the crossing over here in Hull or at any point in Canada the Minister of Railways, under this Act, has the power to direct the board to deal with the matter, not at the expense of the applicants, not at the expense of the people of the country; the board can deal with it regardless of individuals, regardless of corporations, simply as a duty which has been imposed upon them by the parliament of Canada, and I am sure that the contention of my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) that it would be a laborious task, that it would be an expensive luxury to have these remedies applied by the board is certainly without foundation. My hon. friend, I am sure will agree with me in the statement that simply sitting down and writing the facts and addressing a letter to the Department of Railways and Canals is not very expensive. The party writing would be put to the expense of providing stationery, but he would not even have to place a postage stamp upon the letter; he would simply have to mail the letter and the machinery provided by this Act would be set in motion and the remedy can be applied.

Mr. LANCASTER. Nothing has been done; it is in the same condition as it always was.

Mr. EMMERSON. Nothing has been done?

Mr. LANCASTER. It is in the same dangerous condition it always was.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is some particular crossing which my hon. friend has in his mind?

Mr. LANCASTER. The one I referred to.

Mr. EMMERSON. My attention has not been directed to any crossing. It is quite apparent, in reviewing the whole facts, that parliament adopted a certain policy; parliament concurred in the enactment of a law giving certain power to this tribunal. That tribunal is efficiently exercising its powers and jurisdiction. My hon. friend, I think, has not shown any good and sufficient reason why there should be a reversal of that policy or why we should take from this board powers which it now enjoys. It does not seem, to me at least, that his proposed amendment would in any sense meet the difficulty as well as it has been met to-day by the present powers of the board.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (King's and Albert). Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister, while he denied that the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) had been able to convince the House, was willing to admit that he had been somewhat entertaining. Candour compels me to say that the minister has been neither convincing nor entertaining. The hon. gentleman has not ventured to deny the absolute necessity which exists for some measure to be taken in order to protect people at level crossings in this country. My hon. friend is a man of considerable nerve, but he would scarcely have nerve enough to make a denial of that proposition. There is not a week but that you read in newspapers of the death of some person at these level crossings. In my own town, through which the Intercolonial Railway, over which the hon. gentleman presides—and so successfully (?) presides—only the other day a young lady crossing the track was killed by a train which was running at a speed of between 40 and 50 miles an hour through the very heart and business centre of the town where hundreds of people cross the track during the business hours of the day, where there was no protection whatever, neither gates nor watchman. Trains are allowed to come in there at all rates of speed, from 25 miles an hour up to 60 and 70 miles an hour. A number of other deaths have occurred at this same crossing. I have here in the Stratford 'Daily Herald' of January 28, the report of the killing of a man by a Grand Trunk Railway train at a crossing a few miles east of a little town called Shakespeare and the coroner's inquest in that case is now going on. This is a matter of very grave importance. These railways are soulless corporations; they are more interested in getting dividends than in safeguarding the lives of the people. We, as representatives of the people, have that duty to perform, and it is for us to see that legislation is enacted that will prevent the railways from making this wholesale slaughter of human life. I have given some attention to this matter and the result of my observation is that I do not believe there is a single instance of a person being killed by a railway train in which the fatality was not directly or indirectly the result of carelessness by some person. Trains are allowed to pass through settlements at speeds varying from 40 to 60 miles an hour, right in the heart of thickly settled towns or villages. It is outrageous. What is the remedy suggested by the minister? He says that this Railway Commission will look after this matter. This Railway Commission does not strike me as being in a position to look after anything. It may have a tail but it has no head, and the head is supposed to be the thinking and acting and doing part of anybody.

The Railway Commission is overloaded with work at the present time; and yet the hon. minister would have us believe that this commission is ready to visit all the towns from the Atlantic to the Pacific and inspect the level crossings wherever necessary. Was there ever so absurd a contention put forward by a man in his position? The hon. minister cites section 24 of the Act, which provides that the board may of its own motion do so-and-so. As I understand there are many pressing cases at the present time which the Commissioners have not adjudicated upon; and yet the hon. gentleman would leave this whole matter to their

action. Now, this difficulty could be wholly remedied by the adoption of the very effective general clause proposed by my hon. friend from Lincoln. The minister would have us believe that it is the proper thing to have special legislation for each particular case. We do not want special legislation in this country; we want general legislation, which will treat all places alike. What special circumstances can exist in any particular place to justify it being exempted from the operation of the general law? My hon. friend never gave us any reason to show why any town or village in this country could justly be exempted in this way, because he could not. There is no case which a general Act could cover so well. What does the hon. member for Lincoln wish to do? He simply wishes this House to make a declaration which will state the meaning of the law clearly and distinctly so that there would be no doubt about it. The hon. minister put it forward as a reason why this legislation should not pass, that great judges had differed as to the meaning of the present Act. Could there be a stronger reason in favour of the proposed amendment, in order that these great minds may not differ. The commissioners, in their rules and regulations, require that every proceeding taken before the board under the Act shall be taken either by the applicant or his solicitor; and in cases relating to level crossings two or three years might elapse before a judgment could be got, if we are to judge by the past history of the Railway Commission. This could all be remedied by adopting the very effective clause proposed by the hon. member for Lincoln, who is entitled to a hearty meed of thanks from the people of this country not only for what he has already done in connection with this matter, but for the legislation which he introduced in the last session of parliament, and which the government, although they opposed it at first, were at last brought to believe in and adopt. I fail to see that that hon. minister has answered the argument of the hon. member for Lincoln in any way, and I think this Bill should pass.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Railways and Canals has laid down the doctrine that we should not classify incidents, and having classified them, meet them by a general proposition. He has taken for granted that once we have this Railway Act, no amendments are to be brought forward. Now, I take it that that Railway Act will be ineffective, if it is not constantly reinforced by new legislation; and there is good reason for the amendment proposed to-day. It deals with a number of cases that are peculiarly alike—cases that may occur in incorporated villages, towns and cities, and for which there is sufficient cause for a general Act governing them. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals says we should leave these matters to the commissioners. It is true that they might make a general rule governing them; but we do not know when any such remedy will be applied by the commissioners, and so we come to parliament for such a general rule. This is only one incident. There are hundreds of grievances in this country that could be speedily and easily remedied by amendments to the law—by inserting more definitions in it. I contend that a splendid case has been made out in favour of this amendment, which is in the direction of protecting the rights of the people. The lives of the King's subjects are of more value than the interests of the railways. The people are being mowed down every day. In the city of Toronto the other day there was a collision at one of these crossings between an electric car and a railway train by which five or more people were killed; and the same thing is happening in other parts of the country. The people look to parliament to make the law and the Commission to enforce it. We are at the mercy of this commission, which is to-day without a head. Therefore parliament ought to pass a law defining what protection shall be provided at crossings. That is a reasonable proposition, and the principle under which we bring it forward is the general principle that the more experience we have of this Railway Act, the more necessity there will be for parliament to introduce additional definitions into it. On that ground, I say parliament is well within its rights in constantly amending and extending the operation of this Act, and not leaving these matters to the mercy of the railway commissioners. I trust that the House will be prepared not only to make this amendment, but many other amendments to that Act, whenever a general proposition can be outlined and put into a Bill. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) has shown that these incidents are all of one kind, and that the public rights can be protected by a general law, instead of being left to the mercy of either the courts or the railway commissioners. I am sick and tired of hearing talk about going to the courts and to the Privy Council to obtain protection for the rights of the people instead of going to parliament. This is the place for redressing grievances and protecting the rights of the people; but we find hon. gentleman opposite, as usual, against the rights of the people, and in favour of increased rights for the railway companies.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John). This doubtful clause, 227 of the Railway Act, was introduced in 1892 by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart), then Minister of Railways. There can be no doubt as to the meaning of that clause :

No train shall pass in or through any thickly peopled portion of any city, town or village, at a speed greater than ten miles an hour unless

the track is fenced or properly protected in the manner prescribed by this Act.

Well, the manner prescribed by the Act is stated in clause 199 of the same statute, which corresponds with a similar clause in the Act of 1888. Clause 199 says :

The company shall erect and maintain upon the railway, fences, gates and cattle-guards as follows :—

Fences of a minimum height of four feet six inches on each side of the railway.

Cattle-guards, on each side of the highway, at every highway crossing at rail-level by the railway. The railway fences at every such crossing shall be turned into the respective cattle guards on each side of the highway.

I see no doubt as to the meaning of the clause, and the Supreme Court held that its meaning was undoubted. There is nothing in the law to oblige a railway company to put up gates when the railway crosses streets, and I do not see how we could amend the law. Everybody agrees that we cannot legislate to decrease the speed of railways. Railways are built for the purpose of giving greater facilities and more speedy communication, and we should not pass a law which would have for its object the decreasing of their speed. All we should do is to regulate the speed and protect the public. My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) submits to this House a proposition which, though the principle be good, is not practicable. Every one will admit that in certain places there should be gates. Where there is a large population, no doubt it is necessary that a railway company should maintain gates, but in other places, even in villages, that necessity does not exist to anything like the same extent. Take my own town, the town of St. John ; I know that the people there would like to have gates at some crossings, but they are not asking for them at every street. That would entail a heavy expenditure on the railways, and is not required by the people. The people would be satisfied to have gates only on the important streets, where the circulation is large. But if we should adopt the law proposed by my hon. friend from Lincoln, we would impose on railway companies the obligation of maintaining gates across every street. I think that would be going too far, and is not required by public necessity. It would be wiser for us to leave this question to the Railway Commission, which has power to legislate on these matters. Whenever a question arises as to the necessity of having gates in any particular locality, the Railway Commission is the best tribunal to decide the matter. For my part, I cannot see why, because in some streets gates may be required, we should compel railway companies to put them up and maintain them in every street. It has been suggested that the Railway Commission have no jurisdiction to compel companies to put up and maintain gates, but if we will look to clauses 186 and 187 of the Railway Act we will find that, not only have the Railway Commissioners the power to compel the railway companies to adopt that means of protection, but they may compel a company to carry its railway underneath or over a highway. This is clearly stated in section 186. Then take section 187, and you will find that section 186 applies, not only to new railways, but to railway crossings already in existence. This shows that the Railway Commission have full power to apply the requisite remedy. Why, therefore, should we proceed to legislate upon the subject before we have ascertained that the Railway Commission are unable to perform their duties ? Where is the evidence that any complaints have been submitted to the commission and that the commission have failed to apply a remedy ? I cannot see any evidence which would justify our intervening. Were I to see any doubt in favour of our adopting such a law as our hon. friend proposes, I would be inclined to give his proposal the benefit of the doubt, not having any particular inclination in favour of the railway companies as against the public.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland). There can be no doubt that there exists a crying grievance throughout the country with regard to the speed at which railway trains run through thickly-peopled portions of towns and villages. I know that the grievance exists in the county I have the honour to represent, and some means should certainly be devised to overcome it. Whether the means proposed furnishes the proper remedy or not can be left to the Railway Committee to decide. No doubt the Railway Commission has power to enforce rules and regulations regarding the speed of trains and the protection that shall be afforded the general public, but the difficulty that exists is this : The Railway Commission does not act, and the people do not bring the matter to the attention of that commission. It would take a very long time indeed to get the Railway Commission to decide on all the questions in dispute between the railway companies and the public regarding what protection should be placed at the different highway crossings in the thickly-peopled portions of towns and villages.

Mr. HAGGART. Would you not think it was the duty of the Railway Commission to make general rules and regulations with regard to crossings ?

Mr. GERMAN. But the Railway Commission have not made any such rules, and we have no expectation that they will.

Mr. HAGGART. If my hon. friend will read clause 25 of the Act, he will find that it is the duty of the Railway Commission to make these rules.

Mr. GERMAN. Well, all I can say is that they have not done, and, from present

appearances, they are not likely to do it very soon. There is strong complaint, throughout Ontario at any rate, from many of the thickly-peopled portions of towns and villages, that proper protection is not afforded the public. For my part, I am in favour of this Bill going to the Railway Committee. If, in the meantime, the Railway Commission will meet and promulgate satisfactory rules and regulations, these should be accepted as sufficient; but unless they do so, I think this parliament should pass a law to overcome the difficulty regardless of the action of the Railway Committee.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) has introduced again the Bill which he presented to this House first a couple of years ago. I had not had the pleasure of hearing his argument before, but I have listened with attention to what he said this evening. The clause of the old Act which he read provides:

> No locomotive or railway engine shall pass in or through any thickly peopled portion of any city, town or village, at a speed greater than six miles an hour, unless the track is fenced in the manner prescribed by this Act.

I do not know how language could be plainer that that. My hon. friend states that the judge who tried the case in the first instance decided it in one way, and his decision was sustained by the Court of Appeal. The case then came to the Supreme Court, and that court reversed the decision of the courts below. He says also that, in order that the law might remain as the Supreme Court has decided it, the company paid the claim thus making an appeal unnecessary. The section I have quoted is from the Act 55-56 Victoria. Is that the wording of the Act at present? The words of the present Act are as follows:

> No train shall pass in or through any thickly peopled portion of any city, town or village, at a speed greater than ten miles an hour, unless the track is fenced——

That is the wording of the old Act, but it goes on:

> ——or properly protected in the manner prescribed by this Act.

In order to understand both clauses we need to know what is meant by 'properly fenced' in the old Act and 'properly fenced or protected' in the Act of 1903. I have not had the opportunity of looking at the Act 55-56 Victoria, but my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German) has shown what the words mean. As to the present law, I think, there can be no meaning other than that no railway company has a right to run any train through the thickly peopled portion of any city, town or village, at a speed greater than ten miles an hour, unless the Board of Railway Commissioners orders otherwise. Look at the powers of the board. The board may make orders and regulations as to the speed of trains, as to the use of steam whistles, as to the passing from car to car, as to the coupling of cars or shelter to be provided for employees. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) says it would be impossible to make regulations fixing the speed of trains generally, because they may have to vary in different places. My contention is that the Act imposes upon the commissioners the duty—although the word used is 'may'—to make regulations and rules in reference to all these subjects, and that where it is desired that the rules shall not be applicable to a particular case an order may be made applying to that case. So, it seems to me that the law plainly is that, until rules and regulations are passed by the Board of Railway Commissioners, no train may pass in or through any thickly peopled portion of any city, town or village, at a speed greater than ten miles an hour. I do not think that the amendment by my hon. friend from Lincoln could make the law any plainer or any stronger. I may be mistaken, and the courts may hold that the view I express is not the correct one. At the same time, I do not know any words in the English language which could more clearly limit the powers of the railway company to run trains at a rate faster than ten miles an hour, unless the track is fenced or properly protected in the manner prescribed by the Act, and the meaning of those words has been set forth by the hon. member for Welland. We have given the power to the Railway Commission, and if that body does not exercise that power, it ought to do so. There are other ways, perhaps, in which protection for the public at these crossings might be better provided than by having gates or watchmen. There is a plan at present in use in portions of Canada and the United States by which a train, long before it reaches a crossing sets a bell ringing. Surely, a railway company ought to be allowed to provide protection of that kind wherever it is the best that can be provided. I suppose it is of sufficient importance to receive the fullest consideration from the committee and from the Minister of Railways, and the minister ought to have a policy in regard to the Bill and to state that policy to the House.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. R. BLAIN. The Bill introduced by my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) asking that parliament give better protection at level railway crossings, is one that should receive careful consideration at the hands of this parliament. Many years ago when the question of better protection at level crossings was up for discussion, the people were told to go with their cases to the Railway Committee of the

Privy Council, and that their grievances would be redressed. The people were not satisfied with that recourse, they did not get much remedy. At previous sessions of parliament we were told, when the question came up for consideration, and the people were agitated about it, that they would have to wait until the Railway Commission was inaugurated. Well, that commission was inaugurated in 1903, and from that moment until this moment I do not think there is one case in all Canada where better protection has been given to the public. Therefore, whether the power rests with the Railway Committee of the Privy Council or whether it was given to the Railway Commission board is not very important in so far as the public are concerned; for neither from the one or the other have they been able to receive such protection as I think the people of Canada are entitled to. I had the honour of bringing this question myself to the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals in 1903, when the Railway Bill was up for discussion. I moved this amendment, which will be found on page 6257 of the 'Hansard' of 1903:

> Every company shall provide and maintain at all level crossings within cities, towns and villages, whether incorporated or otherwise, such gates, electric bells or subways as may be sufficient for the protection of persons using the streets or highways.

The Minister of Railways speaking to that amendment, said:

> It is useless to put that on the statute book for the reason that the Railway Commission have power to do it, and will do it when they commence their work.

We have examples of this in every county in Canada. In my own county the Grand Trunk Railway Company constructed a line from Toronto to Hamilton, with one track. At that time the trains did not run very fast, and at villages in the southern part of my own county there was no protection whatever at level crossings. After a few years had elapsed the Grand Trunk constructed another track, making a double track between Toronto and Hamilton, and on that double track the Grand Trunk not only run their own trains but the Canadian Pacific Railway has running rights over that road. Now trains are running over that road at the rate of forty and forty-five miles an hour, passing through important villages at that high rate of speed, yet there is no better protection for the public than there was when there was only one track and trains were running at a low rate of speed. It does seem to me that when such changes are taking place the public should be considered, either by this parliament or by the Railway Commission. The Minister of Railways and Canals answered the amendment I introduced in 1903 by saying that the question of better protection at railway crossings would be dealt with by the commission, and we took him at his word. In the town of Brampton where I live, there is a very dangerous crossing, one that has caused the people of that community a good deal of anxiety, and at which a number of persons have been killed during the last few years. The mayor of that corporation had a resolution passed by the council, and plans were prepared showing the dangerous condition of the railway crossing there. These plans were submitted to the Railway Commission, at one of their sessions, held in the city of Toronto, accompanied by every measurement that was necessary, pointing out that houses were constructed close to this crossing, and that when the public were passing over it they would not see fast running trains. We placed before the Commission Board the very same information that we had placed before the Committee of the Privy Council and with exactly the same result, that we got no satisfaction whatever. It is not enough for the government to say now that they have transferred from this parliament to the Railway Commission power to deal with cases of this kind. What the public desire is that either the government or the Railway Commission should see to it that the law is enforced, if we have such a law, and that better protection is given. My hon. friend from Lincoln has brought the matter to the attention of the government at former sessions of parliament. Petitions have been presented from almost every municipality in this country where there are large towns and cities, almost every municipality has had some trouble with this question. I am of the opinion that general legislation should be enacted. It may be said that perhaps the same danger does not exist in every town. I am of the opinion that while there are towns that do not require special protection at railway crossings because the population is not large and the traffic is not great; still I think it would be better to have legislation so that special cases may be dealt with by the Railway Commission rather than that every case should be dealt with by it. I am in thorough accord with the Bill introduced by my hon. friend. Perhaps it can be improved upon, but I think the hon. member for Lincoln should receive the co-operation of the government so that legislation may be enacted at this session which will give better protection to the public at level railway crossings in every part of Canada.

Mr. ALFRED H. CLARKE (South Essex). I entirely agree with the object of the Bill which has been introduced by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), and if there were no existing provisions to protect the public otherwise than by this Bill, I would be strongly disposed to support it. But it appears to me there are two or three reasons why this question can be better dealt with by the Railway Commission than

by laying down one uniform rate of speed at all places in the same town. I come from a constituency where we have two or three trunk lines, and where there has been a good deal of complaint about the rate of speed at which trains have run in going through some of the towns. The difficulty we find is not so much, or not altogether, the rate of speed, but that at some of the crossings there are obstructions, there are buildings in some places which obstruct not only the sound but the sight of trains. It seems to me proper that in those cases there should be a different rate of speed. I do not think ten miles an hour is slow enough at some crossings in some towns and cities; in others ten miles may be a sufficient protection. I think therefore that inasmuch as varying conditions exist, the Railway Commission can better deal with this question, and fix a low rate of speed where there is a dangerous crossing, as they have a right to do, and perhaps another rate of speed at another crossing, in order to do complete justice according to the circumstances which may arise. Another difficulty frequently arises in determining whether or not a particular crossing is in a thickly-peopled part of a city, town or village, so as to have the benefit of the protection contemplated by the Act, and persons suffering damages are uncertain as to their legal rights.

One jury may say that a certain crossing is located in a thickly peopled part; another jury may say that it is not a thickly peopled part. The Railway Commission may say that at a certain crossing a certain rate of speed may be established and that at certain other crossings a certain other rate of speed may be permitted, and if there is any grievance in respect to any particular crossing there will be no trouble in bringing the matter before the Railway Commission. My experience with the Railway Commission has not been that it is a difficult matter to get before them. We had a difference with the Pere Marquette Railway Company in regard to their service, a letter was sent to the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals and immediately the matter was taken up by the commission and relief given. Its proceedings were prompt and expeditious, and it is a body that can do complete justice to every case. I think it is better, until we find that the Railway Commission does not afford the remedies to the public which they are entitled to, that we should not depart from the course which this House has so recently committed itself to, of leaving these matters to be disposed of by that tribunal.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to continue the discussion of the question along the legal lines. That feature has been very well dealt with by the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) who has introduced the Bill. I shall simply content myself by pointing out to the committee and to the government that conditions prevail in the country, in the rural sections as well as in the incorporated towns and villages, that may require the attention of those in authority. I will give an illustration with which I am familiar, taken from the county I have the honour to represent, where, between Toronto and Hamilton, as has been referred to by my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain), there are a great many trains passing every day. I know of one crossing where, I was informed, during the time I visited that section of the country, that as many as from 75 to 80 trains cross the public highway between two villages inside of 24 hours. It does seem to me that, if, in the outskirts of incorporated villages and towns, additional precaution is required, those in the country are fairly entitled also to protection. From 75 to 80 trains a day is a large number, and there is nearly as much risk to the public on a rural highway that is very frequently travelled as there is in the towns and villages. My object in rising is simply to say that if the matter is to receive more careful consideration from this House, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) and the government, there are many sections of the country that demand similar protection to that which would be afforded by this Bill in villages and towns.

Mr. G. H. PERLEY (Argenteuil). Mr. Chairman, although a new member, I feel I should say a few words in support of this Bill or rather in support of the principle of it. I know it is very difficult for the government to deal with this question, but at the same time no one can dispute that the people have a grievance in regard to the crossings in towns and villages. I understood the hon. member for St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers) to say that he did not think any case had been made out. It seems to me that the mere fact that so many people are killed from week to week and month to month is quite sufficient to make out a case for this House to deal with. It is evident that the machinery for getting at this matter in a practical way is not sufficient. We all know that the Railway Commission has power to deal with it. Nobody disputes that, but at the same time I do not think any one can dispute the fact that it is an expensive proceeding for any town or village to come before the commission here in Ottawa and get a grievance righted in regard to a certain particular crossing. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) has referred to the permissive clause of this Act, by which the Railway Commission may take the matter in hand without being asked to. From experience we all know that these permissive clauses very seldom amount to much and particularly with a body which has now so much to do and before which there will be more and more cases coming as time

goes on. It is not at all likely nor is it in human nature that the board would wish to take up these matters unless they are brought to its notice. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals claims that because this House has given the commission power to deal with these matters, therefore, this House should leave the commission alone. The commission is the creature of this parliament and if there is something in the Act which ought to be remedied, I cannot see that that is any argument why this parliament should not provide the remedy. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals deliberately neglected to express any opinion on the merits of this question, and it seems to me that that is the fair way for the members of this House to consider the question which is of so much interest to the people at large. No doubt, towns and villages differ, as the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals stated, in their requirements, but at the same time I do not know of any town or village in which it is right or proper that a railway company should run a train at the rate of forty or fifty miles an hour without protection for the public ; and certainly the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals did not give us the name of any such town or village, even if he knew of one himself. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that something ought to be done to make it easier for the public to get their rights. I am sure that in so far as the actual wording of the Bill is concerned the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and others of more experience will be able to say whether it ought to be worded exactly as it is, but I certainly feel that it is right for this House and the government to take this matter into their consideration and pass some such legislation of a general character as will meet the requirements of the case. I do not think that the people ought to be left to come to the commission and fight out these matters in detail as they now have to do.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure we all agree with the object which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) who introduced this Bill had in view ; that is to say the fuller protection of life and property at level crossings throughout the cities, towns and villages of Canada. At the same time it is important for us to realize what the legislation at the present time is and to ascertain, if possible, how far an improvement in the direction which my hon. friend wishes to go and in which we sympathize with him, would be accomplished by the legislation that he has introduced. It seems to me that it is impossible to imagine that this House could possibly incorporate a railway company that would not at some point pass through a city, town or incorporated village, and in passing through a city, town or incorporated village of necessity it must cross some one of the highways in these cities, towns and villages. What is the law in such a case ? The law is that no railway can cross a highway in any city, town or village except with the previous consent of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and the law is that this Board of Railway Commissioners must determine the conditions under which this railway can cross the highway. Now, if the railway is already in existence over the highway it is still within the power of the Railway Commissioners to alter the conditions under which that railway crosses the highway ; so you have in the Board of Railway Commissioners at the present time the power to determine the conditions under which the crossing is to be made and the power to regulate a crossing already in existence.

Mr. COCHRANE. But they do not do it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend will exercise a little patience, please. What did my hon. friend seek to do by his legislation, and what would be the effect of the legislation he is introducing ? There should be, it seems to me, no doubt that railway crossings must of necessity exist under different conditions, and you must deal with each crossing in the light of the local conditions. For instance, you would not pretend to regulate a crossing in the heart of a great city in the same way and to make it subject to the same conditions as you would a crossing in the outskirts of some obscure village. You must bear in mind the conditions existing at each crossing. What would be the result of the proposed legislation if we adopted it ? The result would be that the Railway Commissioners would not have a free hand, but that they would be obliged to determine that at each railway crossing, whatever might be the local conditions, there must be either one of two things—either a watchman or a gate. No discretion is to be exercised if the crossing is in the heart of Montreal, or, as I said, on the outskirts of some obscure village anywhere throughout the Dominion of Canada. The conditions of crossing would require to be settled by the Board of Railway Commissioners in absolutely the same way in all cases.

Mr. FOSTER. How is it now ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Now it is subject to the control of the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. FOSTER. But under a condition imposed by parliament ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not quite understand.

Mr. FOSTER. As to speed.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In the absence of regulations, the speed cannot exceed 10 miles an hour.

Mr. FOSTER. But they can regulate ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They can regulate that speed so as to make it less than 10, or they may permit them to proceed at a higher rate, provided that proper precautions are taken at the crossing.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the Board set aside a law of parliament ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course, they can, when the law provides that they shall have the power to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. Does it provide that power ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course, it does ; the section—No. 186, I think—says that positively.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if I have stated the conditions correctly, namely, that the Board of Railway Commissioners have the power to determine the conditions under which a crossing can be made on the level, then the only question to be considered further by this House is as to whether or not the Board of Railway Commissioners can be moved to interfere in each particular case. It is not necessary that the Board of Railway Commissioners should deal with each case in each municipality, but it is free to the Board to determine the conditions under which all the level crossings in any municipality shall be regulated. They shall have the right to determine the conditions for the whole municipality at one time. And then the question comes up as to whether or not it is an obligation on the individual to go to the Board of Railway Commissioners and complain of the conditions existing at each crossing, or whether or not by some other method the Board can be moved to take action. Let us see what happens.

Mr. COCHRANE. Nothing happens.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As a rule, the conditions are that a railway crossing is dangerous to all persons in a particular locality. No one individual is affected by that exclusively, but dozens of those who use that crossing are affected, and as a result those individuals would all of necessity make application to their municipal council. Through this body the municipality would act ; if a railway crossing dangerous to the life of the individual existed within the municipality, the corporation of the municipality would take action, and, if the corporation did not take action, we all know how prone our electors are to go to members of parliament, and if they draw the attention of members of parliament to the fact, all the members would have to do would be to draw the attention of the minister to the existence of the dangerous crossing, and then the Act provides that the minister, of his own motion, can set the machinery of the Board of Railway Commissioners in action and have the matter regulated, so that you will have either the individual concerned with the crossing acting through the municipal council, or else they can act through their member, and in this way bring pressure to bear on the minister. It seems to me that these are conditions which would commend themselves to this House, and that the members will see how reasonable it is to allow this matter to be dealt with by that Board which this parliament has created for the purpose of dealing with questions of this sort. I quite understand that it is exceedingly important that public attention should be drawn to the conditions existing at these crossings, and especially that the attention of the Board of Railway Commissioners should be drawn, and this discussion is an important discussion from that standpoint. It is important that the Board should know, as they will learn as a result of this discussion, that these dangerous railway crossings exist at different places, and that parliament expects them to provide a remedy for these dangerous conditions. My suggestion would be, under the circumstances—because, after all, this is an important matter, and affects not only the individuals and municipalities, but the railway corporations as well—I know it is not popular in this House to speak in the interests of railway corporations, but, so far as I am concerned, at all events, I think that a railway corporation is entitled to justice as well as a municipality or an individual—I consider that under the conditions that arise here, it is proper that we should refer this matter to the Railway Committee, so that the Railway Committee may hear all those who are interested further, and if further light comes to us it is possible that we might all change our minds and endeavour to introduce legislation which would be effective if it is necessary to do so. I would therefore concur in the second reading of this Bill, with the understanding that it should go to the Railway Committee for further consideration.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved that the Bill be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). Mr. Speaker, before that motion is put, I desire to say a word or two. Those of us who were in the House last parliament will remember that many public bills were referred to the Railway Committee, and nothing came of any of them. No amendment was made unless a Bill was considered and dealt with in the Committee of the Whole House, as Public Bills are supposed to be dealt with. I remember that the hon. member for St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers) introduced very necessary legislation imposing on railways responsibility for fires caused by locomotives along the line

or their railway, and making them liable for damages to the people whose property along the railway was injured by such fires. That Bill was introduced in two different sessions and sent to the Railway Committee, but nothing came of it on either occasion. When we were considering in the House the general Bill consolidating the general Act that amendment became law. Then Mr. Cowan, who represented Essex, introduced in two different sessions a Bill relating to drainage under railways, legislation which was very much needed in the interests of the farming community, particularly Ontario. That Bill was sent to the Railway Committee each session, but nothing came of it until, in 1903, we were considering in the Committee of the Whole House the Bill to consolidate the General Railway Act, when it, too, was adopted and became law.

I could instance other Bills. For instance, the Minister of Agriculture, in introducing any measure relating to his department, does not suggest that it should go to the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization. If he wants the Bill passed, if he is sincere, as I presume he is, and as I am to-night, he insists, as I do, upon the Bill being dealt with as all Public Bills are, by being referred to the Committee of the Whole House. I could instance many other cases. When the Minister of Justice last session introduced an amendment to the Railway Act, the same Act that I am endeavouring to have amended to-night, he did not say that he wanted the Bill to go to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, although the railways were interested in that Bill to a much larger extent than they are in mine, in order that the railways might be heard on the question, and that those who were against the railways might also be heard. He took the regular course of moving that the House go into Committee of the Whole on the Bill. It was dealt with as all Public Bills are; it was discussed in Committee of the Whole House and there only. What was right with regard to the Minister of Justice amendment to the Railway Act of 1903 is equally right with regard to the amendment of the member for Lincoln to the same Act. I submit, with all due deference, that this Bill ought to be dealt with by the Committee of the Whole House, and not be sent to the Railway Committee. That committee is only a cul de sac, a place that leads nowhere. The Bill must come back here. Suppose the committee endorses it, it has to come back here and be dealt with by the whole House. Suppose, on the contrary, the committee say they do not think it ought to be passed, still it must come back here; they cannot keep it out of this House. It is only tying up the Bill for the session, as was done in the case of the cattle-guard legislation which was introduced by me for three sessions and was always sent to the Railway Committee and smothered there—always killed in some way, but not on its merits; and finally the amendment was passed when the House was in Committee of the Whole on the General Railroad Consolidation Bill of 1903. With all these facts before us, with this knowledge, to which we cannot shut our eyes, as to what happens to public legislation that goes to the Railway Committee, I object to this Bill being sent there. I am not referring to Private Bills, which properly go there, and which, if condemned there, do not come back to the House at all. But Public Bills, properly so-called, I submit, should not be sent to the Railway Committee, and this Bill should be treated like all other Public Bills. There should be the same rule for all of us. We should now go into Committee of the Whole House and discuss this Bill; and I think we could put it into better shape than we could by wasting our time in the Railway Committee, having a lot of discussions and votes and hearing railway counsel and other people, who after all can tell us nothing that we cannot learn from our constituents. We are supposed to make the laws as we understand that our constituents want them ; and if the Minister of Justice or myself or any one else in this House wants to know what the views of the railway companies are, we are honest and intelligent enough to find them out as part of our duty, just as we find out the views of the rest of our constituents—because the railways are as much our constituents as other people. I submit, therefore, that we should deal with this Bill on the floor of this House, as we do with all other Public Bills. I do not think it is the proper course to send it to the Railway Committee, and I must ask the House to reject the motion of the Minister of Justice.

House divided on the motion of Mr. Fitzpatrick.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Adamson,	LeBlanc,
Alcorn,	Lefurgey,
Archambault,	Lemieux,
Barker,	Logan,
Beauparlant,	Loggie,
Béland,	Lovell,
Black,	Macdonald,
Bole,	Macpherson,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	McCarthy (Simcoe),
Bourassa,	McColl,
Boyer,	McIntyre,
Brodeur,	McIsaac,
Brown,	McKenzie (Bruce),
Bureau,	McKenzie (Cape Breton, N.),
Caldwell,	McLennan,
Calvert,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Campbell,	Miller,
Carney,	Parmelee,
Cash,	Paterson,
Clarke (Essex),	Piché,
Copp,	Pickup,
Costigan,	

Crawford,	Préfontaine,
Cyr,	Proulx,
Demers (St. John),	Ratz,
Derbyshire,	Reid (Restigouche),
Emmerson,	Riley,
Finlayson,	Rivet,
Fisher,	Roche (Halifax),
Galliher,	Ross (Rimouski),
Gauvreau,	Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Geoffrion,	Schell (Glengarry),
German,	Schell (Oxford),
Haggart,	Scott,
Harty,	Sloan,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Stewart,
Jackson (Selkirk),	Talbot (Bellechasse),
Johnston (Lambton),	Talbot (Strathcona),
Kennedy,	Turgeon,
Lamont,	Turriff,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Watson,
Lavergne	Wilson (Russell),
(Drummond & Arth.),	Wright (Renfrew)—85.
Law,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Ames,	Jackson (Elgin),
Armstrong,	Lake,
Avery,	Lalor,
Barr,	Lancaster,
Bergeron,	Lennox,
Blain,	Maclean (York, S.),
Bland,	Martin (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Broder,	Monk,
Chisholm,	Paquet,
Clare,	Perley,
Clements,	Porter,
Cochrane,	Roche (Marquette),
Crocket,	Schaffner,
Daniel,	Sproule,
Elson,	Staples,
Foster,	Stockton,
Fowler,	Taylor,
Ganong,	Walsh,
Gunn,	Wilmot,
Henderson,	Wilson
Herron,	(Lennox & Addington),
Hughes (Victoria),	Worthington,
Ingram,	Wright (Muskoka)—45.

Motion (Mr. Fitzpatrick) agreed to.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe) moved second reading of Bill (No. 6) to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act of 1898. He said : The object of the Bill is to remedy a grievance which the marine engineers allege to have existed for some time past. They complain that the department, which now has power to issue permits, are thereby enabled to grant to men, who have not passed examination, certificates for the season to act as marine engineers. I have introduced this same Bill for two consecutive sessions. Last session it did not reach its second reading and the session before I agreed, owing to some objections, to allow it to stand. The Bill has since been pretty well circulated throughout the districts interested; and from what I have heard from the marine engineers themselves, the lumbermen who own tugs, and the fishermen who require tugs in their business, they desire to be given a hearing before a committee of the House. Since introducing the Bill I have found that there is a good deal of difference of opinion among the interests concerned, and after consultation with my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I came to the conclusion that the wisest course would be to have a small special committee which would hear the parties interested and report to the House. Were we to discuss the matter here, I am afraid there would be much difficulty in arriving at a satisfactory conclusion. From what I have heard from the different interests in my own constituency, it may be somewhat difficult to deal with the matter, and in justice to all parties interested, unless we hear from each class of persons what they have to say, the conclusion I have come to therefore is that the only satisfactory way to dispose of it would be to have the various parties interested brought before a special committee.

Mr. LANCASTER.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. McCARTHY moved that the said Bill be referred to a special committee consisting of the following : Johnston (Cape Breton), E. F. Clarke, Bickerdike, Bennett, Johnston (Lambton), Lefurgey, Smith (Nanaimo), Lancaster, McPherson, Sproule, Préfontaine and the mover.

Motion agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. What business to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We shall take up the Seed Bill and then the Census Bill and then go into Supply.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. When does the government intend to take up the notice of motion with regard to the Chief Commissioner of the Railway Commission ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To-morrow we will take the notice stage. It will come up for discussion on Friday.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, January 31, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

OTTAWA ELECTRIC COMPANY.

Mr. W. A. GALLIHER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 12) respecting the Ottawa Electric Company.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. GALLIHER. The Bill is along the lines of the one introduced last year ; in fact, it is the same Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. To new members like myself that does not convey any instruction. Cannot the hon. gentleman give us briefly the purport of the Bill ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Shortly, the Bill is to acquire the power to purchase stock in other companies.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ATLANTIC, QUEBEC AND WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. C. A. GAUVREAU moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 13) respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.

Mr. FOSTER. We should have some explanation of this, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GAUVREAU. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, by this Bill the company is simply asking for an extension of time.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE MOLSONS BANK.

Mr. H. B. AMES moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 14) respecting the Molsons Bank.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Would the hon. gentleman explain the provisions of the Bill ?

Mr. AMES. The Bill provides for a redistribution of the capital stock of the Molsons Bank, so that the shares hereafter instead of being $50-shares may be $100-shares.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 11) respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 15) respecting the St. Mary's and Western Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. McIntyre.

Bill (No. 16) respecting certain patents of the Canada Car Company, Limited.—Mr. L. P. Demers.

Bill (No. 17) respecting certain patents of the Goodwin Car Co.—Mr. Demers (St. John and Iberville).

Bill (No. 18) respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Parmelee.

Bill (No. 20) to incorporate the Moosejaw and Edmonton Railway Company.—Mr. Scott—by Mr. Logan.

CALGARY, RED DEER AND BATTLEFORD RAILWAY.

Mr. H. LOGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 19) to incorporate the Calgary, Red Deer and Battleford Railway Company.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Explain that.

Mr. LOGAN. The object of the Bill is to incorporate a company to build a railway from Calgary to Battleford. That is all the explanation.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is this to revive a charter that was extinct last year ?

Mr. LOGAN. No. It is to create a new company.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Mr. GEO. D. GRANT moved :

That in accordance with the recommendation contained in the report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders, the time for receiving petitions for Private Bills and also the time for presenting Private Bills be extended to Thursday, February 23, and Thursday, March 9, respectively.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. I do not think there is any thing very objectionable in the motion, but I must object to the motion for the adoption of the report being made on the very day the report comes in. I think that objection should apply to all reports. We should have an opportunity to see what they are before a motion is made for their adoption.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE. As one who has often objected to motions of this kind in former years, I object again. It seems to me that they always tend unnecessarily to lengthen the session. Either the time is sufficiently long to allow parties to introduce their Bills, or it is not. The judgment of parliament was that the time was sufficiently long and therefore it made the rule. If the time is not sufficiently long, then we should amend the rule and make it longer. If the rule is what parliament thinks it ought to be, we should not violate it so often. I had the assurance of the Prime Minister last year that all and sundry ought to take notice that in future it would be the aim of parliament to confine them within the limits of the rule as nearly as possible, and that when a violation of the rule took place, there must be a strong and exceptional reason given for it.

Mr. HAGGART. I raise the point of order, that the motion is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the objection is a good one, and the motion will have to stand as a notice.

THE SAFETY OF SHIPS.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysboro') moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 21) to amend the Act respecting the safety of ships. He said: Under the existing regulations tramp boats of the class known as shelter deck boats, are not allowed during the winter season to carry timber between the main deck and the upper deck, and the purpose of this Bill is to permit them to carry deals and timber in that space. The policy of the government is to make no change of this kind unless it is approved by the Board of Trade in England, and I have taken the precaution to ask the Department of Marine and Fisheries to communicate with that authority to see if this change will be acceptable to them. I do not intend to press the Bill to a finish unil we hear that it is acceptable to the British Board of Trade.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS.

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved that the House do on Friday next go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

1. Resolved, That if a judge of any Superior Court in Canada is appointed Chief Commissioner of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, he shall not be removed at any time by the Governor in Council except upon address of the Senate and House of Commons.

2. Resolved, That if any chief commissioner of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, having been at the time of his appointment as such chief commissioner a judge of any Superior Court in Canada, or having resigned his office as such judge for the purpose of accepting appointment as such chief commissioner, has continued in office as judge of one or more Superior Courts in Canada and in the said office of chief commissioner for periods amounting together to fifteen years or upwards, or has become afflicted with a permanent infirmity disabling him from the due execution of his office, and if such chief commissioner resigns his office, or if his term of office, or any renewed term of office, has expired, His Majesty may, by letters patent under the Great Seal, reciting such periods of office or such permanent infirmity, grant to such chief commissioner an annuity equal to two-thirds of the salary of the judicial office which he held at the time of his appointment as such chief commissioner, or which he resigned for the purpose of accepting such appointment, to commence immediately after his so ceasing to hold office as such chief commissioner, to continue thenceforth during his natural life, and to be payable by monthly instalments and pro rata for any period less than a year during such continuance.

3. Resolved, That if any such chief commissioner of the Board of Railway Commissioners resigns his office or completes his term of service, original or renewed, therein, having, in either such case,

(a) attained the age of seventy-five years, and continued in office as such judge and in the said office of chief commissioner for periods amounting together to twenty years or upwards, or

(b) attained the age of seventy years, and continued in office as such judge and in the said office of chief commissioner for periods amounting together to twenty-five years or upwards, or

(c) continued in office as such judge and in the said office of chief commissioner for periods amounting together to thirty years or upwards,

His Majesty may, by letters patent under the Great Seal, reciting such period of service, and, in cases (a) and (b), such chief commissioner's age, grant to him an annuity, payable as aforesaid, equal to the salary of the judicial office which he held at the time of his appointment as such chief commissioner, or which he resigned for the purpose of accepting such appointment, to commence immediately after his resignation as chief commissioner and to continue thenceforth during his natural life.

4. Resolved, That if between the date of the appointment of any such chief commissioner or of his resignation of his office as such judge and the date of his resignation of, or retirement from, the office of chief commissioner, the salary attached to the judicial office which he held at the time of his appointment, or which he resigned for the purpose of accepting appointment as such chief commissioner, has been increased, the annuity to be granted to him hereunder may be increased in the same proportion.

5. Resolved, That local judges in Admiralty of the Exchequer Court shall be deemed to be judges of a Superior Court within the meaning hereof.

He said: I have the authority of the Crown to introduce these resolutions.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I must take the rather unusual course on this motion of drawing the attention of the government to the condition of affairs that exists in the country in connection with the matter treated in this resolution. It is so important that I think I shall be able to show the government that its duty is rather to abandon this legislation and take advantage of the legislation which now exists and proceed to fill up the vacancy in the Railway Commission. What is the situation in the country to-day?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I raise the point of order that at this stage no debate is allowed.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. My hon. friend the First Minister has made a motion and I am drawing the attention of the government in the country to a certain condition existing in connection with this very question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The motion just made has always been taken as simply a notice of motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the point well taken. The hon. gentleman cannot debate the question at this stage.

Mr. SPROULE. On Friday next will not the Speaker have to leave the Chair, in compliance with the motion just made, and allow the House to go into Committee of

the Whole without a motion to that effect being made again, and will not this preclude any debate before the House is in committee ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, in the case of all resolutions dealing with money, the first stage consists of giving notice that on a certain day a motion will be made that the House go into a Committee of the Whole. The second stage then will be the debate on that motion with the Speaker in the Chair. The resolution is then moved in committee and the committee reports. But the report of the committee cannot be concurred in until the following day. The most ample discussion is therefore allowed at every stage. I would draw my hon. friend's attention to rule 93 :

If any motion be made in the House for any public aid or charge upon the people, the consideration and debate thereon may not be presently entered upon, but shall be adjourned till such further day as the House thinks fit to appoint, and then it shall be referred to a Committee of the Whole House before any resolutions or vote of the House do pass thereupon.

Motion agreed to.

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, can the hon. gentleman give any information as to whether the membership of the transportation commission is complete, and also wheher any reports have yet been made ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I could not give the answer to my hon. friend now but will do so to-morrow

MINISTERS OF FINANCE AND INTERIOR.

Mr. FOSTER. Can my right hon. friend tell us when we may have the pleasure of seeing the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) in his place. I observe also that another minister, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) is absent. When shall we see him back in this sphere of activity ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think that the Minister of the Interior will be here about February 15. I am sorry to say that I cannot give definite information regarding the Minister of Finance, and my hon. friend will regret this as much as I do. The last information I have is regarding a domestic matter which has kept him in Vienna longer than he expected.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Agriculture for the year ending October 31, 1904 (Mr. Fisher).

Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the year ending June 30, 1904—Hon. Wm. Paterson.

INSPECTION AND SALE OF SEEDS.

Bill (No. 7) respecting the Inspection and Sale of Seeds—Mr. Fisher—was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this the same Bill that was before the House last year and the year before?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). Practically it is. There are, however, certain slight modifications which I shall explain in general terms. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) who has asked me this question, will remember that the Bill as introduced last session was for the purpose of controlling the sale of agricultural seeds, so as to remove a grievance or difficulty which has existed in the past, in that these seeds frequently are impure in having the seeds of weeds mixed with them, or in the seeds not being germinable, thus causing loss to the purchaser both in their purchase and in their use. For the purpose of learning the facts I instructed an officer in my department to investigate this question. As much as four years ago, this officer went carefully into the subject. He took a large number of samples of the seeds that were being sold in various parts of Canada and analyzed by methods well known in seed laboratories. His reports show that there was a real need for control over this trade. Investigation proved that large quantities of very inferior seeds were being sold in this country, and that in those seeds there was a large number of weed seeds, often the seeds of weeds that were unknown in the locality where the seed was to be used, so that the result of its use would be to introduce into localities pernicious weeds which, till that time, had not been known in those localities. This was one part of the evil. The other part was that in frequent instances seed was sold under false names, that is, it was not what it was represented to be. A notorious instance of that kind was found in the eastern part of Canada, where a seed was sold purporting to be the seed of a spring grain, when, as a matter of fact, it was the seed of a grain which was to be sown in the fall in order to ripen. Again large quantities of seeds were sold of which a proportion, in some cases a considerable proportion, was not germinable. The purchaser, not knowing this, sowed the usual quantity and, of course, got little, if any, return. These difficulties in the trade were the more likely to continue, because the farmer who purchased the seed had no means of determining its value. In some cases, of course, the weed seeds are quite apparent, but, not unfrequently, these seeds are not recognizable by the farmers. Sometimes they are seeds of weeds entirely unknown in the purchaser's locality, or in many cases, the farmer is not familiar with the seeds of even the ordinary weeds of his

own neighbourhood. In many other instances the value of the seed could not be determined except by what I might call laboratory methods, such as have been in established use for some time in other countries. In the United States and various European countries, the laboratory investigation of the quality and value of seeds has been carried on for many years. There is to-day a thoroughly established method for the examination and testing of seeds of all kinds. We thought it wise that the advantages of science should be put within reach of the farmers of the Dominion of Canada for their protection in the seed trade. I therefore, established in the department a seed laboratory and the work of that laboratory has since been going on. I am glad to say that, by the testimony of the seedsmen themselves as well as of many farmers, the investigations and reports of this branch have contributed materially to improvement in the trade, and that for the last year or two there has been a decided improvement in the quality of the seeds sold to our farmers. A greater number of farmers to-day are critical of the seed they buy than formerly, and their knowledge has compelled improvement. But there is much yet to be done.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. There are many on this side anxious to hear the eloquence of the hon. minister and to follow his explanation, yet there is not an hon. gentleman on the ministerial side paying the slightest attention, and the noise of their conversation makes it impossible for us to hear the minister. I ask you to call the hon. gentlemen to order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I hope hon. gentlemen will keep order for it is very unpleasant for a speaker to be interrupted.

Mr. FISHER. The noise was not interferring with me, Mr. Chairman, though I would prefer to talk without so much effort. I need hardly say that I am not attempting any eloquence in regard to a matter of busines such as this. I was saying that, though much had been accomplished there is still room for improvement. While the general average of the trade has been improved, I regret to say there are still in our country a number of men who handle seeds for agricultural purposes who do not seem to be alive to the importance of the trade and who still deal in very inferior seeds. This House has practically declared its opinion that a law should be passed to control this trade. A Bill was introduced last session, but was dropped because, owing to the lateness and length of the session, it was deemed impossible to make it law. I hope that, introducing it as I have done this session, at an early stage, when there is every opportunity for hon. members to give attention to the subject, the result will be better. I think I can fairly call for the co-operation of members on both sides to effect this improvement in the relation of the farmers to those who supply them with seed, and that I may look with confidence to the Bill being passed into law. I shall be extremely disappointed if the Bill is not passed this session. I need hardly go into details in explaining the Bill, but may say in general terms that we wish to provide by this Bill machinery which will, in the first place prevent the sale of seed containing more than a certain number of seeds of pernicious weeds, the presence of the seeds of which, I consider, makes seed unfit to be sold in Canada. Section 3 and section 6 combined absolutely prohibit the sale of seeds containing certain weeds. In addition to that, we propose to establish a grade or standard of the seeds which shall be permitted to be sold with the brand of No. 1, or of an extra quality upon it. That is established by section 4. Then we propose to provide machinery by which the law may be carried out. I think, in brief language, I have given the substance of the Bill. The details will come up as the various sections are considered. I think perhaps it is better that I should defer the explanations of the changes that have been made in the present Bill as compared with the Bill of last session until we come to each section, when I will be able to explain more fully. Again I would repeat for the information of the House that the general proposals of the Bill are: In the first place, to prohibit absolutely the sale of seed which contains seeds of particularly pernicious weeds; and secondly, to provide a standard, a No. 1 quality of seed.

Mr. SPROULE. We have had this same Bill before the House during two previous sessions. The first time, I understood, it was allowed to drop because it was found objectionable to seedsmen, and to farmers as well. Last year it was put on the paper at a reasonably early period of the session, and, of course, could have been put through if the government had made any effort to do so. Therefore, the minister and his side of the House are responsible for the Bill not going through last year. There was time enough, but it was assumed that so many objections were raised throughout the country that the government thought better not to push it on. Might I ask whether, since then, the government have received numerous objections to the Bill, or whether reasons have been given why it should not pass, or amendments suggested. In my experience the seedsmen do not look upon it with much favour, whatever the farmers may think.

Mr. FISHER. I think my hon. friend put the matter a little strongly when he alleged the reasons for the Bill not having been put through and made law last session. It is true the Bill was introduced about the mid-

dle of the session, I think, but at the same time there was a great deal of other pressing matter before the House. Also certain opposition to the Bill developed, chiefly on the part of the hon. gentlemen opposite, but on the part of a few gentlemen on this side of the House as well, who were afraid that the Bill might interfere unfairly with the trade. The seedsmen made certain objections. I do not remember, however, at the present time that any farmers' organization or any representative farmers intimated that there was anything in the Bill that they objected to. On the contrary, I was able to quote and to show last session, and the session before, a very strong demand on the part of those organizations who in Canada largely speak for the farmers in a non-political sense ; they wanted a Bill of this kind. The opposition which developed was raised chiefly at the instance of the seedsmen. But their objections were thoroughly threshed out last year, and related only to slight points which I have to a certain extent modified in the present Bill. But at the same time I do not profess to have met their views entirely, because if I did meet their views entirely I think the Bill would be practically emasculated, and would be of no use for the purpose of protecting farmers in the trade. I acknowledge that if this Bill did not tread upon the toes of somebody in the trade it would be unnecessary, and I would not have introduced it. It is only because there are certain people who deal in seeds in this country who require to be regulated by law that this Bill is necessary, and for that reason only am I desirous of making the Bill law. I speak of these people knowing well that they do not include the large majority of the seed dealers, who are an honourable body of men, who deal honestly and fairly, and carry on their trade in a reputable way. At the same time there are, unfortunately, certain other men dealing in seeds that ought not to be sold, and it is for the purpose of restraining these men that we find the necessity of this Bill. As I said a moment ago, when we come to the details of the measure I will be able to explain the slight modifications which I have made. and which will, I think, to a large extent meet the objections which some of the reputable traders in seeds expressed last session.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the minister, whether wittingly or unwittingly, does the opposition great injustice when he intimates that it was because of the opposition they raised to the Bill that it was left over last session. The Bill was discussed, and after a lengthy discussion the opposition expected the Bill would go through. They had raised all the objections that they thought desirable to raise, and drew the minister's attention to the weak features of the Bill. After that they expected the Bill would be gone on with, and paid no more attention to it. But the government did not make any effort to carry it through, the minister did not make any effort to carry his own Bill through. The reason which he gives to-day seems to me not to be a good one, that is to say, it was not pushed through because there was other more important business before the House for the government to deal with. According to the explanation which the hon. gentleman gave us at first he would seem to regard this measure as one of the most important which could be brought before this House ; but if the interest of the farming community is to be staved off until every other measure and every other interest is attended to, and finally this Bill is to be thrown over, it seems to me that it is not very complimentary to the farmers. My first inquiry was as to whether this Bill was exactly the same as the previous Bills; also whether the hon. gentleman had received any objections to this Bill. If so, we can deal with them when we come to them.

On section 2,

Mr. FISHER. That fixes the date of the coming into operation of the Act. We will let that section stand.

On section 3,

No person shall sell, or offer, expose or have in his possession for sale, for the purpose of seeding, any seeds of cereals, grasses, clovers or forage plants unless they are free from any seeds of the following weeds :—Wild Mustard or Charlock, (Brassica Sinapistrum, Boss); Tumbling Mustard, (Sisymbrium sinapistrum, Crantz.) ; Hare's Ear Mustard, (Coringia orientalis, Dumort.) ; Ball Mustard, (Neslia paniculata, L. Desv.) ; Field Pennycress or Stinkweed, (Thlaspi arvense, L.) ; Wild Oats, (Avena fatua, L. and avena strigosa, Schreb.) ; Bindweed, (Convulvulus arvensis, L.) ; Perenniel Sow-Thistle, (Sonchus arvensis, L.) ; Ragweed, (Ambrosia artemisiaefolia, L.); Great Ragweed, (Ambrosia trifida, L.); Purple Cockle, (Lychnis Githago, Lam.); Cow Cockle, (Vaccaria Vaccaria, L.) Britton) ; Orange Hawkweed or Paint Brush, (Hieracium aurantiacum, L. and Hieracium praealtum, Vill.); Ergot of Rye, (Claviceps purpurea, Tul.), unless each and every receptacle, package, sack or bag containing such seeds, or a label securely attached thereto, is marked in a plain and indelible manner—

(a.) with the full name and address of the seller ;

(b.) with the name of the kind or kinds of seed ;

(c.) with the common name or names of the aforenamed weeds, the seeds of which are present in the seed sold or offered, exposed or had in possession for sale.

2. The provisions contained in this section shall not apply to the sale of seed that is grown, sold and delivered by any farmer on his own premises, for seeding by the purchaser himself, unless the purchaser of the said seed obtains from the seller at the time of the sale thereof a certificate that the said seed is supplied to him subject to the provisions of this Act.

Mr. LENNOX. I call the attention of the hon. minister to the wording of this

clause. It does not appear to me that it reads very well :

No person shall sell, or offer, expose or have in his possession for sale, for the purpose of seeding, any seeds of cereals, grasses, clovers or forage plants unless they are free from any seeds of the following weeds—

Then, reciting these weeds, it goes on again :

—unless each and every receptable, package, sack or bag containing such seeds, or a label securely attached thereto, is marked in a plain and indelible manner.

These two words 'unless' do not harmonize or make complete sense. As the intention evidently is that these seeds shall not be offered for sale unless properly labelled, I would suggest that the section be made to read :

No person shall sell, or offer, expose or have in his possession for sale, for the purpose of seeding any seeds of cereals, grasses, clovers or forage plants having therein the following weeds—

Reciting them, and then going on :

—unless each and every receptable, package, sack or bag containing such seeds, or a label securely attached thereto, is marked in a plain and indelible manner.

I think that would make it read better.

Mr. FISHER. I think perhaps the criticism of my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) is correct when he says that the two words 'unless' do not sound well. The meaning, however, is just the same.

Mr. LENNOX. I think it would read better, and be clearer.

Mr. FISHER. I think it would read better, but I do not think it is worth while making the change.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the suggestion is an improvement.

Mr. FISHER. I think it is in the wording. I do not see any objection to the change.

Mr. NORTHRUP. If the hon. minister would add the one word 'and,' I think it would cover the point.

Mr. LENNOX. I move that the amendment be made in the way I suggest.

Mr. FISHER. That change, which changes the form, so to speak, of a clause, might interfere with the wording of the Bill later on, and I think it would be better perhaps to leave it at the present time until we see whether a change in the form of the sentence might not interfere with the form of any of the sections afterwards. I will bear in mind the suggestion, and before we report the Bill we may deal with it.

Mr. LENNOX. Very good. I am satisfied with that, but I do not think it can interfere with anything subsequently appearing in the Bill. Then, in reference to the other part of the clause—subsection 2—and this is probably a finer distinction than the other, I would suggest that the words 'that is,' immediately before the word 'grown,' be left out, merely for better reading.

The provisions contained in this section shall not apply to the sale of seed that is grown, &c.

It would read better as follows :

The provisions contained in this section shall not apply to the sale of seed grown, &c.

Mr. FISHER. Perhaps those words are not necessary. All through the Act we speak of seeds that are free from the seeds of weeds. If we adopted the first suggestion of my hon. friend, substituting for 'unless they are free from any seeds of the following weeds,' the words containing therein' or 'having therein,' we would be making use of a different form of expression from that which we find in other portions of the Bill. The expression 'free from seeds' is contained all through the Bill, and it would be rather awkward to change it. The words 'that is' are perhaps unnecessary, but their presence does not interfere with the sense.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I would call the hon. minister's attention to the fact that the suggestion of my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) would be met by simply putting the word 'and' before the second 'unless.' That would avoid any complication, and perhaps meet the views of my hon. friend.

Mr. FISHER. I think that would change the sense.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture for some information in regard to the extent of the weed plague, both in the eastern portion of the country and in the Northwest Territories. Is it a fact that there are more weeds in the west, especially in the wheat country, than formerly, and are they becoming a menace to the growth of wheat in that country ?

Mr. FISHER. In regard to the latter part of my hon. friend's question, I think I am well within the mark in saying that as cultivation increases in the west the number of weeds increases. There is very little of what I might call hoe cultivation, practically none, and without that weeds are sure to increase wherever land is cultivated. They are increasing in that country just as cultivation is increasing. There is also a large introduction of weeds into the west in the crops which, before the land was cropped, were entirely unknown. How they got there it is not easy to determine. In some cases they have been brought in in seed, and sometimes also they have lain dormant for many years, as weed seeds sometimes will, and are brought out by cultivation. In the eastern parts of Canada good culti-

vation, good farming, reduces the number of weeds. I would not like to say that in that respect our farmers are deteriorating. I think to-day there are more fields that are well cultivated in eastern Canada than there were fifteen or twenty years ago, but at the same time there is a spread of bad weeds in parts of the country where these individual and particular weeds were formerly unknown, and I think it is due to the greater facilities of communication and the greater facilities of trade, inasmuch as seeds that are grown in one part of the country are more often sent to another part of the country than they used to be in the days of early settlement, when the farmers bought chiefly from their own neighbours and never went far away from home to get their seeds. To-day it is quite a common thing for farmers in the older provinces of Canada to buy seed that has been grown hundreds of miles away from where it is to be sown. In the days of the early settlement this was not so much the case, and in consequence of this facility of trade new weeds are being found constantly in certain sections of the country.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether he can say there is any relation between the growth of the weed plague in the west and the change in the hard wheat belt. The hard wheat belt seems to be growing and the weed plague seems to be growing. I would ask him if he has any information on that point?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think I have. I do not know of any information that would lead me to believe that the presence of weeds in the soil or the growth of weeds in the crop has affected the quality of the wheat.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But the hard wheat belt is moving. It does not remain in the same place.

Mr. FISHER. I will accept the hon. gentleman's statement. I do not know whether it is true or not.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It is.

Mr. LENNOX. I understood this section was to stand.

Mr. FISHER. I have no objection in view of the suggestion about the wording, but I would like to finish the discussion on the principle of the section and to adopt that allowing the section to stand only for verbal correction.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. As one interested in the seed trade for a number of years, I would like to submit a few observations in connection with this clause. I would call attention first to the latter part of the first paragraph of clause 3.

> Unless each and every receptacle, package, sack or bag containing such seeds, or a label securely atached thereto, is marked in plain and indelible manner, &c.

I would submit that packages are of different sizes, and that what might be quite possible in regard to a 200 weight package will be quite impossible in connection with a very small package. The Bill as now framed makes no difference between packages of different size, but the small dealer buys some of his seeds in very small quantities. It would be impossible to put the names of all the noxious weeds on one of these packages as they are not large enough. In this list there are 25 names, many of which are long and unintelligible to the average farmer. It seems to me that if we are going to have a law of this kind it should be a practical law and one that could be carried out. As a merchant who has been engaged in the handling of seeds, I would like to be in a position to assist in the carrying of legislation which is practical, but I do not think from my experience that all of these names can be put on each receptacle or bag. There is no way in the average seed warehouse of printing all of these names and they would have to be written, which would be a serious matter because sometimes a merchant will have from 100 to 200 packages of seed on hand; to label every one of these packages seems unnecessary so long as the particular package from which the merchant is selling is labelled, in order that the buyer will know what he is buying, which ought to be the principal thing required. There is no intention on the part of the average merchant to impose on the public seeds that are not fit for sale or use, and I think the seed merchants are as much entitled to respect in this regard as other merchants. They endeavour to do what is right and expect to do business because of the confidence people have in them.

What I cannot understand in subsection 2 of subsection 3 is why farmers are exempted from the legislation which is applied to merchants. Seed that may be purchased from one farmer by another may be as harmful as any seed purchased from a merchant. If the seed sold by the farmer is as noxious as that sold by the merchant, the farmer should be under the same law as the merchant, but according to this subsection, he does not seem to be; he may sell to his neighbour seed which a merchant would be prohibited from selling. That is one law for the merchant and another for the farmer. I come from a section where seed growing is a considerable business and our farmers are anxious to have their seed placed on the market. If it cannot be so placed then so much money will be tied up in bags, because the law says that the grain cannot be sold as seed as it may contain too much of these weeds.

I submit that these criticisms ought to have the attention of the minister. I regret that the Bill is in my hands now for the first time and that I have not had the pleasure of hearing it discussed before and I would like to have some opportunity of looking into its provisions. I desire to co-

operate with the minister in any way I can, but I submit that some of these features are impracticable, and I think that we should endeavour to have all legislation that we may pass carried out in the spirit in which it is enacted.

Mr. FISHER. I may tell my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) that I quite concur in his idea that the law should be such as can be carried out easily for the seller as well as the buyer. I have framed the provisions of this Act with that idea always in view, and I think that practically the Act does allow all of that. My hon. friend has made three criticisms of this section which I shall take up one by one. His first criticism is that it will be practically impossible for the seller to put all the names of these weeds on the packages. I may say to my hon. friend frankly that I consider that this section will practically prohibit a seller selling seed with these weeds in it. If he does undertake to sell seed with the names of these seeds on it, and says that they are all in that seed, I do not think that any farmer will buy it. If he is selling seed which contains a majority of the weeds mentioned in that list he ought not to sell it because he will be selling something which will be disgraceful to this trade ; he should be prevented from doing it. It is possible that a man might honestly and properly sell seed containing one or two of those weeds, and in order to enable that to be done with proper protection to the trade, I have changed the original intention of the Bill as introduced two years ago, when the sale of seed containing any of these weed seeds was to be absolutely prohibited. The Bill in its present form does permit of a little safeguard for the honest seller who may know that there are some of these seeds, a very few, in the seeds they are selling, and who then honestly tell their purchasers of this fact. That provision is made distinctly and directly in the interests of the trade, allowing them to go as far in the way of selling seed containing seeds of these pernicious weeds as I think it would be proper and right to permit.

My hon. friend speaks of the size of the package. These weed seeds would not be in the garden seeds which are sold in small packages such as my hon. friend perhaps has in his mind's eye when he speaks as he has done. A great many garden seeds are sold in little paper packages on which it would be difficult to write the names of these weeds, but we do not expect to find these weeds in these seeds, and if they were in them it would be highly improper and we should do anything we can to prevent it. If a package is large enough to have a label attached to it bearing the name, surname and address of the seller and the name of the variety of the seed contained in it, it would be possible to write on the back of the label the names of the weeds whose seeds are contained in it, and there would be no real difficulty in that. If we allow what my hon. friend proposes we would have a condition of affairs under which the farmer would purchase his seed and have it taken perhaps by a scoop out of a large bag or box in the store of the salesman, and afterwards if he found that that seed was not good or if he took a sample of it to be tested by the seed laboratory, it would be impossible for him to prove conclusively that that seed had come out of any individual package or bag or box in the seed salesman's warehouse, and therefore there would be no possibility of proceeding against the salesman.

In regard to the second objection which the hon. gentleman made, that clause 2 of subsection 2, of section 3, seems to exempt farmers from the provisions of this Act, I may say that it only exempts farmers from the provisions of this particular section. The reason for that exemption is this : As my hon. friend says, we do not wish to interfere with the trade of anybody, and more than is absolutely necessary. The provisions of this section are very limited, because they apply only to the case of a farmer who sells seed on his own premises to somebody who is going to use the seed, not to sell again, but for seeding purposes. Practically it exempts the case of a farmer who on his own soil sells seed which he has grown himself on that very soil to a neighbouring farmer who is going to sow it. That does not offend against one principle of this Act, which is intended to prevent the spread of weed seeds in new sections. The farmer does not send it away somewhere else to be used. In the next place, the farmer who purchases the seed probably knows the land of the farmer who raised it—knows whether it is clean land, knows pretty well what kind of weeds were growing in that farmer's fields, and he purchases the seed with his eyes open to all these things; whereas if the farmer buys seed from the seed merchant, he does not know where the seed was grown, has never seen the fields where it was grown, does not know whether they were clean or not, does not know whether the seed came from a thousand miles away or from the next farm, and therefore does not know what evil weeds he may be introducing into his own farm and his own section. The two cases are entirely different. It is for the purpose of preventing an unnecessary interference with the sale and purchase of seeds among neighbours where seed is largely grown that this proviso and exemption is made. But the exception is very small, because if the purchaser chooses, he may require that the seed be sold under the provisions of the Act. If he does not require that, he purchases the seed with his eyes open without availing himself of the protection which this Act provides. This

clause is only put in for the purpose of facilitating trade in seeds amongst neighbours, and not unnecessarily interfering with that part of the seed trade. But the trade with seed merchants is so totally different that it requires a supervision and control which the other class of trade does not.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The hon. gentleman meets to a certain extent the objection which I made, but still I think not fully, with regard to the sale of seed by one farmer to another. The merchant is deprived of the sale of such seed, and at the same time is hampered with legislation, while the farmer is not. Therefore, he cannot take advantage of the facilities of the Act and do the business he could do without it. The average profit on a bushel of clover seed is only about five per cent of its value, which constitutes a valid reason why it is not fair to hamper the merchant. It should be remembered that the merchant is not the originator of the seed; but the farmer or grower is. When the farmer takes the seed to market, the buyer may say to him, I must send the seed to the laboratory at Ottawa and ascertain whether it is saleable under the Act; if it is not, I must leave it on your hands. If the merchant practices adulteration, you can punish him; but if he buys from a farmer in good faith and offers the seed for sale in good faith, he is dealing in a fair and honourable way, even though he may not be living up to the strict terms of the Act. The secret of the whole matter is that the farmer is the grower of the seed in the first place, and therefore the Bill should begin with the land. The man who grows the seed is the best judge of what is in it. He knows whether the field is thoroughly clean or whether it is infested with wild oats or mustard, for instance. I would rather have two minutes to look over the field where the seed is grown than an hour to examine bag after bag of the seed. Therefore, I think the grower of the seed should be held accountable rather than the merchant or handler of the seed. The merchant should not be hampered more than the farmer is. Both should come under the one law. If the merchant is held amenable to it, so should be the farmer, who in selling to his neighbour is taking away from the merchant the business which he would otherwise have. The merchant has to pay taxes, and he should be safeguarded in his business. I submit these points for the consideration of the minister.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend has completely endorsed what I said a moment ago, that in such a sale as I referred to, the purchaser does not need the protection of this Act. The hon. gentleman said he would rather have two minutes to examine the field where the seed was grown than an hour or two to examine bag after bag of the seed. That is just what the purchaser does who buys seed on the premises where it is grown, and therefore he does not need the protection which the farmer does who buys from the seed merchant. But my hon. friend forgets another thing. The seed sold by the farmer must be sold to another farmer for his own use. The seed merchant buys from the farmer who grows the seed, and then cleans the seed. He has appliances and facilities for cleaning it, and as a matter of fact the seedmen of Canada do clean their seed. Further on, the Bill allows the farmer to sell seed to the seed merchant for cleaning purposes. In section 7, there is a provision that if the seed is sold to the merchant to be cleaned, then the provisions of the Act do not apply. The merchant buys from the farmer the poor or dirty seed, and proceeds to clean it and sell it as clean seed. He pays the farmer a much less price for the dirty seed than he receives for the clean seed which he sells, and quite rightly, for he ought to be paid for his work of cleaning it. But it is not necessary that the provisions of the Act should apply where a farmer sells impure or dirty seed to a merchant to be cleaned. The merchant can take care of himself quite well.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. I wish to say one word with reference to this Bill. It came before our farmers' institute a year ago, and there was only one objection which the farmers had to it. It was this, that it prevented the farmers from trading in seed among themselves. You know that a farmer who lives on clay land is always anxious to buy seed from his neighbour who lives on sharp or sandy soil. He thinks that the seed grown upon sharp soil, when sowed upon clay land, would produce a better crop, and that the seed grown upon clay land, when sown upon sharp soil, will produce equally good results. Frequently farmers are anxious to exchange their labour for seed and cannot go to a merchant to buy it. Farmers should have the privilege of buying seed from one another without getting into any difficulty under this Act. They buy with their eyes open. An examination of the field when the crop is growing gives a far better idea of the quality of the seeds than looking at the crop after it is harvested and threshed. Consequently, the farmers are anxious that the Bill should be changed so that they might be free to purchase from one another. As regards the marking of packages, no one would ever buy seeds which would have on the package the names of all these weeds, and no man would undertake to put up packages of seed for sale which would contain all these foul seeds.

Mr. WALSH. How will this section affect merchants in the country districts who buy grain from the farmers? Suppose a merchant buys a lot of grain and the very same day sells a number of packages of the seeds which turn out to contain some foul weeds,

would the merchant be subject to the penalty provided by this Act ?

Mr. FISHER. The exception in this clause only applies to the purchaser who buys from a farmer for the purpose of using the seed himself. If the seed is sold to a man who wishes to sell again, all the provisions of the Act apply.

Mr. WALSH. In many cases the merchants have no way of knowing whether there are foul seeds in the grain purchased or not.

Mr. FISHER. If they undertake to deal in seeds, they must take the necessary precautions to secure pure seeds.

Mr. LALOR. How can a country grain dealer, who buys seeds from a farmer and probably the very same day sells some of those seeds, tell whether there are any foul seeds in the grain or not ? I do not see why you should bring him under the provisions of the Act. In allowing one farmer to sell foul seeds to another, you are placing a bonus on the spreading by farmers of foul seeds in the neighbourhood where they live.

Mr. FISHER. If the local grain dealer buys seed from a farmer, all the provisions of the Act apply to the farmer who sells to him. It is only when a farmer sells to another farmer who intends using the seed for sowing purposes, that the exemption applies. If a farmer sells to a country store-keeper, the store-keeper has the same recourse against the farmer as the farmer would have against him. But if a farmer sells to a merchant, who has cleaning machinery, grain for the purpose of being cleaned, then the provisions of the Act do not apply to the farmer. But if he sells to a purchaser, who intends selling the seed again without cleaning it, then the farmer comes under the Act.

Mr. COCHRANE. In our section of the country, the farmers often sell without knowing what the purchaser intends doing with the grain. The purchaser does not let the farmer know that he is buying the grain to sell it as seed. Suppose a farmer sells grain to a grain dealer and then the grain dealer sells some of the grain to another farmer who wants it for seed, in what position would the farmer in the first instance be ? He did not sell the grain to the purchaser in order that the purchaser might sell it again. He sold it that the purchaser might do as he likes with it.

Mr. FISHER. That would be a matter left to the discretion of the court and the court in such case would probably find the farmer guiltless and the grain merchant guilty.

Mr. BARR. It seems to me that the object of the Bill is, to a considerable extent, to furnish grist to the lawyers. The usual custom is for the farmer to sell his grain wherever he finds the best market. Surely there should be a guarantee given the farmer that he did or did not sell the grain for seed. Otherwise the merchant can throw the responsibility back upon the farmer and endless litigation would be the result. There should be some provision to protect the farmer or he will be in continual trouble. No doubt where a seed grower has grown grain for seed, where he has exhibited it for sale as seed, it is necessary that the law should protect the purchaser against the purchase of foul seeds. But when a farmer sells grain without understanding that it is purchased to be sold again as seed, why should he be responsible? A country merchant, purchasing grain from a farmer might ask if he could sell the grain for seed. The farmer, not understanding the law—it would take a long time to understand it—gives his consent, and sells his grain at the best price he can get for it. The merchant can afterwards plead that he purchased the grain for seed and so paid a high price, and, if proceeded against under the law, might throw the responsibility on the farmer. I submit that the farmer, selling his grain in that way must be given better protection than he is given under this Bill.

Mr. FISHER. I sympathize with my hon. friend's (Mr. Barr's) desire to protect both sides of the bargain, and I think this Bill does protect both sides to the utmost possible extent. My hon. friend says that a country store-keeper buying grain from a farmer can afterwards sell it for seed and pretend that he bought it for seed from the farmer. But the machinery of the Bill, which we come to later on, provides that, in order to be able to make such a plea the purchaser must within seven days take a sample and have it analyzed, and, if the seed is found to be impure or wrongly described, the purchaser must proceed against the farmer from whom he bought the seed for having sold it under false representation. I think this completely protects both sides in the case we are discussing. But I say frankly that I do not want the farmer or the country store-keeper, or the seed merchant either, to be protected so much that we never can convict him if he has done wrong. I want the Bill such that under it wrong-doing can be punished and so prevented. My hon. friend seems to fear that the farmers or country store-keepers will not be informed about the law. As soon as it becomes law I intend to take every means in my power to spread the knowledge of it, as I did with regard to the proposals for this Bill, concerning which the farming community are pretty well informed, as well as concerning the discussion of the subject in this House last year. I think the leading farmers, at any rate in

all sections of the country, as well as the country store-keepers and the seed merchants are pretty well informed as to what is proposed in this Bill. And they will be still better informed if it becomes law.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I would like to ask the minister what position the millers will be in under this law? Speaking for my own city of Chatham, I can say that the millers there take every precaution to get the best seed to dispose of among the farmers. And the same is true of the seed merchants. It seems to me that the effect of this Bill will be to drive a great many dealers out of business and so put the farmers at a disadvantage.

Mr. FISHER. Anybody who sells seed for seed purposes will come under the operation of the Bill whether he is a miller, a dealer, a farmer or anything else—except the farmer who sells on his own premises to his neighbour. My hon. friend (Mr. Clements) describes in eulogistic terms the seedsmen and millers of his district and I have no doubt he describes them truly. These people need not fear the Bill; on the contrary it is a Bill that will protect them from dishonest competition.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It seems to me that the millers will be compelled to go out of the selling of wheat, oats and things of that kind as seed. Yet, I am sure hon. members will agree with me that millers throughout the country are most anxious to furnish the farmers with the best seed possible and that they do it.

Mr. FISHER. If they are selling seed that will render them liable to prosecution, they are selling seed that it is not desirable that the farmers should buy.

Mr. LENNOX. I would call the hon. minister's attention to a rather different phase of subsection 2 from that we have been discussing. The argument has been directed to the idea that the farmers are getting too much indulgence under this section. On the other hand, I think they are not getting the protection they are entitled to. It is true that there is a provision which may, to some extent, facilitate the disposal of their grain by the farmers. But when we turn to section 7, it appears to me—and I would ask the minister to take it into his consideration before we pass that section finally—that, the farmer should have the protection that is thrown about him under subsection 2 not only as regards selling to a neighbouring farmer, but in all cases. In one case, he is selling his grain not knowing to what purpose it will be diverted, and in the other he is selling it knowing that it will be used for seed. To avoid the possibility of lawsuits and the complications that would follow, I submit, the subsection should be framed in such a way as to afford protection to the farmer in all cases of selling his grain ; and should throw on the dealer in seeds the onus of seeing that the grain is not resold for seed until it is put in proper condition. That could be accomplished, perhaps, by the introduction of a very few words. I will read the section as I would like to see it, for the consideration of the minister :

> The provisions contained in this section shall not apply to the sale of seed grown, sold and delivered by any farmer on his own premises, for seeding by the purchaser himself or to a dealer in seeds, unless the purchaser himself or the dealer in the seeds obtains from the seller at the time of the sale thereof a certificate that the seed is supplied to him subject to the provisions of this Act.

The proper course is to provide that dealers in seeds shall guarantee to the public that seeds purchased from them are in reasonable condition, and to leave the farmer absolutely free to sell his seed to a dealer in whatever condition it may be, because, the farmer has not facilities, probably, to extract the various weed-seeds, and, in many instances is not aware of the fact that these objectionable seeds are present in the grain.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister say what would be the probable cost to a seedsman of the machinery necessary to clean all the seeds he has referred to? I cannot help thinking that if the machinery is expensive it will not only increase the cost of the seed to the farmer, but it will place the seed business in the control of a very few hands.

Mr. FISHER. The cost of the machinery to clean the seed would depend altogether upon its capacity as well as upon its effectiveness. Probably the largest seed dealers in Canada have machinery which would fulfil all the requirements of this Act, and sufficient to meet all the demands likely to be made upon them. Such a machine would cost about $800 ; while for a small business, an ordinary fanning mill would do a great deal, though it would not be completely effective, such a machine as can be got for $30 or $40. But the large seed merchants could get all the machinery required in this country, for less than $1,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Then I think the effort will be practically to force the cleaning of seeds and the sale of seeds, in our country, into the hands of a comparatively few. There are very few local seed merchants who would invest in machinery costing $800 for the purpose of cleaning the seed that will be sold in their community. While I think that many provisions in the Bill, are wise, there are others that I think are too sweeping. When you compel farmers to purchase only such seeds as have gone through the hands of the seed merchants, you may depend upon it they are going to pay a great deal more for their seeds.

Mr. FISHER. As a matter of fact, the seed merchants of Canada to-day are pretty well equipped with seed cleaning machinery, The seed merchants have practically all the machinery necessary to fulfil the requirements of this Act. An investment in a plant costing from $500 to $700 or $800 to enable a man to carry on a business of this kind, would be a very small charge upon the business. When it comes to the farmers themselves cleaning their seeds, they cannot do it ; therefore we provide machinery by which, under certain conditions and in certain circumstances, they can sell seeds if the purchaser chooses to buy from them.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many seed merchants have the necessary machinery ?

Mr. COCHRANE. Is there one between Kingston and Toronto ?

Mr. FISHER. I am told by my officer who is familiar with the trade that there are fully fifteen seed merchants who have the full equipment.

Mr. BARR. Is that for the whole Dominion ?

Mr. HENDERSON. That is a big combine.

Mr. FISHER. That would be for the whole Dominion, but most of them are located in the province of Ontario.

Mr. BARR. What will Manitoba and the other provinces that have no machinery of this kind do ? It is not likely to benefit the farmer, and that is the starting point. It seems to me dangerous legislation and is making a radical change.

Mr. FISHER. There are two or three seed merchants in the province of Manitoba who are thoroughly equipped, and one at any rate in the province of British Columbia who is well equipped ; and there are some others in Ontario further east.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The point raised by my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) was exactly the point I wanted to bring to the notice of the minister. While I would compliment the minister upon his desire to pass useful legislation in this direction, I cannot see myself that it is going to benefit the farming community to any extent. It will certainly cause a great deal of trouble.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. So far as my experience goes, no machine has yet been devised that can thoroughly remove all the seeds named in the Bill, and that is the point I desire to draw to the attention of the minister. For instance, from alsike clover and timothy seed there is no machine yet devised that can remove false flax seed. So far as I am aware that has never been removed successfully by any machine. Now the minister rather intimated that seed merchants wilfully left in certain seeds that might be removed by machinery. I believe it is the endeavour of every honest merchant to remove every impure seed that it is possible for him to remove. But I want to point out that there are certain seeds mentioned in this Bill that cannot be removed by any machine ever yet designed. No machine can be designed, unless it has eyes that can take out those weed seeds that are the same size and weight as the pure seed. Wind won't do it, and sieves won't do it. Then what will do it ? Nothing but eyes, and we have no machine yet, that has eyes and that will take out these seeds of similar weight and similar size, and only different colour, from the sample. The effect of the Bill will be to put the business into a few hands, to raise immensely to the farmers of this country both the price of the seed grain and the seed grasses ; and both of these, if they are cheap, constitute an element of wealth that no farmer can afford to ignore. My belief is that clover seed at $8 or $10 a bushel is quite high enough ; if you put it up to $12 or $14 a bushel you are going to do great harm to agriculture in this country. I submit it is not well to pass too drastic a measure. I trust the minister will allow that clause to stand until he has had an opportunity to look into it and to make it more workable.

Mr. FISHER. I would point out to my hon. friend that I did not say that weed seeds would be entirely removed ; I said that machinery was in existence which could conform to the provisions of this Act. The provisions of this Act do not require absolute purity, they come as closely to it as we can make them under the circumstances prevailing in the trade. We do not expect to get absolute purity, we would be very glad to do so, but that is likely to be impossible. I may say that the Bill has been considerably modified so as to make it less stringent than the Bill of last session. But I desire to say that if the Bill is not passed as stringent as it is here framed, it will be practically useless in improving the seed trade in this country ; and I am not prepared to take the responsibility of leaving the seed trade any longer without control.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. I am inclined to think that if the seed trade got into fewer hands it would be better for the farmers of this country, because the dealers would be able to get a better class of seed and sell it cheaper than they would otherwise. Allow me to give you one illustration from my own riding. A gentleman from the state of New York came there and went into the seed business. When he was purchasing seed he got a list of all the farmers who grew good seed. He had an agent whom he sent round to inspect every field before the crop was harvested, so that he

might know exactly what foul seed of any kind was growing in that field. When he found farmers who had the very best quality of seed and the cleanest fields, it was from them he purchased his seed. The consequence was that farmers gradually began to grow a better class of seed. But unfortunately the duty imposed by the United States government on seeds going into that country was so high that he could not export any from Canada. I think, therefore, that if this Bill becomes law we will eventually have not only better seed, but cheaper seed, by reason of the inspection of seeds in the fields where they are growing.

Mr. COCHRANE. What kind of seed is it that the hon. gentleman refers to?

Mr. WRIGHT. Peas.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is a great trouble to clean peas I am sure. You must have time. An ordinary fanning mill would take all the foul seeds out of peas.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 3 stands:

On section 4,

4. No person shall sell, or offer, expose or have in his possession for sale, any seeds of timothy, red clover, alsike, or any mixture containing the said seeds, in or from any receptacle, package, sack or bag upon which is marked 'No. 1' or any other designation which represents such seeds as of first quality, unless they are free from the seeds of weeds named in section 3 of this Act, and are also free form the seeds of White Cockle, (Lychnis vespertina, (Sibth.); Night-Flowering Catch-fly, (Silene noctiflora, L.); False Flax, (Camelina sativa, Crantz.); Canada Thistle, (Onicus anvensis, Hoffm.); Ox-eye, Daisy, (Chrysanthemum Leucanthemum, L.); Curled Dock, (Rumex Crispus, L.); Blue Weed, (Echium vulgare, L.); Ribgrass, (Plantago lanceolata, L.); Chicory, (Cichorium Intybus, L.), and contain out of every one hundred seeds not less than ninety-nine seeds of the kind or kinds represented, or seeds of other useful and harmless grasses and clovers, of which ninety-nine seeds must be germinable.

Mr. LENNOX. I would call the hon. minister's attention to this in connection with the next section. Probably we could deal with it when we come to section 5, but we might as well understand how it works out now. It is provided that out of every one hundred seeds ninety-nine shall be of the kind or kinds proposed to be sold. Then, section 5 provides:

The Governor in Council may make regulations determining the maximum proportion of seeds of the weeds named in sections 3 and 4 of this Act, that may be tolerated in any seeds without affecting their character as being within the meaning of the said sections free from the seeds of the said weeds.

I do not see how these two sections can possibly work out together. There is a definite provision in section 4 that out of every hundred seeds ninety-nine must be of the character proposed to be sold. If that is absolute then the provision contained in section 5 can have no application; and it is very important, I should think, that there should be some provision of that character because it is almost impossible that the growers of seeds should come up to the provision which is here contained, if I understand these two sections aright.

Mr. FISHER. In reply to my hon. friend I will say that section 4 is absolute. Of every one hundred seeds there must be ninety-nine of the kind which is purported to be sold. But, the regulations which may be passed under section 5 could not contravene that in any way whatever. That would refer to the percentage of seeds which might be allowed where the Act requires that the sample must be free from seeds, but that would in no way override the necessity of ninety-nine seeds out of a hundred being true to the name of the sample.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the hon. minister see the effect of that? Is it possible to work that out in the way the hon. minister suggests? It is provided that out of every one hundred seeds there shall be ninety-nine of the character that is purported to be sold; that is that out of one hundred seeds in the whole package there shall be ninety-nine seeds of the character represented to be sold. Then what happens under section 5? That only allows one per cent of objectionable seeds. That only leaves one per cent of all those weed seeds enumerated in section 3 and again added to in section 4, which may be represented in these seeds. Then, how can it be worked out? The Governor in Council may determine what proportion of objectionable seeds shall be in a package without militating against the provisions of the Act. That—I say it with all due respect—is not good sense upon the face of it.

Mr. FISHER. I do not agree with my hon. friend. If my hon. friend will look at section 6 he will see that there is a provision in that section also for a greater proportion than five to one thousand of the seeds sold as being permissible even though the Act may say that no weed seeds shall be present. Now, the regulations under section 5 may go as high as ten per thousand permissible and still not interfere with the provision of one per cent in section 4, but they may go a great deal less than ten per thousand. They may by regulation be placed at only two or three per thousand and that would not contravene or interfere with the one per cent which may under section 4 be existent. But section 4 requires absolutely that there shall be ninety-nine per cent of the seed which is purported to be sold; that is absolute and no regulation under section 5 can go beyond that or allow more than one per cent,

but it might allow much less than the one per cent and still be within the provision of the Act.

Mr. LENNOX. Which is only making it a little more absurd than I thought it was. That is all the difference.

Mr. FISHER. I cannot see it.

Mr. LENNOX. It comes down to this, according to the hon. minister and according to the section, that the utmost of foul seed that can be contained in the package is one per cent, but after providing for that condition of things and after the admission, extracted by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) that as to certain seeds it is impossible to extract them, we have this position of things that the most that can possibly be contained in a package is one per cent of foul seeds. Then we have sections 5 and 6 containing this additional provision that the Governor in Council may make regulations by which the one per cent of foul seeds shall not be permitted. What condition of things will we have in regard to the farmer who is growing seeds ? I am not solicitous about other parties because I think they can protect themselves, but we have this condition as regards the farmers that we have them reduced to the absolute necessity of having ninety-nine per cent of the kind of seeds that are purported to be sold, with the additional burden, cast upon them, that the Governor in Council may make a regulation that even that door of one per cent of escape may be closed and it may be made a fraction of one per cent. If it was unreasonable before, I think it is much more unreasonable by reason of these provisions contained in sections 5 and 6.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think my hon. friend understands the section.

Mr. COCHRANE. That is the trouble.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, that is the trouble, but at the same time as the trouble is there, I will try to explain it. Under section 4 there are two conditions which are requisite before a sample of seeds can be marked No. 1. The first is that the seeds are free from the seeds of certain weeds. Does my hon. friend understand that ?

Mr. LENNOX. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. First, that they are free from the seeds of the weeds named. That is the first condition. The second condition is that there shall be at least ninety-nine seeds in every one hundred of the seed which is purported to be sold. Now, in regard to the first condition, the Governor in Council may make regulations as to what percentage, if I may call it so, or fraction of a percentage may be permitted and the sample still be considered to be free from these weed seeds. That would probably be, surely be in this case, far less than one per cent permissible.

Mr. LENNOX. Exactly, it must be.

Mr. FISHER. Then in regard to the second contention of its being necessary that 99 seeds out of 100 should be the seeds purporting to be sold, section 5 does not apply to that at all.

Mr. LENNOX. No, I know that.

Mr. FISHER. Very well then, as far as the first part of it is concerned, it would state what number of seeds per thousand were allowed to be present without being considered to be present. That may sound like an anomaly, that they are present but yet are not to be considered present ; but that is in deference to what my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) has pointed out—and I was well aware of it—that we do not expect absolute perfection, we do not expect to get absolute freedom from all weed seeds, but we do want to get just as little as the conditions of the trade, the perfection of machinery and circumstances will permit. We have, therefore, inserted section 5 for the purpose of making a slight allowance for human fallability and weakness, or for the weakness of machinery, if you choose to put it in that way. I think my hon. friend will now understand the necessity of the two sections.

Mr. LENNOX. I think I understand the minister. It is just this, that there must be 99 seeds out of each 100 which are seeds of the variety purporting to be sold. There may be one foul seed in 100, but that possibility does not become absolute, because the Governor in Council may cut that down just as much as they like.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend does not go quite far enough. What he says is true of the seeds named, but there might be other seeds which are not named, and still there must not be more than one per cent of weed seeds.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister says that there is only one per cent of margin. In any case there must be 99 per cent of pure seed ; if there are other seeds that are not named here, there is still only one per cent to work on. I would ask the minister if he thinks it is wise to make so drastic a provision in reference to this matter, and to throw such a serious onus on the people who raise and sell seeds ?

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend again misses one point : this is optional. A man need not put ' No. 1 ' on a package. This is a clause which provides, that if a package of seeds is sold as No. 1, that is, as the best quality, it must live up to this clause. If a man is selling seed that he knows is not No. 1, he should not put No. 1 on his seed.

Mr. LENNOX. That is what I wanted to get at. I quite admit that it is optional,

but what I want to ensure is that the sale of what may be safely branded as No. 1 seed shall not be confined to the hands of half a dozen men. This Act is driving out of the market the large class of producers, and is confining the market to the hands of the half dozen men who have this superior machinery, and when you limit it so that the requirement is as near perfection as you can get—as near perfection as the late Ontario government, 'almost perfection'—you are driving out the producers and the honest, hard working farmer, and creating a monopoly in the hands of a few, which thing is what I want to avoid.

Mr. FISHER. I am rather disposed to take straight issue with the hon. gentleman. If it is necessary that the farmer, in order to get good seed, should have to get it from only a few people, I think that is better for the farmer than to get bad seed from a lot of people. I am prepared to pass a law so drastic that if people will not live up to the law and give the farmers what they profess to be selling to them, they shall be driven out of business. That is the whole purpose of the law. As I said, to begin with, if this Bill did not tread upon the toes of any one in the seed business, there would not be any raison d'être for the Bill at all.

Mr. FOSTER. What ?

Mr. FISHER. Does my hon. friend dispute that ? Perhaps he wants a translation.

Mr. COCHRANE. You ought to talk so that people will understand you.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman understands ; he read some French the other day.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not recognize the French.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman's ear and pronunciation are so perfect in that language that I bow to his superior knowledge. We had an evidence of it the other day.

Mr. HENDERSON. Humbug.

Mr. FISHER. I say frankly that I do not want seed to be sold as No. 1 which will not live up to the provisions of this section. I am prepared to advocate that the Bill should be so drastic that seed cannot be sold to farmers in Canada marked as 'No. 1' and said to be of the highest quality, unless it lives up to the provisions of this section. As a matter of fact, we have had a large number of samples of seed tested, and I have here a statement of what was collected last year. We collected 450 samples through the country, and of the timothy seed 49 per cent of the samples lived up to the provisions of this section; of alsike seed, 17 per cent lived up to the provisions of the section ; and of red clover, 21 per cent, and these were samples of seed that were taken largely in the parts of Canada where avowedly poor seed is sold. When we come to take the samples of seed sent to us by reliable and responsible merchants, we find that there were 196 samples received. Of the samples of timothy 76 per cent were up to this standard ; alsike, 54 per cent ; and of red clover, 63 per cent, showing that if men try to carry on their business properly and rightly, there is no difficulty for them to be able to live up to the provisions of this section. It can be done if people will only try to do it, and if they will not try to do it, it is the object of this Bill to make them do it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the minister tell us what number of firms in western Ontario have the necessary machinery for cleaning the seeds—machinery which costs over $800 ?

Mr. FISHER. I would not like to mention the names of the firms ; to do it would look a little too much like advertising. I may say that a considerable number of the leading seed merchants in Ontario have the machinery.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. As there are only fifteen in the Dominion, would it do any harm to name them all ?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think it would be wise to name individual firms.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It seems to me that one of the great difficulties in the discussion of this Bill is the manner in which the Bill is drawn. If I understand it correctly, the intention of section 4 is that there is to be not more than one seed out of 100 that is not the right kind of seed. If that is the manner in which this is to be judged, I see absolutely no use of clause 5, which says the Governor in Council may determine how many poor seeds may be tolerated. It says that distinctly—

> The Governor in Council may make regulations determining the maximum proportion of seeds of the weeds named in sections 3 and 4 of this Act.

I understood the minister to say that it did not mean the seeds named in section 3, but it might mean some other seed. I think this Bill is not properly drawn for presentation to this House.

Mr. FISHER. I am sorry to hear the hon. gentleman's opinion on such a subject. I venture to say that the Bill is drawn by the best draftsmen of Bills that are available for this House or this country. I do not pretend myself to draft Bills. They are drawn by the Department of Justice, on the instruction we give as to what is required. But I think I have given a complete explanation of the point at issue, and have shown that clause 5 does not apply at all to the percentage of foreign seeds, in what my hon. friend has quoted in section 4.

Mr. COCHRANE. What do you want it in for ?

Mr. FISHER. Because it applies to another portion of section 4. As I stated a few minutes ago, there are two conditions in clause 4, and clause 5 regulates or controls to a certain extent the first condition, but does not interfere in any way with the second condition. My hon. friend who spoke a few minutes ago insists that it does. I cannot help it if he does not understand it.

Mr. COCHRANE. As a plain, practical farmer, I wish to say that there is the trouble. The minister says he is pleading for the poor farmer. Well, I am one of them.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend is not a poor farmer.

Mr. COCHRANE. I made my living as a farmer, which you never did. If the hon. gentleman does not understand farming better than he does this Bill, he would be in a very humble position in life if he tried to make his living by it. He tells the farmers that they can understand this Bill thoroughly. If it is so plain, how is it that the Minister of Agriculture, with all his wisdom, cannot explain it so that the lawyers of this House can understand it ? What position will the poor farmer be in when he goes before a court? I want to impress this on the hon. gentleman's mind—because it requires a great deal to impress a fact on the mind of a gentleman who is so conceited that he thinks he knows it all—that this Bill is so complicated that with all his explanations he cannot bring it down to the comprehension of the lawyers of this House. I wonder if the Minister of Justice understands the Bill that he has drafted.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I want to draw attention to the word 'free' used in clause 4. I understood the hon. minister to say, when discussing clause 3, that he did not expect absolute purity; but the word 'free' as used in clause 4, is not a comparative term; it is absolute, so that if there is one impure seed in a bushel it cannot be said to be free. That is an impossibility. There must be absolute purity from all the seeds enumerated in clause 3, and also those named in clause 4.

Mr. FISHER. No, no. That is just why I want clause 5, to which another hon. gentleman objects so much, so that we may make a regulation to provide that absolute freedom to a certain extent as it may be found necessary.

On section 7—exemptions from the Act,

Mr. CHISHOLM. Why should the provision for cleaning seeds be confined to merchants ? It seems to me that the farmers should be included. A cleaning machine costing $800 might be purchased and taken around from farmer to farmer in the same way as is done with a threshing machine.

Mr. FISHER. If the seeds were cleaned in the way my hon. friend suggests, by the farmers themselves, they would not be sold at all until after they were cleaned; and then they would not require to be exempted.

Mr. CHISHOLM. If the Minister of Agriculture took steps to educate the farmers as to the different kinds of seeds, he might encourage them to prevent the spread of noxious weeds without embarrassing them so much. If he had sample cases prepared, such as I think he has already prepared, with noxious seeds contained in small bottles, properly labelled, and if every seed merchant were compelled to have one of these cases on exhibition at the place where he sold seeds, and at the same time have a bottle containing the seeds he was selling absolutely free from impurities, so that the farmers could see them, he might in that way do a great deal to educate them without hampering them, and prevent a great deal of litigation.

Mr. FISHER. I am glad to hear the suggestion of my hon. friend. We have been trying to do that kind of work. We have had prepared a cardboard box containing samples of the weed seeds known in the country and are distributing those boxes to those who deal in seeds and the agricultural organizations throughout the country. That is one of the educational factors that we have been making use of in order to instruct the farmers so that they may be able to examine what they buy. We are not restricting our efforts to educate the farmers but on the contrary are increasing them.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Are the provisions in clause 7 intended to apply to seed sold for export ? There are many noxious weeds which thrive in a climate such as ours, but might not mature in Great Britain, France or Germany, and seeds containing the seeds of such weeds might not be prejudiced thereby to anything like the same extent in those countries as in Canada. Will the provisions of this Bill apply to such seeds when sold for export ? The bulk of the seed trade in Ontario is with foreign countries, and it is not desirable that we should in any way restrict those markets.

Mr. FISHER. Section 6 provides that no person shall sell or offer or have in his possession for sale for the purpose of seeding in Canada—Any seeds of timothy, &c. I do not think that this restriction is in any of the other sections, but I might say that, as a matter of fact, our seed merchants export almost entirely the highest quality of seed. That is one of the evils we have to contend with, namely, that the best quality is exported and the inferior sold in Canada. The best quality is exported to countries where they have just such legislation as

we are now proposing. Consequently these countries have been able to get better seeds than our own farmers can procure. The Bill applies to all seeds held for sale in Canada, whether intended for export or not. If it did not, we would be constantly hampered in the enforcement of the law by having to decide whether the seed was intended or not for export.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. What the hon. minister says may be true as regards European markets, but the United States are prepared to buy all grades of seeds. They will not pay the same prices, but will buy any seeds at a price. It appears to me important that this Bill should only apply to seeds sold retail for use in Canada. Why should we lessen the value of goods which we send to a foreign country ? If you will prevent dealers from buying certain seed even for export, you will make a marketable commodity a dead stock in the hands of the growers or merchants. I do not think this Bill should apply to seeds intended for export. We can safely let the foreign countries look after their own interests.

Mr. FISHER. I have no desire to protect foreign countries, but the difficulty of carrying out this measure would be very much greater if we were to allow seed to be held in this country, ostensibly for export, of a quality inferior to what is allowed to be sold in the country.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. I do not agree with the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). We should apply to seed for export the same test as to seed for use in the country. We should endeavour to gain the reputation of growing the best seed in the world, just as the growers in Germany of the sugar beet seed are reputed to grow seed that cannot be excelled. France has a similar reputation for cauliflower seed. When you want the best cauliflower seed, you must go to France. One word with reference to the fear expressed that this trade will go into the hands of a very few. As a matter of fact, the wholesale trade is limited to a very few and that is a good thing. How does this particular trade work? A wholesale firm sends out a traveller to the retail dealers in Renfrew. He tells these dealers that if he can sell a sufficient quantity to send a carload to the town of Renfrew, whence it could be distributed to the various other places, he will do it on more favourable terms. The freight is a very important factor. If the retailer can buy at wholesale prices every kind of seed he wants and have it delivered cheaply at his own door, he will not fail to do so because he would then be able to undersell everybody else in his own vicinity.

Mr. MILLER. If the Bill should pass in its present shape, it may lead to some confusion, and some guiltless persons may possibly suffer. The main object of the Bill is to protect the farmer who desires to keep his farm clean and to purchase seed free from noxious weeds. I would suggest that in every case the purchaser should be entitled to a certificate from the seller to the effect that the seller has sold a certain quantity of a certain seed to the purchaser for seed purposes and has sold it, knowing that he is incurring all the responsibility under this Act. We should provide further that any seed sold without such certificate shall be deemed to have been sold for other than seeding purposes. That would meet the many objections raised. The objection that this Bill would drive the trade into the hands of the large dealers does not apply. As a fact the majority of seed merchants purchase their seeds from the wholesale seed merchants who have the appliances for cleaning.

Again, if we say that, in order that the farmer may be protected by the provision of the Bill, the seed merchant in the country store will suffer, then, I say, so let it be; it is a case of the greatest good to the greatest number. We might apply the same argument and say : We will allow every person to sell drugs : We will allow every person to practice medicine. But we do not apply the argument in that way. There is another thing that, in my opinion, might be provided for by the Act and is not. I have known many cases of farmers purchasing in the spring what they believed to be turnip seed, but what they found out too late to be rape seed. It seems to me that where that is done there must have been not merely negligence but deliberate fraud.

If there is any way of punishing the man who is guilty of selling for turnip seed something that is utterly worthless for the purpose for which it is purchased, it would be well, I think, to cover the case in this Bill. There is another point which may not properly come under this Bill as it is at present, but which could easily be allowed for by some little change in the title and might be provided for in a special section. I would suggest that there should be a provision in the Bill that the man owning or having under his control a threshing machine should be obliged, before he leaves the premises of one farmer to go to those of another, to thoroughly clean his separator.

Mr. FISHER. I sympathize very much with the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Miller) in many of the points he has raised. I may tell him frankly, that, in consequence of the opposition to the details of the Bill, I have thought it best to take one step at a time. I hope the day will come, and not very long hence, when we shall be able to go further than is provided for in this Bill, but I suppose it will be impossible, at one fell swoop to effect all the reforms in the seed trade that we would like to see, particularly as that trade has existed hitherto

without control or supervision. I hope that, in the future, provisions shall be made, such as my hon. friend speaks of, but at present, I fear, we can hardly go as far as he would like. As to his first suggestion concerning a certificate accompanying every sale of seed, under the provisions of the Act, there is a subclause in section 3 providing that a certificate can be given that the provisions of the Act do not apply, but, in every other respect all the processes of the Act shall apply to every sale without a certificate required or given.

Mr. HAGGART. Is any law similar to this in force in any country so far as the minister knows, and if so, does it work well ?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot say that exactly similar provisions are in force in any country that I know of. In certain European countries including Austria-Hungary and Switzerland, they had a system called a guarantee system which is provided for by law and which seems to work fairly well. But I hardly thought the condition of the trade here such that we could safely introduce that system. I have taken most of the provisions of this law from laws somewhat similar in their nature—but dealing with other subjects—already in force in Canada. I have taken some of the provisions from the Fruit Marks Act, and of the General Inspection Act.

Mr. HAGGART. I understood that they had a law on this subject in Germany and also in Great Britain, and I wondered how they compared with this and whether they were successful or not.

Mr. FISHER. There are laws on this subject in European countries much more drastic than this. When I first drew this Bill, a couple of years ago, I was much closer to those models than I am in the Bill as now presented. I have been modifying in the direction of leniency, and as I said to my hon. friend (Mr. Miller), I think that it is necessary to proceed a step at a time. I trust that with the improvement in the trade which, I am sure, will result from the passage of this law, we shall be able to go further as the trade can stand it.

On section 8,

Mr. MACDONELL. I would like to ask the minister if it is the intention that a person shall be punishable only when he has violated the provisions of sections of 3, 4 and 5—all of them ? That is the way it is drawn.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonell) has read the section. It says :

Every person who, by himself or through the agency of another person violates any of the provisions of sections 3, 4 and 5——

He is punishable if he violates any of the provisions. There is a misprint in my copy of the Act which I should like to correct. I move that in line 3 or of section 8, the figure 5 be struck out and the figure 6 substituted. Section 5 is not a provision of the Act that can be violated, though section 6 is

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MACDONELL. I would still urge upon the minister the point that the person should be liable if he violated any one of the previous sections—3, 4 or 5. The Act, as drawn, makes these sections cumulative, it brackets the three of them, and says that a man must offend against the provisions of all three sections in order to be liable to indictment. If he offends against any one section, it should be sufficient. I submit the matter as a legal question, and the word 'or' should be substituted for the word 'and.'

Mr. FISHER. I am not prepared to set up my own opinion against the legal opinion of my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonell), who is a lawyer of high standing. But I do not read it in that way, and I would be disposed to risk the enforcement of the Act with the words as they are in the section.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The fine seems to be rather heavy. I understand that these costs may be levied upon every package. That is unnecessarily severe. If it is pointed out to him that one of these packages is wrong and he can fall back on the parties from whom he got it, why, of course, he will do it. But to fine him on the whole fifty packages when he is only selling from one seems to be rather severe. Further, I cannot ascertain where the responsibility of the retailer begins and the responsibility of the wholesaler ends. I do not find in this clause a point at which it may be said that the wholesaler is relieved and the retailer becomes responsible. And when the retailer becomes responsible, it does not appear that he is ever relieved so long as the result of that crop is unknown. I would ask whether he is relieved before or after the crop has been reaped ? If it is open for a man to come back six months afterwards and say: That seed I got from you is not pure seed—of which there is no evidence that he did get it, he only says so—there is a great difficulty. Now, as a dealer, I might buy in the early part of the season from a man in Toronto, later in the season I would buy, say, from a man in Hamilton, and I might also buy from Chicago. It would be impossible for me to tell which of these three lots I sold from to an individual who might complain at the end of the season. Therefore, the responsibility rests upon the seller, and it is not clear where it begins and where it ends.

Mr. FISHER. In the first place, in a case where there is no proof, I do not think the

person accused would have very much to fear, because without proof he cannot be condemned. In the second place, in regard to the retailer and the wholesaler, the case would be in regard to a certain sale, whoever made that sale would be responsible. The provisions of subsections 2 and 3 of this section enable a person who has made a sale to escape responsibility of that sale under certain conditions which are here detailed, one of which is that it was a seed package the seal of which had not been broken. The other is that he must prove to the satisfaction of the court that he had not tampered with the seed, and that it was really in the condition in which he obtained it, and that he had sold it in good faith. He would have to prove this to relieve himself from responsibility. The proof on which he would be relieved of responsibility would no doubt serve in a court of law against the person who sold it to him. So far as the protection of the wholesaler who sells to the retailer is concerned, the wholesaler would have no responsibility if the retailer sold again, because the last purchase would be the only purchase on which a case could be founded, unless under the circumstances to which I have just referred. The hon. gentleman also spoke about a minimum penalty, that is to say, that if a person sold a large number of packages he might be unfairly mulcted in a considerable sum.

Now, if my hon. friend will study the section carefully, he will see that while there is a maximum limit there is no minimum limit. In the amount to be imposed on him for each package, the magistrate or the court, I suppose, who imposed the fine would take all the circumstances into consideration. If he judged that a small amount would suffice to punish him and to indicate that he had done wrong, the amount placed on the sale of each individual package would be so nominal that the whole amount he would have to pay would be very small.

Mr. BARR. Suppose a farmer purchases from a retailer and he finds that the seed is not good and proceeds against the retailer. But the retailer gets out of it on the ground that he purchased the seed from a wholesale dealer or some other person ; then would the farmer have to proceed against the wholesale dealer ?

Mr. FISHER. I think subsection 3 of this Act would meet such circumstances :

> Every magistrate who has disposed of any case under the foregoing subsection shall, within one month from the date of his judgment therein, send to the Minister of Agriculture a report of the case.

I think it will then be the duty of the department to take up the case and proceed. Although that is not expressly stated, I think it is implied that such a case as the hon. gentleman indicates would be one that the department might properly take up.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that the object for which a report is to be made ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I think the minister would be assuming a grave duty in deciding whether he should take it up or not. This section makes it optional for the Department of Agriculture to interfere in the case. I may say that I think the intention of the minister in drawing this Bill is a good one. But I regret that we have not sufficient information before us as to how similar Acts work in other countries to enable us to judge of the probable effect of this one. I think we should proceed very slowly on such information as we can get. I think the committee ought to be placed in possession of an abstract of the legislation passed in other countries on this subject, that would enable us to come to a conclusion as to whether we should pass this measure in its present form or not. If there is a law on the statutes of the United States, as I think the Minister of Agriculture said there was, we ought to be placed in possession of it. I think the Bill will largely increase the price of seeds to farmers, and I think that a large majority of farmers, after purchasing their seeds, will hesitate very much before going into court and taking the chance of getting a remedy for the sale of impure seeds to them.

Mr. FISHER. I think my hon. friend (Mr. A. Martin) does not quite give the farmers the credit which is due them for defending themselves. We have a number of laws on the statute-book to protect trade in various ways. We have the General Inspection Act, we have the Act which deals with commercial fertilizers and a number of other Acts, all of which are framed for the purpose of protecting the individual in his trade. This is another Act of the same character. The point my hon. friend brought out in regard to the government, or the department, proceeding and taking up cases is one in regard to which I do not agree with him. I do not think it ought to be imperative under the Act, because circumstances vary so much that it would be necessarily left in the discretion of the minister of the department as to what should be proceeded with and as to what should not be proceeded with. That is the invariable rule in all cases that come under the Inspection Acts, and in this case I think it would be absolutely necessary as in the other cases.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I think it would not be a good feature of the Bill that it should be left in the hands of the Department of Agriculture to determine whether the purchaser shall have any remedy or not. It might lead to some very improper decisions by the Minister of Agriculture and some farmers might suffer while some others might get the benefit. Information in reference to the working of similar enact-

ments in other countries is wanting. The hon. minister did not enlighten the committee in this respect. It is very well to protect the farmers, but I am afraid this is a Bill for the lawyers to fight over. I would gladly support an effective and workable Bill, but this one is full of difficulties. The committee should have better information in reference to what has been done in other and older countries.

Mr. FISHER. Under any circumstances and in any case the department or any individual could proceed. It is an offence against the law. The Bill does not limit the prosecution to the person who suffers.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the object of the 3rd subsection of section 8 ?

Mr. FISHER. The object of the third subsection of section 8 is to provide in case the person accused of selling fraudulently has proved that he was not himself responsible for the condition of the seeds, then an approach may be made to the Minister of Agriculture so that if it is thought necessary or advisable, departmental action can be taken for the carrying on of the prosecution. If my hon. friend will read the section just preceding he will see under what conditions and circumstances the seller can clear himself of a charge of breach of the Act. When he has done so some one else is evidently guilty and section 3 provides that the department may be notified of the condition of affairs, may take it into consideration and if it is thought advisable may institute a prosecution against the party who is guilty.

Mr. FOSTER. Not against this person.

Mr. FISHER. No, against the person who is guilty.

Mr. FOSTER. They may commence a new prosecution.

Mr. CHISHOLM. Would the Minister of Agriculture explain to us what would be done in a case where a retail merchant had bought seed in an unbroken package, had sold it and it was subsequently found that the seed had originally been supplied to the retail merchant from a wholesale merchant in a foreign country. How could the man be punished ?

Mr. FISHER. We could not do anything.

Mr. A. MARTIN. In this case the retailer is summoned and brought before the court by the farmer, but when the retailer proves that he is innocent but that the wholesaler from whom he has bought the seed is the guilty person what does the minister propose to do ? He proposes that the retailer who is innocent shall pay the costs, and what remedy has the retailer ? He has only to transmit that evidence to the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Agriculture may pigeon-hole the complaint after subjecting him to costs. In my opinion this is a Bill altogether in the interests of the wholesale dealers. When an action such as this section provides is brought against a retailer an opportunity should be given to him to proceed against the wholesaler without having to submit to the Department of Agriculture the question of whether or not he should be able to do so. Favouritism might be shown in such a case. The department might take action in the case of a retailer who is friendly to them and do nothing in the case of a retailer who was not. If the retailer is to be subjected to costs he should have an opportunity of proceeding against the wholesaler from whom he has bought.

Mr. FISHER. If my hon. friend reads the Act he will see there is nothing in it to prevent that either.

Mr. A. MARTIN. The section reads :

> Nevertheless, if the accused proves to the magistrate before whom he is tried that the package, sack, bag or receptacle containing the seed respecting which the complaint or information is laid, was purchased by him directly from a seed merchant domiciled in Canada, and was not opened, or the state of the seed was not altered, while it was in his possession, and he had no reason to believe that the seed did not comply with the provisions of this Act, he shall, upon disclosing the name of the person from whom he purchased the seed, and the place and date of the sale thereof, to him, not be liable beyond the costs of prosecution.

What is the next step ? Is there a provision here that the retailer shall fall back on the wholesaler ? No. It says :

> Every magistrate who has disposed of any case under the foregoing subsection shall, within one month from the date of his judgment therein, send to the Minister of Agriculture a report of the case, giving the name of the accused, the name of the person who sold the seed to him, and the date and place of such sale.

That is all he has to do, and it is then for the Minister of Agriculture to say what is to be done. He may say : Well this man is obnoxious to us, he has mulcted him in costs, but there is no remedy for him. Another person may be viewed with more friendly eyes by the Minister of Agriculture, who will say we will proceed in this case and bring the wholesaler into court. I do not think that this power should be placed in the hands of the Minister of Agriculture or any other minister.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend has read the conclusive proof of what I just told him ; there is nothing in this Act to prevent the retailer himself proceeding against the

person who sold the goods. The magistrate is obliged to report the case to the Minister of Agriculture in case the minister should think it is a case in which proceedings should be taken, whether the retailer cares to do so or not. But the retailer has all the machinery of this Act to protect himself. There is nothing in the Act to prevent him from proceeding against the wholesaler.

Mr. A. MARTIN. There is nothing in the Act and that is the whole trouble. In place of allowing the farmer to have a judgment against the retailer and the retailer to fall back on the wholesaler as it should be in the Bill.

Mr. FISHER. It is so in the Bill. That is what this subsection means. I have informed the hon. gentleman and the House that it means that the magistrate shall report the case to the minister in case the minister thinks it necessary to proceed, but that does not debar the retailer from proceeding against the wholesaler. The retailer has at his disposal the whole machinery of the Act just as the farmer had against the retailer. I have stated that to the hon. gentleman and I cannot make it any clearer.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Well, I cannot make it very much clearer to the hon. minister. What my contention is, is this, that when the farmer brings a suit against the retailer, and the seed is proved to be faulty, he should be able to get a judgment against the retailer ; and if the retailer is aggrieved, let him get his remedy from the wholesaler. I think that would be a great improvement on the Bill.

Mr. FISHER. I think it would be unfair to the retailer, if he is able to supply the proof described in subsection 2, to have a judgment rendered against him, and I want to protect the retailer to that extent.

Mr. A. MARTIN. The Minister of Agriculture knows very well that the farmers of this country are not going to law against the wholesaler in Montreal or Toronto. Take the case of a farmer in Prince Edward Island, who buys seed from a retail merchant and brings him into court and proves that the seed was not what it was represented to be. He cannot get judgment against the retailer because the retailer falls back on the wholesaler in Toronto. The Minister of Agriculture expects the farmer to proceed against the wholesaler——

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Or leave it to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. FISHER. That would be a case in which it would be quite proper for the minister to take up the case and proceed against the wholesaler ; but at the same time there is nothing to debar the retailer in Prince Edward Island from proceeding against the wholesaler himself.

Mr. A. MARTIN. It is a great objection, I think, to this Bill that the farmer, after bringing the suit against the retailer and proving his case, should then be compelled to go against the wholesaler in a distant part of Canada.

Mr. LENNOX. I ask the minister to explain clause 8. It is said that the fine need not exceed $5 for the first offence. It can therefore be up to $5, and that fine shall be in respect of each receptacle, package, sack or bag, and it may apply to a case where a man has it in his possession for sale, contrary to the said provision. I want the minister to say to the committee whether that will cover a case of this kind. A dealer gets a large quantity in bulk of any kind of seed and does it up into a thousand packages. Then it is discovered that he has that seed for sale, and that it has this improper admixture of noxious weeds in it. Is it contemplated by the minister that an information may be laid charging this man with having a thousand packages of a certain kind of seed for sale contrary to the provisions of the Act, and that he may be fined in respect of each of these packages to the extent of $5, so that there could be inflicted by a magistrate—a magistrate who has, perhaps, no great knowledge of law—a fine of $5,000, or in default of payment a term of one month's imprisonment.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, under the reading of the Act the extraordinary case which my hon. friend cites might occur ; but I would trust to common sense and judgment of a magistrate to deal with the case on its merits, and to put the fine on each individual package low enough not to make it such an outrageous and extraordinary fine. Were such a fine as my hon friend speaks of inflicted, I think it would be a proper case to take on appeal to a higher court ; so that the last resort would not be left in the hands of what my hon. friend has described as an ignorant country magistrate.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not propose to take the language of the hon. minister. I did not use the term 'ignorant country magistrate.' The minister may have very good reasons for wishing to put it in that form.

Mr. FISHER. No, I thought that was what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. LENNOX. Allow me to say that the hon. minister is mistaken.

Mr. FISHER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. LENNOX. I said that it might be dealt with by a magistrate who had no great knowledge of law. I suppose that might happen with a magistrate, as it might with a Minister of the Crown. I submit to those

in this House who have a knowledge of law that the hon. minister is not right in suggesting that in the case I put there could not be a successful appeal to a higher court. There would not be ground for an appeal. The magistrate would not have gone beyond the limits of the evidence and would not have exceeded his jurisdiction. If there is any such rule of law as that a judgment of a magistrate can be set aside when he acts within the limits laid down by the statute, it would be important to this House to be acquainted with that fact. As I understand it, there is no such rule of law. The case I put is clear, and I believe it is beyond question. It is not beyond the imagination of members of this House that there might be times when it would be very satisfactory to a magistrate to impose just such a fine, and it might happen that in the next adjoining municipality a person would be fined simply $5 or less for a single offence. There is liable to be great inequality and a great perversion of justice under this section. I do not say it with any desire to carp particularly about the Act, but I think it is well worth while for the minister, who, I will imagine, is anxious to advance the interests of the farming class, to consider whether that would be a wise provision.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As the hon. gentleman says, it is quite true that inconvenience would result from the application of the law as stated here; but the hon. gentleman is aware that cumulative penalties are not at all unknown to the profession. They have arisen under the Banking Act and under the Railway Act. I have a case in mind of a bank having been proceeded against for an enormous amount by cumulative penalty. How does my hon. friend propose to deal with a matter of this kind? My attention has frequently been drawn to this difficulty, and up to the present time I have not found a remedy. If my hon. friend could suggest a remedy, I have no doubt the Minister of Agriculture would be glad to apply it.

Mr. FOSTER. You might make a maximum aggregate fine.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The fine is $5 for each particular offence. If a man sells one package, the fine of $5 would not be excessive, and if he sells one hundred, the principle is the same—he has committed one hundred offences.

Mr. FOSTER. He may have made only one sale, and yet have a thousand packages for sale.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend is quite right. What has been pointed out is a serious inconvenience; the point is to find some remedy. It might not only be an inconvenience but something more. It might be an injustice.

Mr. LENNOX. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice has met this matter in the spirit I expected. It is not the case of a second offence——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is for cumulative offences.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not know that I would call it a case of a cumulative penalty, but rather a case of a man being liable for merely having in his possession goods which do not come up to a certain standard. He shall be liable to a fine for the first offence not exceeding $5 and for each subsequent offence not exceeding $25 together with the costs of prosecution for each receptacle, package, sack or bag in or from which seeds are sold offered exposed or had in possession for sale contrary to such provision. The hon. minister will perceive that the case I am dealing with is not a case of sale but the case of a person having simply in his possession a number of packages. There is a provision for a cumulative penalty. In the case of a second offence he may be fined up to $25 for each separate parcel in his possession. You might have a case where a man had offered one package for sale contrary to law and had been informed against and fined up to the limit of $5. He might then be informed against for having in his possession one thousand parcels contrary to law, and be fined $25 for each parcel or up to $25,000. Is it not absurd that such discretion should be left in the hands of any magistrate without limit or right of appeal. What I would suggest is that in no case should the penalty exceed a certain sum.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I quite appreciate the point and the remark made by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. But there is this difficulty. You must not deal with a large offender on more favourable terms than with a small offender. The discussion has been profitable. I do not think that this Bill can leave the committee tonight, and I would like to deal with the point now made in such a way as not to create an unfortunate precedent.

Mr. LENNOX. A person who had a thousand packages might not be a large dealer. A very small quantity might be divided into a thousand packages.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the position taken by the Minister of Justice is very reasonable. But whichever way you have it, you will have some inconvenience. It would be a great hardship to have this cumulative penalty put upon a dealer who really was not very guilty after all, and you might sometimes fail to mete out proper punishment to an inveterate breaker of the law. We might, however, take the more lenient course, and limit the maximum penalty; and then if we found that the law did not work well, we could change it.

Mr. FISHER. I am quite willing to let that section stand in order that I may look into the matter with my colleague. We thought that by making no limit to the smallness of the penalty, we were giving the opportunity for the imposition of a very light sentence, even when a large number of packages was concerned.

Section 8 is allowed to stand.

On section 9—who shall be prima facie liable.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This is to prevent the penalty being imposed on the clerk.

On section 10—examination of seeds, payment of samples, penalty for preventing examination.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it the intention to appoint an inspector ?

Mr. FISHER. We shall require a staff for the purpose of enforcing the Act.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is the object—to give employment to a staff of hungry officials.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman makes a statement quite unwarranted, not in accord with the facts, and for which he has no foundation. The object of the Bill has been explained, my hon. friend knows it well, and he deliberately undertakes to misrepresent it.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, whether it is in order for any member to say that another deliberately misrepresents the object of a Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The minister probably went a little too far in using the term 'deliberately,' but was no doubt provoked to use the term by the hon. member for Leeds who imputed an unworthy motive to the hon. minister, and was equally out of order.

Mr. FOSTER. You are most accommodating, Mr. Chairman. On being called to give a decision upon one point of order, you take up another, and we are very much obliged for the double ruling.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I think the committee should have some information from the Minister as to the number of persons who are to be employed in carrying out this Act, what their duties will be and about how much the cost to the country will amount to.

Mr. FISHER. So far as I can see at present, there will be no necessary additions to the staff I now have.

An hon. MEMBER. Then, the hon. minister must have too many now.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister spoke of analysts—these, I suppose, he already has in the department ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Section 10 authorizes 'any person charged with the enforcement of this Act' to enter premises under certain circumstances. That would seem to indicate that persons are to be appointed to enforce the Act; and it seems to me that if the Act is to be made efficient, the minister must employ people to enforce it. As my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Martin) suggests, this is a good time for the minister to take the committee into his confidence and tell us what the cost of enforcing the law will be, as measured by the salaries of the officials who will be necessary.

Mr. FISHER. For education and analytical work, I already have a staff——

Mr. FOSTER. A staff distributed over the country ?

Mr. FISHER. They travel part of the time carrying on educational and organization work, and part of the time they are in the office at Ottawa. There are four or five men under the head of this branch, Mr. Clark. I hope to utilize the services of these men where it is necessary for the department to intervene. They now collect specimens—where we do not get them voluntarily sent in—by purchasing in the open market. That kind of work has been going on for four years. It may be necessary to add one or two to that staff, not so much with a view to enforcing this Act, but to assist in the general work of the department, and, as part of that work, to supervise the enforcement of the Act. I think it will generally be enforced by those who are defrauded and who take advantage of the Act as a means of protecting themselves. In cases such as those covered by section 8, the department might intervene through one of its officials, whose duty it would be to put a case in the hands of the Department of Justice. And we shall be able, when we think it necessary, to employ the Dominion Police to enforce this law, the same as any law, in cases where the government finds it necessary to intervene. At present I have no intention of adding to the staff in the way of inspectors to go about the country and specially do the work of enforcing the law.

Mr. SPROULE. What would be the position of a purchaser of seeds who found the field in which the seed had been sown grown up with weeds, though he had not noticed the weed-seeds before sowing ?

Mr. FISHER. He would be competent to proceed under the Act, but the difficulties of proof would be very great, unless he had taken the precaution to take a sample of the seed under the provisions of the Act soon after purchasing the seed. But any farmer, knowing the Act to be in force, if he had any suspicion of the seed he had

bought, would take a sample, and then he would be armed for procedure if he found it necessary to act.

Mr. SPROULE. I am inclined to think the seedsman would order him out of his place of business if he tried to take a sample, because it would be throwing suspicion on the goods.

Mr. FISHER. The seller need not know anything about his taking a sample under the Act.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought the sample had to be taken in the place where the seed was bought.

Mr. FISHER. Yes; or in the presence of two disinterested witnesses.

Mr. SPROULE. He could buy it, take it home and sample it there ?

Mr. FISHER. He would have to prove that it was the seed that he had got from the individual.

Mr. COCHRANE. In our section we grow a great deal of alsike. Some of it is exported to be used, as I understand, for colouring purposes. I have had as many as twenty bags of alsike seed in the barn at once, but I could not say, when raising the seed, what it was to be used for. Yet, under this law, as I understand it, these inspectors could come in and take samples and put me to a lot of trouble.

Mr. FISHER. Wherever the person engaged in enforcing the law has reason to suppose that seeds are kept contrary to the provisions of the Act, he would have a right to enter and make an examination.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I would like to ask if there is no limit to the applications for samples ? Is the dealer obliged to furnish samples to every inspector and complainant who may demand it of him ? If they are allowed to come in and demand interminable samples, the seedsmen will be much hampered, because the seed business is a rush trade, as every one knows. Further, I understand the minister to say that it is not necessary that the seller of the seed should be present when the sample is taken, or have any knowledge of it. I would object to that. That was done in our town in one case and did serious harm to the dealer. Surely, the man who furnishes the sample should know what it is for. He should be able to keep a sample for his own use, the same as he would of food products that are analyzed by the department. When the government analyst buys a pound of coffee or other article for examination, he always leaves a portion of it with the dealer, so that the latter can get it examined by another analyst if he desires. If these seeds can be taken without the knowledge or consent of the owner, I think you are doing a grievous harm to the tradesman or grower behind his back.

Mr. FISHER. With regard to the idea that any one may go in and take samples, it is to be remembered that this section only gives authority to do so to the official who is charged with the enforcement of the Act. The department is not going to instruct a dozen officials to go and take samples of any individual's crop. An ordinary informer cannot take a sample under this provision, it is only the person charged with the enforcement of this Act that is allowed to enter on a man's premises by authority and take a sample, and clause 10 says he shall not be impeded in the exercise of his authority and his duties for that purpose.

Mr. COCHRANE. I asked about the case of a farmer who was raising alsike clover seed for export. Now I have had many bags of seed on my place at the same time, and under this clause I should think that a party would have power to come into my barn and inspect those bags whether I was willing or not, even though he might not know whether they were going to be sold for seed or not. That would be a great hardship, and should not be allowed unless the official was notified that they were there for sale for seed. This clause allows an inspector to do that sort of thing.

Mr. FISHER. No doubt the man charged with the enforcement of the Act would have such power, and if the seed is likely to be sold for seeding purposes I think a government official should have that power, as he has in many other cases. He is a government inspector for that purpose, and is empowered to enter into premises where he believes any article is being held for seed purposes contrary to law. He will have that power under this Act. I would not like to say that we should restrict that power of a government official in the exercise of his functions.

Mr. FOSTER. But that seems to be an extraordinary power. I do not think an official should have that power in reference to all seeds in respect to which no accusation or charge has been made. But my hon. friend here is simply the possessor of a lot of grain that he has raised and stored in his barn or his granary. There is no question about selling the seed for seed purposes or anything of the kind ; and without his being charged with any impropriety, you say that a certain official may enter his premises whenever he chooses and make an inspection of his grain, and if he is impeded by the owner the latter renders himself liable to a fine of $500. It seems to me that is going too far, and that before your enforcer of the law can enter any premises it must be premises in which it is supposed that there is seed out of which sales have been made for seed purposes. But this clause goes much further. Any granary, chamber, receptacle of

any kind in any part of the country whose owner is not selling seeds for seed purposes or anything of the kind, may be opened arbitrarily by this official, and if the owner, who has a right in his own possession, obstructs the official he renders himself liable under the law. I think that should only take place where there is a seed about which there is a question of illegal selling for seed purposes.

Mr. FISHER. This clause is exactly similar to the clause in the General Inspection Act, in the Inland Revenue Act and also in the Customs Act. Customs officers have far greater powers than are given here.

Mr. COCHRANE. I do not think the case here is at all parallel to a case under the Customs or Inland Revenue Acts, because in these latter cases a man is defrauding the revenue. I am not defrauding anybody, so far as I am concerned. I raise that grain myself. I am not responsible under this Act for what I do with it. I am not liable for what I do with alsike clover or anything else I have in my possession. Yet an official of the government can come into my premises whenever he sees fit and inspect my wheat; he can take a sample of wheat, or timothy with foul seed in it, as there very often is, and it is nobody's business so long as I keep it in my granary and do not sell. I do not think any government official should be allowed to come on my premises and inspect my grain when he don't know whether I have it for sale for seed or not. It is none of his business what I have it there for, unless I let the public know that I have this seed there for sale for sowing purposes.

Mr. FISHER. There is a good deal in what the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) says, and I think it might be well possibly to limit the application of this section in some cases. As I said before, it is taken almost verbatim from the General Inspection Act; but the circumstances are a little different.

Mr. LENNOX. I would ask the minister to consider another phase of this matter. There is a penalty of $500, no for having seed that is improperly labelled, but for, in any degree, obstructing the officials. It might work out in this way: A farmer has only enough wheat upon his place to seed his own farm and feeling it to be a serious injustice that this official should come in, inspect his grain and takes a sample of it. He does, to some slight extent, obstruct the official. He has no knowledge of the law. Of course, it is said, that a want of knowledge of the law is no excuse—that every man is bound to know the law, but still we must look at this thing from a practical standpoint. He has no knowledge of the law, he knows he is right, he obstructs this official and he is fined. He has only enough seed to seed his farm, he has no intention of selling any, he can prove beyond question that he had not anything to sell, he feels it an injustice that this man can come in and invade his rights and property, he obstructs him to some extent and although it is proven in the end that the grain was not offered for sale he is fined $500. I would like the hon. minister to consider that point.

Mr. FISHER. The qualification which I have just suggested might be put in in accordance with the request of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane). That will cover the point that the hon. gentleman speaks of.

Mr. LENNOX. Very good.

Mr. SPROULE. In regard to that other question it seems to me it is not very clear yet, that is, as to who may take samples of seed, and under what circumstances they may be taken for the government analyst. The Bill says 'any inspector, informant or complainant.'

Mr. FISHER. That is the 11th clause.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, my first question was: must these samples be taken in the presence of the person who sold the seed? And the hon. minister's first reply was that this was quite unnecessary. I see there is a provision which says:

> Any inspector, informant or complainant who, finds or suspects seeds to be sold, or offered, exposed or had in possession for sale for the purpose of seeding in violation of the provisions of this Act, shall take a sample from the said seeds and forward it to such person as the Governor in Council appoints as an official seed analyst to examine and report upon any seed submitted for analysis under the provisions of this Act.

Section 12 provides that:

> Any sample of seed taken for official analysis——

This may be taken by either the inspector, informant or complainant:

> ——under the provisions of this Act shall be taken in the presence of—
>
> (a) the person who sold or offered, exposed or had in his possession for sale the said seeds, or
>
> (b) two impartial or non-interested witnesses.

Would it be competent for a person when purchasing seed to take it home, then afterwards call in two impartial witnesses, take a sample of the seed and send it to the government analyst?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. The farmer who purchases the seed need not necessarily take a sample in the store before he leaves. He may take it home. He may send his servant or his boy to buy the seed and when he gets this seed home, according to the provisions of section 13, he may take a sample 'within seven days from the date on which the seeds entered into the personal possession and became the property of the puchaser.' It would never do to restrict the tak-

ing of a sample of the seeds to the moment of purchasing the seeds. We would practically nullify the operation of the Act. Of course, when the sample is taken it has to be taken fairly in the presence of two unbiased, unprejudiced witnesses who will certify to its being a fair sample of the seeds.

Mr. SPROULE. This applies to seeds that are not sold in sealed packages. Suppose seeds are sold in sealed packages, what then ?

Mr. FISHER. There are two cases provided under section 13. One is the case where seed is sold in a sealed package. I am glad to know that a number of the best seedsmen are putting up their seeds in small sealed packages for the express purpose of protecting their own reputation, and the seed is sold through the retailer in an unbroken package bearing the seedsman's seal. Then, a sample must be taken at the time of breaking the seedsman's seal. Where the seed is sold in bulk and then retailed, we have to make other provisions and the provisions are as contained in section 13. Samples are to be taken within seven days and under section 12 they must be taken in the presence of two impartial and non-interested witnesses. I think we safeguard the seller as well as we possibly can.

Mr. FOSTER. In reference to section 11, second line, does not the hon. minister think that is a little loose ?

Any inspector, informant or complainant who finds or suspects seeds to be sold, &c.

Any man of a suspicious turn of mind is always suspecting things. We quite well know what little rivalries and jealousies are likely to take place.

Mr. FISHER. That is only as regards the taking of the sample. If he did not suspect he would not take the sample at all. We must allow him to take the sample on suspicion.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that you should allow him to take it on suspicion. I think he should have something stronger than suspicion. He should have some just ground for believing. Suspicion is very different from the basis upon which a man ought to proceed in any form legally against his neighbour or against a citizen.

Mr. FISHER. What does my hon. friend want him to have ?

Mr. FOSTER. He should have some good ground for believing. He should have some prima facie evidence. Any man can suspect anything, and suspicious men are apt to suspect anything.

Mr. FISHER. You cannot get the evidence until you have taken a sample and analysed it.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. FOSTER. Neither could a man enter a house and take a criminal from that house until he had some basis for doing so.

Mr. FISHER. It is not a question of going into a man's house. It is simply the taking of a sample.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a question of interfering with a man's property. He should have some reasonable ground for believing.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Inland Revenue). I may say that in regard to the Adulteration Act it is almost similar to this provision of the Bill. Where there is ground for suspecting that the law has been violated the inspector may go into a house and get samples; in fact, we generally give instructions to the inspectors to go into every store where they think goods are being offered for sale which do not comply with the law and procure samples. I suppose the same principle might apply in this case. There is nothing injurious to any person in the fact that collections of samples are made.

Mr. SPROULE. But you do that for the safety of the public health.

Mr. BARR. Do I understand that when taking these samples they are obliged to pay for them ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr LENNOX. Under section 10, but not under section 11.

Mr. FISHER. Section 11 provides for the taking of a sample from what the purchaser has. It is not a forcible entry and the taking of a sample from somebody else's seed. It is the taking of a sample from the seed which has been purchased and which is in the possession of the purchaser who must take it and forward the seed to the analyst.

Mr. LENNOX. Is that correct ?

Mr. FISHER. I understand so.

Mr. LENNOX. I am not quite sure of that. If you take section 11 and section 12 together I think that section 12 will probably embrace what is provided for in section 11, and section 11 authorizes an inspector, informant or complainant who finds or suspects seeds, &c., to take a sample from the said seeds and forward it to the government analysts, and then any sample of seeds taken shall be taken in a certain way according to section 12. Do not these two sections go together ?

Mr. FISHER. Certainly.

Mr. LENNOX. But then the inspector, informant or complainant can go into the premises of a person who has not sold one bushel or one package of grain and take a sample and not pay for it, whereas under section 10 if you take samples you must pay for them. I cannot see the reason for that difference.

Mr. FISHER. My reading of it is that section 10 gives authority to enter in and take a sample where there is somebody objecting to the taking of a sample, for instance from a merchant's bin or dealer's bag. There the person charged with the enforcement of the Act is given certain authority and power; similar authority and power is given under the Customs Act, the Inland Revenue Act, and the Adulteration of Foods Act. It is not an unusual power at all. It is given under most of the Acts connected with the administration of just such things as this in Canada. But to return for a moment to my point. This section 10 provides for the taking of a sample when there is objection on the part of the owner of the grain to the taking of the sample, and the person charged with the enforcement of the Act has to exercise his authority and rights in order to perform his duty. Section 10 gives him that authority and that right. Section 11 provides that in a case that is in dispute, a sample must be taken to be forwarded to the government analyst for test or analysis, and it says that, that sample shall be taken by anybody who is entering upon a prosecution or a case or even if he does not want to enter into a case, if he simply suspects he has been wrongly treated he will take a sample of the grain and forward it to the government laboratory for analysis. Section 12 provides necessary precaution as to how and under what conditions a sample is to be taken which is to be forwarded for analysis. If the sample were not taken under these conditions, the analysis of the sample could not be used as proof in a test case. That is the object of section 10, to provide regulations and conditions under which a sample should be taken, the result of analysis of which would be used in a test case. I think these are the reasons for having three different sections; they deal with the matter in three different ways.

Mr. LENNOX. Section 11 can be taken with section 12.

Mr. FISHER. Yes; any samples taken under section 11 must be taken in the way prescribed in section 12.

Mr. LENNOX. Section 11 goes very far. It embraces any case where goods are to be sold or offered, exposed or had in possession for the purpose of sale, and so on. It embraces any case where any person has these goods for sale. Then any inspector, informant or complainant may take a sample of seed with or against the owner's will and send it to the analyst, so that I do not see exactly why, if it is to be paid for in the case my hon. friend mentioned before, it should not be paid for in this case. That this provision applies to seller as well as buyer is further borne out, I think, by the provision in section 12 that a sample may be taken in the presence of (a):

The person who sold or offered for sale or had in his possession for sale, such seed.

Now, if this did not apply to the dealer or grower, how could the sample be taken in the presence of the person who offered, exposed or had it in his possession for sale? These are words which show plainly that not only does it embrace the case which the minister refers to as a case where a person has suffered, and therefore voluntarily acts, and might be supposed to surrender his sample without payment, but also that it applies to the other case of the dealer or grower, and if there is good reason for having provision for payment in the 10th section, I submit to the minister that there is much more reason for having it in the case of these two sections, for this reason that in this case there are a variety of people, not alone a government official who is always doing justice, but a variety of people who may act; we have an inspector, an informant, and a complainant, and the informants and the complainants may if they think fit be legion. A may take a sample to-day, B to-morrow, and C the next day. There is no limit to the possible number of samples, and thus a valuable seed might be frittered away by enemies. That is not a probability, but it is a possibility, and a law should be certain. The Minister of Agriculture brings in the analogy of adulterated food. Surely he does not think that there is any analogy between a case of malfeasance such as that, a deliberate act of adulterating food, and the act of an honest farmer who has in his possession grain which he has no suspicion offends against this law, grain which contains seeds of which he does not know the name and which he has no means of testing. One is a direct crime against the laws and the other is at most a mere matter of neglect or want of knowledge or nonfeasance.

Mr. FISHER. Will section 11 apply to any inspector? No one has a right to go in and take a sample contrary to the desire of the owner except the government officials. The informant or complainant cannot do it except by the permission of the person owning the seed.

Mr. SPROULE. You make it imperative because you say 'shall.'

Mr. FISHER. That 'shall' means that in case of taking a sample for the analyst in order to get evidence for a prosecution; a sample shall be taken which shall serve the purpose.

Mr. SPROULE. He may be an informant or an inspector.

Mr. FISHER. I would not say that this section at all authorizes any informant or complainant or even an inspector to go into a place against the owner's will but of course I would not give a legal opinion on it. Section 10 does give that authority to the inspector.

Mr. SPROULE. You tell him to do that knowing that he has not the authority.

Mr. FISHER. I tell him to do a thing which, for a purpose, I presume he is able to do. If he is not able to do it I suppose he must get the sample in some other way.

Mr. LENNOX. 'Shall' is ordinarily imperative. Will the minister allow these two sections to stand for consideration ?

Mr. FISHER. I am perfectly willing to let them stand.

Sections 11 and 12 allowed to stand.

On section 13—Samples to be sent within seven days.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. What guarantee will there be to the dealer that the seed will reach the analytic department in the same shape as when it left the retailer's hands ? That is a very important matter. Seed might be surreptitiously placed in a parcel that was purchased. I would remind the hon. minister of the parable of the tares. He will remember that according to Holy Writ, a man sowed good wheat in his fields and at night, while he slept, the enemy sowed tares, and when the seeds sprang up the owner found both growing together. It might be so in this case. I would like to know what safeguard there is that the samples, when they reach the analyst, will be exactly the same as they were when they left the dealer's hands.

Mr. FISHER. Under section 17 the Governor in Council may make regulations, and in these we propose to provide for the method of despatching the samples to the seed laboratory.

On section 14—analysis and certificate.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. Might I ask the Minister of Agriculture how many places in Canada will be available to anybody wishing to have seed tested ? Will it all have to be sent here to Ottawa from every part of Canada ? If so, I think it will be a very serious hindrance to the grain trade. Everybody acquainted with the trade knows that all the seed business is done inside of a few weeks, and every dealer buys very carefully, for the reason that he knows that if there is any left over, he will have to carry it for twelve months. Perhaps half the seed sold by dealers is sold on rush orders by wire to headquarters, and has to be hurried out at once. What opportunity would there be for a dealer to send samples to a central place and have them sent back before retailing the seed to his customers ? How long would it probably take, say from Manitoba, or from the maritime provinces, or from British Columbia ?

Mr. FISHER. I suppose that for the present there would be only one seed laboratory for analysis in the city of Ottawa. It is true, as my hon. friend says, the seed business is rushed pretty strongly in the spring, and I do not think it would be possible for the retailer to wait for an analysis of the seed he is selling. On receiving the seed he would take a sample and send it for analysis, and in the meantime would probably have to go on selling the seed. However, in section 8, subsections 2 and 3, machinery is provided by which, if he were prosecuted for selling bad seeds, and he had a sample taken in the way I speak of that would be a proof that would enable him to relieve himself of the responsibility and pass it on to the wholesaler who had sold him the seeds.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. Another point while I am on my feet. Anybody having a suspicion that any seed may be impure and not up to the requirements of this Act, should immediately send a sample to the Department of Agriculture. I think twelve months is altogether too long in order to ascertain whether action is going to be taken with regard to any seed. I think that anybody feeling aggrieved should be able to get an answer back within three months.

Mr. FISHER. That point comes up later on.

On section 15—certificate as evidence.

Mr. LENNOX. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the words 'shall be accepted as evidence.' Sometimes it is provided that it shall be prima facie evidence in a matter of this kind. I presume that it shall only be accepted as evidence in the case, not as necessarily conclusive evidence.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would not think it would be looked on as conclusive at all—merely as part of the evidence in the case.

Mr. LENNOX. I think that is fair.

On section 18—time for prosecution limited.

Mr. LENNOX. Should we not better limit that to 6 months ?

Mr. FISHER. It was six months in the old Act. My reason for changing it to twelve was the case contemplated in subsection 2 of section 8. In such a case, if the prosecution failed against the retail dealer, it would have to be continued against the wholesale dealer, and if the limit were made six months, there might be a failure of justice.

Mr. LENNOX. In that case the extension is quite right, but in ordinary cases the limit should be only six months.

Mr. FISHER. I shall consider the point and perhaps we might make the limit of twelve months apply only to cases under subsection 2 of section 8.

Mr. MACDONELL. This clause is rather vague. It says that any prosecution may be

commenced within twelve months from the time when the matter of complaint or information arose and not later. What is that time ? Is it the time of sale by the wholesale dealer or resale by the retail dealer ? There might also be a doubt as to the nature of the offence. One of the offences is the exposing for sale. A merchant might expose for sale during two years and no prosecution be taken against him within those two years. If one were taken subsequently, what would be the position ? In my opinion none could be because the twelve months from the time when the matter of complaint or information arose would be up. It seems to me the clause might be made clearer.

Mr. FISHER. This clause was taken verbatim from the Summary Convictions Act. The clause in that Act is well understood and its interpretation well established by the courts.

Mr. MACDONELL. I am not aware of any provision in the Summary Convictions Act which makes the exposing for sale an offence. Supposing a man had the goods exposed for sale a couple of years, what date would you take as that on which the matter of complaint or information arose ?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot answer the legal question my hon. friend has raised. I submitted the matter to the Department of Justice and they evidently considered that this clause covered the case.

Mr. WALSH. Suppose information is not laid for six months or a year and no report given on the sample and the seedsman in the meantime goes on selling, how is the farmer to be protected ?

Mr. FISHER. I hope there will not be any such delay in analysing the samples and giving a report. The report should be given in two or three months at the longest. But this Bill is intended to act rather as a deterrent than as a means of punishment. Merchants will be very careful, because if they are fined a few times, they will get a reputation for selling bad seed and lose their trade. In that way the Act will do more good perhaps than by punishing wrong transactions.

On section 2 :

This Act shall come into operation on the first day of September, 1905.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I think the delay is not sufficient. A great deal of seed will be on hand at that period, timothy seed just begins to sell freely in Ontario at that date. Fall wheat is then sown from the seed of the former season and the new seed is not on the market in time for the sowing of the fall wheat. There ought to be more time given the dealers, who have large amounts of seeds that may be condemned, to get rid of their stock on hand either by exporting it or cleaning it or in some other way. A vast amount of stuff is held by the seedsmen from one season to another, and to bring in a sweeping Act which would take away thousands of dollars worth of property from the seedsman, as this will, is not in accord with justice. I think the time should be extended six months or a year.

Mr. FISHER. I do not take much account of the idea that this Act will come into force too soon. Everybody in Canada has been fully warned that it is coming into force. The trade expected it last year, but unfortunately the pressure of business prevented its becoming law. I have been informed by those who are more expert than I in trade matters that any time between June 15 and September 15 would be the most convenient to the trade for the changed conditions, and have therefore made the date September 1. There can be no doubt that the Senate will pass the measure, and the trade will have six months in which to prepare for it. I am quite prepared to consider any date for the coming season which would be most convenient to the trade, but do not think we should put it off for another season.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The time of the year that the hon. gentleman has selected is the proper one—between June and September. But I think that 1906 would be a better date to bring in so sweeping a measure.

Mr. FISHER. They have had warning.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. There is a vast quantity of seed in the hands of dealers that would not pass under the Act, and to make a law under which that property, perhaps, cannot be realized on at all, will be a very serious loss to individuals. It may reflect upon our farmers as well, who hold over considerable quantities.

Mr. FISHER. I would not like to take the responsibility of allowing seed such as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockshutt) speaks of, to be distributed among the farmers for another year.

Mr. P. H. McKENZIE. As an agriculturist, I think we have been too long without this Act, and I protest against it being postponed any longer than the minister has stated. It is generally admitted in this country that the weed nuisance is becoming a very serious one, that many of our best farms are becoming polluted with foul weeds, and that the cost of farming these lands is increased by the weed nuisance. Farmers are looking to the Minister of Agriculture to provide a remedy for this condition of affairs. Having listened to the debate, I must say, as a farmer, that I compliment the Minister of Agriculture on the steps he has taken, and I hope he will not longer delay in putting the law into proper condition and bringing it into

force in the interests of the farming community.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I would just say, in answer to the hon. gentleman (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) that the seed grown in the province of Ontario is among the best in the world, in spite of our having no such law as is now proposed. I speak particularly of red clover and alsike. Ontario seed of these kinds brings, as is well known, more than the American product, and more than most of the European product. That being the case, why do we need this Bill so urgently? It is certainly not because our seed is inferior. We have a large quantity of good seed, but most of it is shipped abroad.

Mr. P. H. McKENZIE. That is the very difficulty. We are exporting our best seed, and inferior and foul seeds are being sold to our own farmers. And, unfortunately, we have too many farmers who are willing to buy bad seed. We would like to have it put beyond the power of farmers to buy poor seed. This should be done in their own interest. I have noticed that the principal part of the opposition to this Bill has come from the lawyers and the seedsmen. I am astonished, in the first place, that the lawyers should object to the Bill. They say it is going to cause no end of lawsuits. Well, that would certainly be in their interest. As to the seed dealers, I think that when the law is working properly—as it will do before it is long in force—it will be found that it will not injure them at all. And it will greatly benefit the country in which we all take such an interest, and the prime industry of the country, the industry of agriculture.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. I am delighted to know that such good seed is produced in this province. And if, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockshutt) says, there is such a great amount of splendid seed throughout the country, so much the better for the country at large, and so much the less danger of disaster to the holders of the seed. If the seed is good there is no danger of trouble.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am surprised to hear an hon. gentleman talking about opposition to this Bill. It can only be explained on the ground that it comes from gentlemen who are new members of this House, and who fail to make the distinction between fair criticism and opposition. The life of parliament is criticism. It is unfair for any hon. gentleman to charge His Majesty's loyal opposition with having opposed a Bill simply because they have criticised its provisions. We have been endeavouring to help the minister to improve the Bill and make it workable. This we have been doing for the past three years, and I am happy to say that there has been a vast improvement in the Bill. I think the minister himself admits that there has been a great improvement, and I am sure he will give us credit for the assistance we have given. I believe that he looks at it differently from these other hon. gentlemen. There may be questions on which we disagree. For instance, there is the question of the time when the law should come into operation. But for my part, I am not prepared to give an opinion of that subject. My hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) may be correct. He knows the conditions of the trade, probably, even better than the Minister of Agriculture does. There is room in this case for a fair difference of opinion; and I am sure that the Minister of Agriculture will not say that my hon. friend from Brantford has opposed the Bill simply because he has suggested a later time for its coming into operation. In view of the improvement that has already been made, it might be worth while to wait and get a perfect Bill, and one thoroughly workable—for there seems to be great difference of opinion as to whether this Bill is workable or not. I am not opposing the Bill by any means. If it is a good law for the country, His Majesty's loyal opposition will stand by it. We are the guardians of the farmers' interests as much as are hon. gentlemen opposite. I believe we represent more farmers than they do. We have been the friends of the farmers and have advocated the farmers' interests in every matter, not merely in such measures as this, but in the general policy of the country, and in providing markets for the farmer. It is not reasonable to say that we are opposing the measure because we criticise it. I am sure the Minister of Agriculture will give us credit for having assisted materially in bringing the Bill into its present improved shape.

Mr. FISHER. I am glad to give hon. gentlemen opposite, and especially the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), an old friend whom I have seen in this House for many years, all the credit possible. But I would give him even more credit if he had not said so much about being the friend of the farmer. The hon. gentleman doth protest too much, methinks, I believe the farmer will realize that fact. We are not going to discuss the question as to who are the friends of the farmers; the records of parliament and the records of legislation will prove that better than any protestations the hon. gentleman can make or I can make. But I am glad the hon. gentlemen opposite endorse the Bill which I have the honour to present to the House, and of helping through so far as it has gone. The principle of the Bill after all is the chief thing, and if we can get an unanimous endorsation of the principle of the Bill, I have no doubt the details can be threshed out and made workable by the combined common sense of the

members of this House. The Bill to-day, while not so drastic as it was, is probably more to the taste of the people than when it was first introduced, and is more likely to be successful when passed. I trust that when this Bill becomes law and has been in force for a few years, the condition of affairs will be such that we will be able to pass a still more drastic measure, giving greater protection to the purchaser of seeds and greater protection to those who are engaged in the trade. I would be glad to be able to do that in the years to come as Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think it lies in the mouth of the Minister of Agriculture to charge me, during the time I have been in this House, now some sixteen or seventeen sessions, with having at any time failed to stand up in the interests of the farmers of this country. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can recollect the time when he opposed a measure in this House that was directly in the interest of the farmers, when he stood up against a measure that was intended to protect the butter interests of the farmers. That is something I cannot be charged with. The hon. gentleman would take half an hour to explain away that little difficulty. I have heard him try to do it, but to my mind he failed altogether in accomplishing his object.

Mr. FISHER. It was all explained away in the elections of 1897.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is hard to explain away a speech and harder to explain away a vote.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. I am astonished to hear the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) say that he has improved this Bill by opposing it during all these years. I am sorry that we did not live with him, or he with us, in the days of the children of Israel, when Moses brought down the law on the mount. We would have heard the hon. gentleman cry out: Wait Moses for a little while until the members of the opposition get a chance at this Bill, and you will see how they will improve it for you.

Mr. HENDERSON. This is a new phase of the question. I do not know what kind of seeds they had in those days, I do not know what the hon. gentleman refers to.

Mr. FOSTER. Manna.

Mr. HENDERSON. He must have an extraordinary idea of legislation. I do not know where he is getting a precedent in those olden days for what we are doing this afternoon. He has not been here all the afternoon.

An hon. MEMBER. Where was he?

Mr. HENDERSON. I don't know. perhaps he was out with Moses somewhere. He spoke about my opposing the measure. I never opposed the measure, I do not know a gentleman on this side who has opposed it. The member for South Renfrew (Mr. A. A. Wright) does not seem to be able to draw a distinction between fair criticism and opposition. The proper way to deal with the Bill in this House is to criticise it. I am not like the hon. gentleman, who merely sits here to register everything that the government proposes, whether it is right or wrong. When the hon. gentleman does that, I do not consider he is acting in the interests of his constituents, because he is simply registering what another man does. I am glad to hear the Minister of Agriculture say that while this measure is not so drastic as the measure of previous sessions, he thinks it will be much more acceptable to the people, and can be more effectually enforced.

Mr. FISHER. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, when we will take into consideration the various sections that we have not dealt with.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman not to take this up in committee stage again for, say, about ten days. The discussion we have had will go out to the country through the press, and in the meantime we may receive certain suggestions which will serve to make the Bill even better than it is.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman's suggestion is reasonable, but the business of the House may require that we take it up a little earlier.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir William Mulock, House adjourned as 9.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 1, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 22) respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver—by Mr. Scott.

QUESTIONS.

SHERBROOKE POSTAL SERVICE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON—by Mr. Lefurgey—asked:

1. Is it the intention of the government to charge a two-cent postal rate on letters from the city of Sherbrooke to a branch office in the city, and only a one-cent postal rate on letters to the central office in the city?
2. Has the government under consideration the establishment of postal delivery service in the city of Sherbrooke?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General) :

1. The two post offices in the city of Sherbrooke are independent post offices, neither being a branch of the other. The letter rate is fixed by statute, and not under the control of the government, and the rates charged in Sherbrooke are in accordance with the provisions of the Act.

2. The answer to the second question is : No.

THE MANITOBA SCHOOL FUND.

Mr. BOLE asked :

1. What amount was paid last year to the government of Manitoba for interest on the school trust fund ?

2. Was the total amount claimed by the government of Manitoba paid ? If not, how much was deducted, and for what reason ?

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

1. The amount paid to the Manitoba government on account of interest, &c., on the Manitoba school lands fund for the fiscal year 1903-1904 was as follows :—

Interest on the credit balance of the fund on 30th June, 1904..	$31,290 66
Balance revenue, other than principal moneys, and interest on sales, for fiscal year 1903-1904.	43,934 26
Total..	$75,224 92

2. The total amount claimed by the Manitoba government has not been paid. There are two amounts, in regard to which a settlement has not yet been made.

(a.) The sum of $81,342.17 being the total amount of the costs of management from the time the fund was formed in 1879 to the 30th June, 1904. The reason that it has not been settled is on account of the difference of opinion between the provincial government and the Auditor General as to the mode of treating these costs.

(b.) The government of Manitoba contends that the loan of $30,000 made to the province in 1879 and 1884, and which, in accordance with the provisions of Act 41 Vic., cap. 13, was repaid out of the first proceeds of sales, should now be paid over to the province.

BUILDINGS LEASED BY THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked :

1. How many buildings or portions of buildings in the city of Ottawa have been leased by the government for public purposes since the 1st of January, 1904 ?

2. Where are such buildings or portions thereof located, and who are the lessors ?

3. What rental has the government stipulated to pay for the use of these buildings or portions thereof ?

4. By what branches of the public service are these buildings occupied ?

5. In the preparation of the leases did the government stipulate, in each case, that the lessor or lessors should pay taxes to the municipality of Ottawa ?

6. If such stipulation was not included in any lease, what was the exemption, and why was it made ?

7. In the event of the government deciding to lease further buildings in Ottawa for public purposes, or to renew existing leases when they expire, is it the intention of the government to insist that the lessor or lessors must pay municipal taxes on such buildings ?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1 & 2. The following premises were rented by the government since 1st January, 1904 : Building on Queen street, owned by and leased from Jas. W. Woods ; two flats and store room in the Corry block, on Rideau street, owned by and leased from Jas. A. Corry ; two rooms in building, 193 Sparks street, owned by and leased from Slater & Sherwood ; two rooms in Orme block, 176 Wellington street, owned by and leased from J. L. Orme & Son.

3. Building on Queen street, at $5,300 per year ; flats and store room in Corry block, at $4,600 per year ; rooms in building, 193 Sparks street (Sherwood & Slater), at $45 per month ; rooms in Orme block, 176 Wellington street, at $250 per annum.

4. Jas. W. Woods' building, on Queen street, occupied by the Railway Commission; flats and store room in Corry block, occupied by the Georgian Bay Ship Canal Survey, by the Ottawa River Works staff, and the Hydraulic Survey of the Department of Marine and Fisheries ; rooms in buildings, 193 Sparks and 176 Wellington streets, are occupied by the Interior Department.

5 & 6. In the case of the Railway Commission lease, it has been stipulated that the lessees shall pay taxes. In the other cases, it being only for rooms and for a comparatively short period, no stipulation has been made about taxes.

7. This matter is now under the consideration of the government.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What is the total importation of merchandise for home consumption into Canada for the current fiscal year to December 31, 1904 ; also the importation from Great Britain and from the United States respectively ?

2. What is the total exports and the exports of home products for the same period, and also the exports of home products to Great Britain and the United States ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. The total importations into Canada of merchandise for home consumption for the current fiscal year up to December 31st, 1904, was $123,043,650. For the same period, the importations of merchandise from Great Britain amounted to $28,923,454, and from the United States to $74,739,987.

2. The total exports of merchandise exported from Canada for the current fiscal

year up to December 31st, amounted to $118,438,246. Total exports of merchandise —home products—for the same period, amounted to $113,229,216. Total exports of merchandise — home products — to Great Britain, $63,072,205, and to the United States to $38,077,738.

THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, FRUIT DIVISION.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

Is it the intention of the government, in consonance with the resolution of the Fruit Growers' Association of Prince Edward Island, approved by the other organizations in Canada, to maintain its usefulness to the growing needs, the fruit industry demands ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). On the passage of the Act to provide for the marking and inspection of packages containing fruit for sale, known as 'The Fruit Marks Act, 1901,' it became necessary to organize a staff for the administration and enforcement of the Act. The organization was placed, by the Minister of Agriculture, under the control of the Commissioner of Agriculture and Dairying, Dr. James W. Robertson, and became known as the fruit division of his branch.

In addition to the enforcement and administration of the Fruit Marks Act, the fruit division was charged with the supervision of the packing and transportation of fruit, particularly in cold storage and cool chambers, and the marketing of the same ; and this brought the work of the division in close connection with the cold storage and extension of markets divisions, which, having been organized principally for facilitating the transportation and promoting the sale of dairy products, were in charge of the chief of the dairy division, Mr. J. A. Ruddick, under the Commissioner of Agriculture and Dairying for several years prior to the retirement of the latter.

Upon the retirement of Dr. Robertson, and the abolition of the office of Commissioner of Agriculture and Dairying, Mr. Ruddick was appointed dairy commissioner, the work of the cold storage and the extension of markets divisions being continued under him ; and owing to his close relations with the work of the fruit division, as above stated, it was deemed advisable to place the work of the latter division in his charge as well. The chief and other officers of the fruit division have been retained in office with the same duties as formerly, which they will hereafter perform under the dairy commissioner, as they formerly did under the Commissioner of Agriculture and Dairying.

It is the intention of the Minister of Agriculture to make the work of the department, both in the fruit division and at the experimental farms, commensurate with the needs of the fruit industry of Canada.

BRITISH COLUMBIA JUDGESHIP.

Mr. SPROULE—by Mr. Lefurgey—asked:

1. How long has the present vacancy on the county court bench of British Columbia existed?
2. What is the cause of the delay in filling the vacancy ?
3. Is it the intention to appoint Mr. W. W. B. McInnes, ex-M.P., to the position ?

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). There are two judicial districts, one constituted by an Act of the British Columbia legislature in 1903, and the other similarly constituted in 1904. No appointment has been made to the bench for either district.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member has not answered the second and third questions.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There has been no cause of delay beyond the fact that the vacancy has existed in one case since 1883 and it has not been thought necessary to make the appointment. With regard to the third question, no doubt the name of Mr. McInnes will be taken into account in connection with other names when the appointments are made.

OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION.

Mr. PERLEY asked :

How many men were on the pay-list of the Ottawa Improvement Commission for the months of September, October, November and December, 1904, and January, 1905, respectively?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The number of men on the pay-list of the Ottawa Improvement Commission during September, October, November and December, 1904, and January, 1905, was as follows :

September, 139 men.
October, 164 men.
November, 152 men.
December, 157 men.
January, 102 men.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Mr. PERLEY asked :

1. Have any appointments been made during the month of January, in connection with the Geological Survey Department or Museum ? If so, who have been appointed, and what are their duties and salaries respectively ?
2. Were any of the employees of the Geological Survey Department, other than technical officers, absent from their duties at any time during the month of January, 1905 ? If so, who were these individuals ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

Napoleon Seguin, fireman, temporary staff, January 16, 1905, salary $500 per annum.

Absence.	Dates.	——
W. H. Boyd	3rd	Statutory leave.
C. F. King	3rd	"
Vincent Perrin	3rd & 4th	"
Jane Alexander	7th	"
Emily F. Goodman	7th	Sick leave.
M. F. Connor	30th	"
O. O'Sullivan	26th	Statutory leave.
F. H. Maclaren	7th	Not paid for absence.
Paul Frereault	28th-31st	"

MARCONI WIRELESS TELEGRAPH STATION.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :,

1. How much has the government contributed towards the construction of the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Station at Table Head, Glace Bay, N.S.

2. What is the reason assigned by the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company, or by Mr. Marconi, for the delay in, or inability to operate the station at Glace Bay ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. $80,000.

2. Change of site because of insufficient accommodation at the first location and for the greater security of the station ; also on account of the work being interfered with by the continued bad weather.

This station has not yet been handed over to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

INTERCOLONIAL AND P. E. I. RAILWAYS.

Mr. KEMP moved for a return showing :

1. The amount of money paid by the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways, between June 30th, 1904, and January 1st, 1905, arising out of claims for damages and refunds of all kinds ; also compensations.

2. The nature and amount in each case.

3. The name of the person or persons, firm or corporation to whom the same were paid.

4. The dates in each case on which the claims for damages, refunds or compensations were filed.

5. The dates of payment of each.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). There is no objection to the order but the word 'compensation' is very general, and if the motion were to pass in its present shape, we would be required to give a statemnt of the wages paid every employee.

Mr. KEMP. What I mean is compensation for injuries. In the Auditor General's Report, compensations are dealt with, and it is that class of compensations to which I refer. I would ask that the motion be amended by adding after the word 'compensation' the words 'for injuries as dealt with in the Auditor General's Report.'

Motion as amended, agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

CANADA-CAPE BRETON CASE—RESIGNATION OF CAPTAIN SALMON.

Mr. H. B. AMES (St. Antoine, Montreal) moved :

For copies of all correspondence, telegrams, &c., which passed between the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or any other official of the said department, and Captain R. Salmon, former wreck commissioner, in the matter of the Canada-Cape Breton investigation, and the resignation of Captain Salmon from his position as wreck commissioner.

He said: I desire to lay before the House the reasons which make it necessary in my opinion to ask for the return of these papers. Most of the members of this honourable House will remember that early last summer a very regrettable accident occurred in the St. Lawrence channel by which several lives were lost, much property destroyed and confidence in the St. Lawrence route somewhat shaken. As was natural and right, there was a demand for a thorough investigation of all the circumstances. The department of Marine and Fisheries, which had created a board whose duty it was to investigate accidents of this kind was naturally called upon to look into the matter with a view to placing responsibility for the accident upon the shoulders of the proper parties. In accordance with orders issued by the department, as I understand it, Captain Salmon opened his court, and, with Captain Reid and Captain Lachance acting as assessors, proceeded to take full evidence with a view to ascertain who was responsible for this terrible accident. He notified, as I understand, the counsel of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, whose steamer 'Canada' was one of those that suffered in the collision. That company, if I am rightly informed, intimated to their counsel that they did not desire to produce testimony before Captain Salmon's court. The wreck commissioner made his investigation as he was by law bound to do, examining the crews of the two vessels with a view to finding out where the fault lay, whether with the channel, with the boats or with the men who were commanding and operating the two vessels. Finally on September 26, the wreck commissioner made public announcement that he was prepared shortly to render the decision at which he had arrived. And from that time the public heard nothing about the matter until October 5, when Captain Salmon, mounting the bench, taking his position as a judge, delivered a statement setting forth his finding in this peculiar case and placing the responsibility upon those who, in his opinion, should bear it, and forthwith gave in his resignation, on the ground that he had been hampered and tampered with in the performance of his duties by the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

At this point it becomes necessary therefore, to refer to the statement which Capt. Salmon speaking at that time from the bench gave to the public. He stated that on September 26, the same day on which he had given notice of his intention to deliver judgment, placing the responsibility for this accident, the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, one of the parties interested in the case, through their counsel, made application to him for a reopening of the case on the ground that they had new evidence to submit and new witnesses to produce. Although his decision was practically made, nevertheless, Captain Salmon acceded to the request and granted the company a delay of seven days, and stated that he would hear any new witnesses on October 3, if they would produce them. On September 29, three days later, it appears, that Captain Salmon, received a communication from Mr. Archer, the counsel of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, at one time the law partner of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) and presumably at the present time connected with the same office, asking, not that the wreck commissioner should hear certain new witnesses, but that he should accept a typewritten statement which Mr. Archer had prepared to setting forth certain evidence that had been given in the Admiralty Court in Quebec, and should take it into consideration before he gave his judgment. Captain Salmon naturally replied that, as he could have no control whatever over this evidence, he could hardly be expected to take it into consideration, that, certainly, as it did not come with the concurrence of both contending parties, but simply from the counsel himself, the acceptance of it would not be fair. Then, if we may believe Captain Salmon's statement, Mr. Archer turned to the Department of Marine and Fisheries to see whether it would not be possible in some other way to accomplish what he had in view. We find that Mr. Archer communicated with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) or with the department, and asked that orders should be issued to withhold Captain Salmon from giving decision in the matter until the report should be brought down by the judge sitting in the Admiralty Court in Quebec. This court, as hon. members know, is one that is called upon simply to deal with actions for damages and determine who shall pay. Next, we find that Captain Salmon is in receipt of a telegram from the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries peremptorily ordering—or its equivalent—ordering him to withhold his judgment until such time as it might suit the department to order him to make it known. If Captain Salmon has rightly given us a copy of the telegram received—that, of course we cannot find out until the papers are laid on the table of the House, that telegram reads as follows :—

Minister desires you to do nothing further until you get orders from him.

I would like to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the hon. members of this House that at the time Captain Salmon received this telegram he was a judge to all intents and purposes, that he was a court and that he was about to deliver an important judgment. Yet, it was at that time he received a communication peremptorily ordering him not to deliver that judgment but to allow the case to remain as it was for an indefinite period, possibly allowing unfit men to continue in the performance of duties aboard steamboats, bringing risk of life and limb to others, although these men should have been deprived of their licenses and prevented from continuing in the steam boat service. You do not wonder that Captain Salmon resented action of that kind, and that he found himself, as an honourable man, bound to choose whether he would retain or give up his commission. Therefore, he made the following statement, the truth of which can probably be verified when the papers are laid before the House:

This court——

Referring to himself.

——was approached by the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries upon a certain date in this city with the specific inquiry as to the possible decision to be rendered in the case.

Let me point out the impropriety of the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, if this allegation is true, approaching a judge who was about to deliver a decision, to ask him which way that decision was likely to go. Captain Salmon adds :

In response to the inevitable and negative reply to such inquiry, the court was offered the suggestion that it might be advisable to consult the counsel of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, Mr. Archer, before rendering the decision, and that such action would be exceedingly acceptable to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that it is not customary in this Canada of ours for orders to issue from ministers requesting judges to consult with counsel who may be engaged in an important case, before rendering judgment. It was evident that, through some inference probably, Mr. Archer concluded that Captain Salmon's judgment was not likely to be in favour of his clients, and consequently he deemed it expedient to take other measures, if possible, to keep the judgment from being delivered against the interest of the clients whom he represented. So it came about that Captain Salmon saw fit to give his resignation. He claimed that although as an officer of the department in ordinary matters he was bound to obey his superior officers, and when, on the demand of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, he was constituted a court of investigation, while he sat as

such court he was to all intents and purposes a judge, and could no longer be interfered with or unduly influenced until such time as he had delivered his decision. He considered that the attempt beforehand to ascertain his verdict, the attempt to delay his judgment, was certainly an attempt to hamper the usefulness of that court; and being an honourable and independant man, he felt there was but one of two things to do, either to disobey the orders that had proceeded from the department to which he belonged, or else to accept the orders, and to feel thereafter that in his capacity as a judge he had submitted to influences which he could not defend. And so he resigned his position, and he stated the reasons why he resigned, and it remains to be seen whether the reasons he gave are, by this House and the country, considered to be sufficient.

Now, I want simply to point out that to all intents and purposes Captain Salmon was a court. It is distinctly specified in the law that while constituted as a regular commissioner he is a court, and that therefore he was expected to uphold the dignity of the court, and endeavour to surround himself with the same atmosphere which should characterize any of the courts of this country. Captain Salmon resigned on the principle that our courts should be sacred and inviolate, that no man should be allowed, during the deliberation of the judge, to interfere with him in making up his mind. I may say that, speaking for the business and commercial interests of the great city of Montreal, it is a great disappointment to us that Captain Salmon should have found it necessary to resign and return to England. We had hoped that we might in time establish a Marine Court in Canada, whose decisions would be of equal value and importance to those of the Marine Courts on the other side of the Atlantic. We know that Captain Salmon in England would naturally state the reasons of his resignation, and naturally we feel that the Marine Courts of Canada will be degraded in the eyes of the mother country and of the world. Further than that, we feel that there are grave questions involved. When two great shipping companies meet with an accident and it becomes necessary to fix the responsibility of that accident upon the crew of one or other of these vessels, the possibility that undue influence may be brought to bear on the court in the interest of either of the contending parties, causes a feeling of doubt and of unprotectedness to exist throughout the entire shipping community. I would also point out that cases of this character where life and limb are at stake need to be considered with great care. In this particular case four lives had been lost. It was of course important that nothing should interfere with an absolutely impartial decision as to who was responsible for the accident, and who was primarily responsible for that loss of life. The travelling public can never feel that they are protected until they are satisfied that when an investigation takes place it will be absolutely impartial.

Further than that, this case affects the marine and shipping interests of the city of Montreal. We are very anxious that it may become possible to reduce the amount of marine insurance that our shipping interests are called upon to pay. We realize that that can only be done by creating, first of all, an excellent channel, and secondly, by creating confidence in the administration of everything connected with the operation of that channel. The doubt as to whether that duty will be well discharged, and as to whether justice will be impeded, militates against a reduction of the insurance which the shipping interests of Montreal are called upon to pay.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I trust that when the correspondence is brought down, and when we receive from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the explanations which I am sure he will be willing to give, the apprehensions that have been aroused will be allayed. Certainly I think that this House, on the face of the case I have presented, is at least entitled to a full explanation and an opportunity to study the full correspondence.

Hon. R. PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). First of all I desire cordially to thank the hon. gentleman for having brought this question before the House, because, notwithstanding the explanations that have already been given in the newspapers and otherwise, there still seems to exist some misapprehension, either voluntary or involuntary. I do not mean to tax the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) with having wrongfully represented the facts of the case, but surely the hon. gentleman has not examined the law nor the facts as they have been published at various times in the newspapers. First, as regards the law. The hon. gentleman seems to be under the misapprehension, and has so stated, that Captain Salmon, when he was instructed to investigate the collision which occurred between the 'Canada' and the 'Cape Breton,' was instructed to hold a court. That is quite erroneous and contrary to the law as it exists. First, I might state that there are two kinds of investigations held by the wreck commissioner under the authority of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. There is a preliminary investigation. Then, there is a formal investigation. The two are easy to understand with a few words of explanation. In this case there was no formal demand for an investigation. The two parties interested seemed to have thought that it was not required. After waiting for a few days or a few weeks I took it upon myself, in the

interest of the public and in the interest of navigation under section 4 of 1 Edward VII, chap. 37, to instruct the wreck commissioner to proceed with a preliminary investigation.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the statute ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. 1 Edward VII, chap. 37, an act to amend the Shipping Casualties Act, 1901, which was assented to on the 18th July, 1904. By section 4 I am empowered, as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to order a preliminary investigation. The clause reads as follows :

The minister may appoint a principal officer of customs or any officer of the government of Canada, or any person to make preliminary inquiries respecting such shipping casualties, and may define the territorial jurisdiction of any such officer or person.

Therefore, the person whom I might appoint is not designated, except that the person whom the minister designates is empowered to hold an investigation within the limits and according to the jurisdiction that the minister gives him and nothing else. Of course, it is provided by subsection 2 of section 4 how he is to conduct the inquiry and how he is to give his report upon it.

If, upon a preliminary inquiry, the officer holding it is of opinion that any loss, or damage, or the stranding of any ship, or any loss of life, has been caused by the wrongful act or default or by the incapacity of the pilot in charge, or that such pilot has been guilty of any gross act of misconduct or drunkenness, the license of such pilot may be suspended by such officer until a formal investigation under this act has been held and a further decision rendered upon the case : provided that the term of suspension shall not exceed a period of three days, unless the minister notifies such pilot within that time that a formal investigation will be held.

Captain Salmon held the investigation in virtue of this statute. He should have known it, and if he did not know it when he rendered judgment, and he seems not to have known it, he was unfit for the position he occupied.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you the instructions to Captain Salmon ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. What is that ?

Mr. HAGGART. How are we to know that it was only a preliminary investigation ? What are the instructions ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE The papers will show it. I will place all the documents before the House, and it will appear that it was a preliminary investigation that he was instructed to hold. From the beginning of the investigation I discovered that he was rather prejudiced against one or other of the parties, and I found it very strange indeed that this officer should stand in that position in an important case like this. So I directed him to carry out his proceedings properly and see that justice should be rendered to all parties. Captain Salmon, knowing very well that he was not holding a formal investigation, never notified the parties as to what was the accusation. Instructions were given under the section I have just read to hold a preliminary investigation. Now, I go farther. Under this clause, I contend rightly, I presume, that the officer was under my charge during the whole time that he was conducting that investigation. I discovered that the parties interested refused to produce their witnesses and refused to take part in the investigation. The proprietors of the 'Cape Breton,' as well as the proprietors of the steamer 'Canada ' were interested in not taking part in the investigation, which was only a preliminary investigation, and why? Because at the time that the investigation began there was pending before the Vice Admiralty Court of Quebec a case in which damages were claimed by the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Co., in which it was sought to establish the responsibility between the two companies and in which the two companies took part. The action had been instituted, I understand, by the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Co. against the proprietors of the ' Cape Breton ' the Dominion Coal Company. This investigation had begun before Judge Routhier in the Vice Admiralty Court of Quebec, and both parties were fighting for their rights. In face of that what was my duty? My duty was clearly defined. It was to see that the rights of neither party should be prejudiced. I was informed by both sides that there were witnesses who would be examined before the Vice Admiralty Court and who would not appear before Captain Salmon in the preliminary investigation. I made Captain Salmon aware of that fact and I also gave him a formal notification that it might be necessary to suspend that investigation of his and await the judgment which would be pronounced in the Vice Admiralty Court. He went on with the investigation. Then it came to the point where the case in the Vice Admiralty Court had been argued before the judge. When the case had been argued before the judge I believed it was my duty to instruct Captain Salmon to suspend his proceedings, and that I did under the law. It is such a clear law that surely if it had been taken communication of by my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) he would not have made the remarks he has made. All through the Act, chapter 35 of 1 Edward VII., 1901, it is clearly established that the wreck commissioner in conducting a formal investigation remains under the control of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in order that justice may be rendered properly. Following up what I have said just now, I will cite section 15 of the Shipping Casualties Act of 1901.

Whenever a formal investigation is likely to involve a question as to cancelling or suspending the certificate of competency or service of any master, mate or engineer, he shall be fur-

nished before the commencement of the investigation with a copy of the report or statement of the case upon which the investigation has been ordered.

In this case none was furnished anybody; there was no complaint on the part of the families of those who had lost their lives in the accident, for the simple reason that coroners' inquiries had been held in each case a long time before the date of this preliminary investigation which was held by Mr. Salmon.

Then I would cite section 14.

Every formal investigation shall be conducted in such manner that if a charge is made against any person, that person shall have an opportunity of making a defence.

Following the well known English principle, that nobody shall be found guilty or condemned without being heard.

Now I cite from the same Act, clause 22.

The minister may, if he thinks that the justice of the case requires it, re-issue and return the Canadian certificate of the master, mate or engineer which has been cancelled or suspended or shorten the time for which it is suspended, or grant in place thereof a certificate of the same or any other lower grade.

Therefore again the minister remains the final tribunal in the case when it is a formal investigation, and in this case it was not a formal investigation.

Then we have section 25.

In any case where a formal investigation has been held the minister may order the investigation to be re-heard either generally or as to any part thereof; and he shall do so—

(a) If new and important evidence which could not be produced at the investigation has been discovered.

What was the necessity I would like to know of Capt. Salmon, an officer of my department, of pronouncing a judgment when I was instructing him to hear the witnesses that had been heard before the Vice-Admiralty Court.

Mr. HAGGART. Do these rules apply to a preliminary investigation?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They apply particularly to a preliminary investigation because he is not called upon to render a judgment, but simply to make a report to the minister in order to show whether it is necessary to hold a formal investigation. That is good law and justice too.

Now I come to subclause (b).

If for any other reason there has in his opinion been ground for suspecting that a miscarriage of justice has occurred.

In this case it was perfectly clear to me that a miscarriage of justice was going to take place. How could Capt. Salmon pronounce either in favour of the 'Canada' or the 'Cape Breton' or rather of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company or the Canada Coal Company, when there was other evidence which had been produced before the Vice-Admiralty Court and which he refused to hear.

Now I shall cite, Mr. Speaker, the opinion of the Merchant's Service Guild of Liverpool.

Mr. HAGGART. Before the minister goes on, would he give us the instructions to Capt. Salmon, so that we will know whether this was a preliminary or a formal investigation.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have not them here but I shall produce them.

We received the following communication:

9th November, 1905.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Canada.

Sir,—With reference to our communications of the 7th ultimo and 15th inst. relative to the inquiry into the 'Canada-Cape Breton' collision, the Guild have been favoured with a copy of the Montreal 'Daily Star' wherein appears a full copy of the judgment, and also your own action previous to judgment being given.

Perhaps you are not aware that whenever an action for damages in the Admiralty Court between the owners of two ships is pending, the Board of Trade invariably defer their official inquiry until its conclusion in order that the civil action should not be prejudiced in any way.

This is the mode of procedure in England, and I am blamed for having done what justice demanded and for following the precedents of the Board of Trade, the English precedents, in the case of investigations of this kind.

That I think disposes of the question of law, because I submit that according to our laws and according to precedents the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was perfectly justified in acting in the way that he did act. Now we come to examine the conduct of that officer and the opinions that have been expressed of his conduct in this same inquiry. You will see that everything which I stated, in answer to the attacks that were made on me at the time, was perfectly right. I shall read the report of that interview from the Montreal 'Star' of October 6, 1904. It is headed 'The Minister of Marine Talks.'

Minister of Marine discusses occurrence.

Hon. Raymond Préfontaine, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to-day gave the following interview on the occurrence:

Mr. Salmon shows his want of judgment, and, therefore, his unfairness for the position he held in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, by his contemptible attempt to insinuate that he was interfered with in his duties as wreck commissioner, as appears clearly by the documents, some private and confidential, which he communicated to the public.

In advising him as I did, I fulfilled my duty to the shipping interest with absolute impartiality, and followed numerous precedents in

the department. I have done what everybody does before all the courts of the land. Requests are made every day to re-open investigations and to suspend judgment, upon showing good grounds and reasons for so doing.

As regards exercising any political influence, it is farcical, when everybody knows that a majority of the directors of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company belong to the opposite party, as do also some of the counsel engaged in the case.

He has very bluntly and unjustly refused their reasonable and just request to hear new and important witnesses in order to do full justice.

As regards his resignation, I was expecting it for some time. He had already six months ago verbally tendered it, and he knew that he could not remain in the department, my intention being to call for his resignation in the interests of the department, and the reason for my delay was to allow him to close the cases before him.

That statement is exactly true. Capt. Salmon had not given satisfaction; there had been very serious complaints against him and without going beyond this case I need only cite one incident with reference to one of the officers of the 'Cape Breton.' I shall not quote from papers on this side of the water but I shall cite the Edinburgh 'Scotsman,' in which the following remarks are made as regards the conduct of this individual :

The Merchant Service Guild and Shipping Inquiries in Canada.

The conduct of marine inquiries into shipping casualties held in Canada has lately been once more taken in hand by the Merchant Service Guild. It has been urged that captains and officers have been bullied and brow-beaten whilst under evidence, and that the decisions of these inquiries have not been in accord with justice. A recent case which the Guild dwelt upon was that of the investigation into the collision between the steamers 'Canada' and 'Cape Breton.' The chief officer of the latter steamer, whilst under evidence, was subjected to a searching examination in the rules of the road by the president of the court, Captain Salmon, who also held the position of Canadian wreck commissioner. In the course of his examination the officer gave an answer which the Guild considered as a perfectly correct one, but the president, thinking otherwise, his anger became aroused and he ejaculated that 'it was God's mercy that he had not had an accident previously, and that the place for him was in jail.'

Having ascertained the facts, the Guild communicated with the Minister of Marine, Canada, referring to this unwarrantable and offensive statement and requesting Captain Salmon to make an apology for the insult offered to the chief officer of the 'Cape Breton.' The reply of the Minister of Marine stated that Captain Salmon had resigned his position as wreck commissioner, but that the communication of the Guild had been filed for reference if necessary. Subsequently, it transpired that, although he had nothing to do with the collision, the certificate of the chief officer of the 'Cape Breton' had been withheld by the Court of Inquiry until such time as he had been examined by an examiner of masters and mates, and found efficient in the rules of the road. The Guild again communicated with the authorities, stating that it would be an extraordinary thing that the court should deal with the certificate of a witness simply because of the manner in which he gave his evidence. They knew of no legal authority which permitted the certificate being withheld, and trusted that this decision would be quashed. They have now received a further letter from the Canadian Minister of Marine, who conveys his best thanks for information furnished him as to practises of the Board of Trade in connection with inquiries into shipping casualties, and also begs to state for the information of the Guild that the certificate of the chief officer of the 'Cape Breton' has been returned to him.

Captain Salmon had no more jurisdiction over this man than the man in the moon, and had no power to suspend his certificate except for three days; and if during those three days the Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not give the necessary notice that there would be a formal inquiry, the certificate would have to be returned. Captain Salmon did not know that. He was determined to act as a court of justice, and committed the wrongful act that he did. I have heard of a commissioner's court in my native county which condemned a witness, and this is a case of the same kind. In the province of Quebec these commissioners have jurisdiction in small cases to the extent of $25. These gentlemen live amongst the farming community, but they generally know a little more than their neighbours. In the case I refer to and of which I am reminded by Captain Salmon's action, a butcher was suing one of his neighbours for an account of $10 for meat. The farmer contended that he did not owe the account, and the plaintiff brought as a witness the hired man of the farmer, who had lived in the house of the farmer at the time the meat had been furnished. The witness said : I know that this meat has been furnished, and that the account is correct, because I ate the meat myself. The justice said : You ate the meat, then ? The man who eats the meat pays for it—judgment against the witness.' That case was appealed to the higher court in Montreal and it cost about $200 to quash that judgment of the justice of the peace. The action of Captain Salmon in this case has been just the same. He condemned this officer and cancelled his certificate because he did not as a witness give an answer that was satisfactory to Captain Salmon. The position taken by Captain Salmon was entirely wrong, unjust and unfair, and revealed an incapacity on his part which it is hardly possible to imagine. As regards his resignation, as I stated in my interview, if it had not been tendered he would have been asked for it, because he was unfit for the position he occupied. As regards the poor fellow returning to England, that is not exactly the fact. Captain Salmon cannot get a position under any marine organization; I know that

perfectly well. He is in New York at the present time. I do not want to say any more about him. The certificates of the officers which have been cancelled, like that of the first mate of the 'Cape Breton,' have been returned to them. We could not hold the officers as suspended, and it was our duty to do what we have done in the matter. I repeat, if Captain Salmon had known his duties, if he had known the law that he was administering, he would not have rendered himself guilty of the act which he committed. I thank the hon. gentleman for having given me the occasion to state the facts as they are. The documents will be willingly placed before the House as soon as possible within the next few days, and they will bear out exactly what I have stated.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). After the discussion which has taken place this afternoon, the members of the House will be curious to see the documents and to find out exactly what Captain Salmon's position was. I have not the pleasure of Captain Salmon's acquaintance. In fact, my estimate of him has been formed from what I think I heard from the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself, a couple of years ago, when, in passing his estimates through this House, he gave unstinted praise to that individual, declaring him to be highly qualified for the position he held.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I did not know him then.

Mr. MONK. If my hon. friend did not know him he should not have gone so far as he did at that time. But my hon. friend has drawn a distinction to-day which has never been drawn before, and which I think he himself neglected to draw, when there was a great storm in the press of the city of Montreal and among the public generally, as to the action of the Department of Marine and Fisheries towards Captain Salmon. I have listened to the reading of the interview which my hon. friend gave to the 'Star' at that time, and in which he failed entirely to point out that Captain Salmon was holding what he calls a preliminary inquiry. The matter was discussed at great length in the papers of the city of Montreal at the time. My hon. friend will remember that a great deal of indignation was shown at the interference with Captain Salmon in the performance of his statutory duties. Nobody that I am aware of claimed that Captain Salmon was not holding a court. On that point I think there cannot be any doubt. In fact, the Department of Marine and Fisheries and my hon. friend the minister himself cannot have considered that Captain Salmon has proceeded under the section of the Shipping Casualties Act of 1901, which he has quoted to the House, because if that was the case, why did the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries—and that has not been contradicted—say that Captain Salmon was holding a court, and endeavour to persuade him from rendering judgment, and suggest to him that he should see Mr. Archer in order to satisfy the desire of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and learn from Mr. Archer what he should do? It has not been contended at any time that Captain Salmon was acting under the section referred to by my hon. friend. There are two kinds of inquiry, one of an informal nature, and the other, which is the one undoubtedly held in this case, under a section to which I will refer in a moment. But what I submit to this House is this, that even if that inquiry had been held under section 4 of the Shipping Casualties Act of 1901, as amended in 1904, it was not proper for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or his department in any way to interfere with the wreck commissioner in the execution of his duties in a preliminary inquiry. To suppose that even in a preliminary inquiry, the wreck commissioner, who is seized with that inquiry and is proceeding with it, may be dictated to by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—to suppose that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may order the wreck commissioner to stop the inquiry, is, I submit, entirely contrary to the very words and sense of the Casualties Act of 1901. I have no doubt that the instructions to the wreck commissioner, will show that he was not acting under section 4 at all, but section 8. Let me read that section 8 as amended by the statute, chap. 64, 3 Edward VII., 1903:

> The minister may appoint any officer of the government of Canada, or any judge of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec, or any judge of a county count, or any local judge in Admiralty of the Exchequer Court of Canada, or any stipendiary magistrate, to be a commissioner to hold formal investigations, and a commissioner shall for such purposes be a court.

Among the cases in which such court may hold a formal investigation of cases of shipping casualties and collisions, I venture to assert, without fear of contradiction, that Capt. Salmon proceeded under that section 8. He did not proceed under section 4 which calls upon him merely to make a preliminary inquiry and report to the minister whether a formal investigation is necessary. There never was before the commissioner any question as to the nature of the investigation he was holding. It was treated as a formal investigation, and the commissioner presiding was considered the judge. All parties interested appeared before him, and all the proceedings were conducted, as they should have been, under section 8. The proposition of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that because an action was begun before the Admiralty Court was a sufficient reason to warrant his stopping this investigation, seems to me absolutely without foundation.

The object of the proceedings in the Admiralty Court was to settle the question of damages due by one shipping company to the other. That court sat for the purpose of settling a private claim affecting private interests and not at all as a tribunal to settle matters affecting the public interest. But the court over which Capt. Salmon presided is one that was created by statute in the interests of shipping generally, in the public interest, for the purpose of inquiring into the causes of the accident, according to the rules of marine science, and reporting the results to the department. After an accident has taken place and a formal investigation into the causes of that accident has begun, to suppose that because the parties interested judged fit to bring their difficulties before the Admiralty Court, the commissioner may be subjected to an order from the Department of Marine and Fisheries to stop his proceedings, is to defeat completely the object of this legislation. The pretension of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that, under all circumstances and at any time, a commissioner is subject to the orders of his department appears to me absolutely repugnant to any wise and proper interpretation of the Casualties Act. Whether the commissioner were holding a mere preliminary inquiry or making a formal investigation under section 8 he was not subject to orders from the Minister of Marine. I am sure that a careful reading of the authorities quoted by my hon. friend will only prove that the wreck commissioner may under special circumstances, such as when new witnesses or new evidence have been discovered be ordered to renew or reopen his inquiry. The facts of this case, as they have been stated by my hon. friend from St. Antoine Division (Mr. Ames) and as they will no doubt be shown by the papers when brought down, show that the minister went a step further and considered himself authorized to prevent that investigation. I think that in so doing he assumed an authority which does not belong to him, and that this House should not fail to express its appreciation of such conduct.

Mr. R. FORGET (Charlevoix). In rising for the first time, Mr. Speaker, to address this House I regret very much that I have to differ from my hon. friend the member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), and the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). The sad accident to the steamers 'Cape Breton' and 'Canada' is one of course in which I felt a very deep interest, and the proceedings in connection with which I followed, as it was my duty, from step to step. As far as I am in a position to form a judgment, in my opinion, the course taken by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was legal and right and gave justice to both parties. When I say that his action was legal, I am not speaking from any legal knowledge of my own, but according to the advice received from eminent counsel—not alone from Mr. Archer, who was our attorney in the matter, but also from counsel who are acting with him, namely, Mr. Pentland and Mr. Wm. Cook, of Quebec, and Mr. Angers—not my predecessor in this House, but the Hon. Mr. Angers. And I think I may safely say that Messrs. Pentland, Cook and Angers, are recognized throughout the Dominion as the best marine lawyers in this country. This accident took place late in June of last year. A few weeks later, the wreck commissioner held an inquiry. In that investigation, the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company decided not to take any part, as we could not get hold of all the witnesses we required. We instituted an action in the Vice-Admiralty Court in the city of Quebec; and while the case was proceeding in that court, Capt. Salmon, to my knowledge, came down into the corridor of the Court House of the city of Quebec and there threatened our lawyers that he would render judgment that same morning, and he made that threat in the presence of the witnesses of both parties who were in the corridor. In view of this extraordinary conduct, I, acting for the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, got our counsel together and asked them what could be done to save the situation, as no doubt it was the intention of Capt. Salmon to prejudice all these witnesses. After asking Capt. Salmon without success to withhold his judgment, the Hon. Mr. Angers advised our attorney, Mr. Archer, as a last resource, to see the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as he had a perfect right to do, and ask him to request Capt. Salmon to wait. The hon. minister was then at the Frontenac Hotel, and the request was only a fair and reasonable one, and in granting it the minister did nothing but justice to both parties. Since that ex parte enquête before Capt. Salmon—an enquête in which the Richelieu Company was not represented—took place, the Vice-Admiralty Court gave judgment. We are told that this is a civil suit and nothing else. But if the Richelieu company or any other party are civilly responsible for any damages, surely they must be criminally responsible as well for the lives of these people. One reason why we thought Capt. Salmon was unfit for the position he held was that he did not even know the local law of the port of Sorel. There was a law for the port of Sorel, but there was no law defending the limits of that port that we might know exactly where that local law applied. That is the reason why we did not appear before Capt. Salmon's court. This is not a political question and I feel free to differ from my hon. confrère (Mr. Ames), to state that difference frankly, and to say that, in my opinion, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries showed only justice and fair play to both parties in this case.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). I do not know what was called for by considerations of justice between the parties, but, as to the action of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the case, this House can have but one opinion. The minister said he was gratified that the hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Ames), brought the subject before the House as it gave him an opportunity of showing how innocent he and the department were in the whole transaction. Yet he did not tell us whether this was a preliminary or a formal investigation. This could be shown by bringing down the instructions given to the officer who investigated the case. Yet he has not brought down those instructions.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The papers have not been ordered yet.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister spoke in defence of his action and said he had all the papers here. Yet, he did not quote the instructions to show whether this was a preliminary or a formal investigation. But the thing for the House to consider is not the merits of the case, but the interference by the minister with an officer, be he judge or otherwise, who was authorized by statute to investigate a casualty case. What difference does it make, as my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has said, taking the statement of the minister himself, whether this was a preliminary investigation or a formal one. What business had the minister or his deputy to interfere or make suggestions as to what evidence should be taken? The statute sets forth in a peremptory manner the duties and powers of an officer making a preliminary inquiry in such a case. He can inspect the ship; he can inspect premises, having the right of entry; he can summon witnesses and swear them; he can look into documents; he can allow expenses to the witnesses and inflict penalties upon those who refuse to give evidence. He is to report his opinion upon the case, accompanied with such extracts from the evidence as he sees fit. So, even if it were a preliminary investigation, it was the duty of the officer to investigate and report to the minister. Fancy a minister, when such an investigation is going on, suggesting that some other evidence should be submitted or that the officer should not give his report with reference to the matter. Why cannot the minister tell us whether it was a preliminary or a formal investigation and remove all doubt? My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier says it is clear that not a question was raised in the court as to the formal nature of the investigation. In such an investigation the statute provides what the duties of the officer are, and a reading of them will show that the reference was the same as sending the case to a court of justice to be inquired into. The minister says that if it were the preliminary inquiry, the penalty that the officer could inflict was a suspension of the officers for three days, pending decision of the question of holding a formal inquiry. If that is all that was involved, why was there any necessity for the minister or his deputy to interfere? As to the merits of the case I know nothing. Captain Salmon may be right or he may be wrong in his finding. But one thing is plain and undeniable, and that is that there has been tampering by the minister or his deputy with an inquiry ordered under statute. The minister brings evidence, intended to excuse himself by showing that the commissioner was unfit for the position to which he had been appointed. Why, this officer was selected by the minister himself to investigate this case. And what is the evidence that he brings to justify his dismissal of the officer? Letters furnished to him after the dismissal. And fancy the mean insinuation of the minister that this officer, who, presumably was doing what he thought to be his duty, is now a vagrant in the streets of New York. And when he said this there was a laugh from his supporters. What is the inference? There is no inference possible except that this is a warning to all officers of the department whose duty it is to hold such investigations as this: Do not dare to exercise an independent judgment, for the minister may differ with you in opinion, and the result will be that you will become a wanderer in the streets of New York.

Mr. AMES. I believe that as a mover of the motion I am entitled to say a word in reply before the debate is closed. There seems to be considerable doubt in the minds of the minister and of the House as to whether this was a formal inquiry or a preliminary inquiry. Certain it is that Captain Salmon thought it was a formal inquiry, because as I understand the minister to say, that if it had been a preliminary inquiry the maximum penalty he would have been permitted to impose was three days suspension of license. You have only to read his report to see that he considered himself empowered to enforce a penalty far in excess of three days suspension of license. The penalties that he permitted himself to inflict under a formal investigation shows that in his judgment it was a formal investigation. For example, he takes upon himself to suspend the certificate of Captain St. Louis. I doubt if he would have cancelled the certificate if he had considered the investigation a preliminary one. He also suspends for a period of twelve calender months the certificate of Peter Kane; would he have done so if he had considered the investigation merely a preliminary one? You have only to read the entire judgment of Captain Salmon to see that he thought he was carrying out a formal investigation. As we have endeavoured to follow the minister through his ex-

planations, we have noted that he is culling flowers on both sides of the path; that whenever any reference seems to assist him on the ground that it was a preliminary investigation he claims the right to that reference; and whenever there is a reference which seems to help him in the contention that it was a formal investigation, he also claims that as well. There is one thing I would like very much to know, and that is, how it was that the minister discovered that Captain Salmon was prejudiced against one of the parties. The minister says he saw there was about to be a miscarriage of justice. How did he find that out? Now, Mr. Speaker, I admit that the minister has the right, after judgment has been delivered and he thinks there has been a miscarriage of justice, to reverse the decision and to remit the penalties. But I submit that during the course of the enquête, while the judge is preparing to deliver his decision, the minister has no right to interfere on the presumption that the court is prejudiced against one of the parties concerned. I would like to point out also that the instructions which were given by the department to the wreck commissioner, if we are to judge from those which were given to his successor, Captain Spain, are very formal. We have only to turn to the last report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries to read: 'That the minister may appoint a commissioner to hold formal investigations'; and these are the instructions which were given to Captain Spain, which we find in his report of December 6, 1904:

My instructions are to investigate every casualty, and to deal promptly with any carelessness or want of judgment shown by either pilots or shipmasters in the navigation of Canadian waters.

'To investigate every casualty and to deal promptly.' That does not mean to withhold judgments indefinitely. The minister has also seen fit to state that Captain Salmon has fallen from grace, and that he is a character no longer to be received with confidence or to be given any further opportunity of dispensing judgments here in Canada. Admitting that is the present opinion of the minister, I am sorry to see that he was so woefully deceived when he appointed him. On the 9th of October, 1903, he told the House in Committee of Supply:

Last year we inaugurated a system of holding investigations into every casualty that occurred. The members of the committee will recollect that this was done at the special request of the Board of Trade in England, in order to render the service as effective as possible. . . . We have replaced Captain Smith, deceased, by Captain Reginald Salmon, at a salary of $2,000. This department is being thoroughly reorganized under a very able officer and we try to make it as effective as possible. Captain Salmon is an officer of the Royal Navy Reserve holding the rank of lieutenant. . . . Captain Salmon is a commissioner of investigation under the law and he has associated with him two expert assessors. . . . We have had a great deal of difficulty in finding a man qualified as Captain Salmon is to take the position at $2,000. It was only after a good deal of inquiry in Canada and England that we succeeded in getting Captain Salmon. He had been employed in Canada on the surveys by the British government, and he became attached to Canada and accepted the position.

Poor man! He became attached before he knew the ways of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

But I intend, under the advice of Captain Salmon, who is a very efficient officer, to have this matter gone into thoroughly, and have efficient schools of navigation established at the proper ports.

Surely he must have been a good man when his advice was taken by the department in the establishment of naval schools; but now we regret to find that his services are lost to the country for ever.

Motion agreed to.

MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved:—

For a return showing:—1. The present indebtedness to the Dominion government of the Montreal Turnpike Trust (a) on capital account, (b) for arrears of interest.

2. The amounts collected at each toll-gate belonging to the said Turnpike Trust during the year ending 31st December, 1904.

3. The names of all parties who have commuted their tolls, and the amount of commutation paid in each case.

4. The amounts expended on each section or road division under the control of said trust, during the said year ending 31st December, 1904; and the contracts given out during the year, with the name of the contractor and the date and amount involved in each case.

5. The amounts paid out during the said year at each toll-gate for salaries of day and night keepers, and other expenditure at each of the toll-gates maintained.

6. The names of all parties holding passes for free use of the roads under the control of said trust during the said year.

7. The expenses of the said trust during the said year, for rent, salaries of the office, giving name and remuneration of each official.

8. The actual indebtedness in detail of the said trust outside of its bonds due to the government of Canada.

He said: I also desire to add another clause:

9. The amounts collected from year to year since 1896 from the municipalities, under special agreement made, as their share pro rata of the bonded indebtedness of the turnpike trust.

I intend moving a motion in reference to the question referred to in this motion, at a later stage of the session. The object of the present motion is merely to obtain as soon as possible the information which it calls for. On several occasions during

the last two parliaments I have made motions to the same effect, and I would ask the Department of Finance to forward the order of the House to the Montreal Turnpike Trust at Montreal, and to get the report conveying the information. I believe that the information asked for by this motion can be compiled in two or three hours. I would ask my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), who I think represents the Finance department pro tem, to see that the order of the House be sent down to Montreal as soon as possible, in order that that information may be before us at an early date, and that I may be able to move on other lines. It is my desire to bring before the House in another form the question of the toll-bars on the principal roads leading out of the city of Montreal, and I desire to make a suggestion to the government which I think will meet with the approval of the persons who are interested in the development of the roads in the vicinity of the city of Montreal. It is impossible to move the House in that direction unless we have the complete information called for by this motion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no objection at all to the motion being granted, but in reference to the last paragraph which has just been added by my hon. friend (Mr. Monk), I was under the impression that the information had already been brought down —part of it, at all events.

Mr. MONK. No.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Was it not brought down before ?

Mr. MONK. No, there was never brought down any of the information called for by paragraph 9.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Carried.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return of all moneys spent by the government on the Toronto harbour and breakwater during each year from 1880 to 1904 inclusive ; and the particular works upon which such moneys were expended, showing how much for dredging, breakwater, piers, cribwork, piling, &c.—Mr. Macdonell.

Return showing the names of all the commercial agents of Canada ; where located ; previous location, occupation and qualifications ; amount of salary of each ; other expenses connected with their positions ; class of product they are chiefly interested in placing on the market ; procedure in the different locations ; results, specific and general.—Mr. A. Martin.

Return giving the names of all officials, clerks and employees on the pay-roll of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, on the 1st of January, 1905, with the amount of salary in each case.—Mr. Perley.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. F. D. MONK. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would take the opportunity of suggesting to my hon. friend the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee (Mr. McIsaac) to call a meeting of that committee as soon as possible. The first meeting is generally employed with the orders for witnesses and documents, and I think it would be important, as we have now a sufficient quantity of the Auditor General's Report to proceed with the business of the committee, that we should have what is in reality the preliminary meeting as soon as possible.

Mr. McISAAC. The matter having now for the first time been brought to my notice, I will call a meeting as soon as possible.

REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.

Mr. U. WILSON. I would like to know when we may expect the report of the hon. the Minister of the Interior, and also when we may expect the meeting of the Agriculture Committee. There is a good deal of work to be done by that committee, and unless we get to work soon it will interfere very considerably with the meetings of the other committees, as several members of the Committee on Agriculture are members of other committees.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that my hon. friend (Mr. U. Wilson) wants to know when the report of the hon. Minister of the Interior is to be brought down. I am sorry to say that at this moment I cannot give any information to my hon. friend. I understand that at this time, and for some time past, the Printing Bureau has been engaged particularly with the Auditor General's Report. I will make inquiry as to the information which my hon. friend wants, and I will try to give him satisfaction later on. I have no doubt that the Committee on Agriculture will be called to meet at once.

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. First Minister said yesterday that he would, at a later date, give me the information in reference to the Transportation Commission. Has he that information now ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, I am sorry to say I have not.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 11) respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 12) respecting the Ottawa Electric Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 13) respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Gauvreau.

Mr. FOSTER. Probably that will be sufficient to give the Railway Committee some work to do, and it might be better to leave the others until we have a chance to look at them.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Customs—salaries and contingent expenses, ports, $1,214,865.

Hon. WM. PATERSON. The first sub-item was about finished was it not ?

Mr. FOSTER. I think the minister was giving us a list of the increases in Nova Scotia.

Mr. PATERSON. I think I gave the gross amount of the increase. In Nova Scotia it amounted to $2,210. Of these 37 increases, I may say that 24 were in Halifax, one in Annapolis, one in Canso, one in Digby, two in Lunenburg, four in North Sydney, one in Pictou, one in Port Hawkesbury, and two in Sydney.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the nature of the increases in Halifax ?

Mr. PATERSON. Largely from $550 to $600. These increases were in accordance with our policy in the large ports of raising the salaries of the lower priced men.

Salaries and travelling expenses of inspectors of ports and of other officers on inspection and preventive service, including salaries and expenditure in connection with the Board of Customs and for the compiling of statistical returns of imports and exports, $189,200.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister explain very briefly his system of inspection ?

Mr. PATERSON. The inspection is carried on by officers duly appointed, one in New Brunswick, who also takes Prince Edward Island, two in Nova Scotia, two in Quebec, five in Ontario, one in British Columbia, one in Manitoba, who takes in the Territories, and the collector of customs at Dawson, who has supervision as inspector over Whitehorse. Their duties are to be continually engaged in the inspection of the offices, examining the clerical work and everything in connection with the business of the office. They report to the commissioner of customs as to the condition of each port. If anything improper is reported, that of course has to be taken cognizance of by the commissioner, it is brought under my notice and has to be dealt with. The inspection is now pretty thorough. Before 1896, owing to the illness of some of the inspectors, it had been impossible to inspect some of the offices for three or four years and some things went wrong, but in 1896 under the old government Mr. McKay was appointed and since then Mr. Boultbee has died and his place has been filled. I think I can safely say that now every port in inspected once a year if not more frequently.

Mr. FOSTER. What members of the Board of Inspection or the staff of inspectors are in Ottawa ?

Mr. PATERSON. None of these to whom I have been alluding, the inspection staff, are in Ottawa. There is a board called the Board of Customs, but there are 13 officers under Mr. McMichael, whose headquarters are at Toronto.

Mr. FOSTER. Is Mr. McMichael one of the Ontario inspectors or is he a chief ?

Mr. PATERSON. He is the chief inspector.

Mr. FOSTER. And he looks after all the other inspectors ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, he is the head and he looks after all the others.

Mr. FOSTER. Do the reports of the others go to him ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, they are all forwarded through him.

Mr. FOSTER. What does he do with reference to these reports ? Does he give them a thorough going over ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, he goes through them, makes a report and sends them to the commissioner.

Mr. FOSTER. I wanted to get the modus operandi. When Mr. McMichael gets the reports of the inspectors what authority has he? Does he deal with any portion of them himself, and is there a certain time in which he has to report to the commissioner, or does he simply report upon and forward all these reports to the commissioner. I want to ascertain if any of these reports fall by the way or any portion of them, or do they all come to the commissioner with the advantage of the chief inspector's notes and comments.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, they all come to the commissioner here and final action is taken here. Mr. McMichael would not take action himself, but he would draw the attention of the commissioner to anything which he thought necessary. The commissioner, however, would have to take action.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the commissioner take the sole action in conjunction with his minister of course, or have you a board here, which assists in any way.

Mr. PATERSON. No, not in reference to that matter, because these inspectors are doing the initial part of the work, and it becomes a matter of judgment whether a search should be made. If a shortage were discovered, as sometimes happens, we would have to take a step which we do not like to take, and perhaps feel it incumbent upon

us to relieve the officer of his position. Since I have been at the head of the department we have changed the practice. Formerly we took securities from private individuals, but now the officers are all under guarantee companies, so that if there is any shortage, we simply notify the insurance company which gives the guarantee, and have nothing more to do with the matter. The company has to make the loss good.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. How are sub-collectors paid—by salary or commission ? If by salary, is there any uniform rule ?

Mr. PATERSON. They are paid by salary, invariably I think. But at certain small points, which are not customs ports, for convenience we give postmasters the power to collect in small matters, and allow them 10 per cent commission.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. There have been cases in which goods have been brought to the sub-agency, and a man at the place has been employed as an agent of the owner of goods, and has charged a certain fee, and the sub-collector, in stating the amount of duty which the individual had to pay, has included the agents' fee. I myself have seen an account rendered by a sub-collector at Neepawa, in which a fee of 50 cents was charged as the agent's commission on an article on which there was paid $4 of duty. It seems to me that that is entirely outside of the duties of a collector.

Mr. PATERSON. So it is. While brokers may do business for others, we do not recognize them in any way at all. They are not agents of the department. If any charge is made by them, it is no part of our duty to collect it.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The party could not get the goods released without paying the agent's fee. The sub-collector has no right to constitute himself an agent for the collection of the agent's fee.

Mr. PATERSON. No, certainly not. We have had occasion to point out that if people pay that, it is not on the demand of the Department of Customs at all.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Another thing occurred in connection with the same office. A person bringing in household effects from the old country was anxious to have them passed immediately, but could not produce his certified invoice in order to get the benefit of the preferential rate. He asked the sub-collector of customs if, by paying the full amount of the duty, and later on producing the certified invoice, he would get a rebate. The sub-collector replied, No, certainly not.

Mr. PATERSON. That would be a misapprehension of his duties, because that is our course. If a person comes with an invoice not properly certified, our regulations provide, and our officers are so instructed, that the goods are to be allowed in at the full general tariff rate, and when the proper invoice is produced, a rebate is allowed.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. And there is no time specified ?

Mr. PATERSON. No time specified, except that it has to be done within three years.

Mr. BENNETT. Is there any age at which the hon. minister deems it right or proper to superannuate officials of his department in the outside service ?

Mr. PATERSON. Under the general Superannuation Act a person over 60 years of age may be superannuated, as the hon. gentleman knows. We have many officers over that age who are capable of performing their duties, and who do not wish to be superannuated.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the minister if the case of Mr. George Watson, the collector of customs at Collingwood, who is in his 77th year, is now under consideration for superannuation ?

Mr. PATERSON. I think he has not asked for it.

Mr. BENNETT. He has been upwards of 40 years in the service. Can the minister recollect whether or not he has applied for superannuation ?

Mr. PATERSON. Not that the accountant is aware of.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not think the accountant would be aware of it. I want to know if the minister is aware of it.

Mr. PATERSON. No, I am not.

Mr. BENNETT. There is no question of his superannuation or the appointment of his successor before the minister at present?

Mr. PATERSON. No, not at present, so far as I remember. Is there a feeling that he is not able to discharge his duties ?

Mr. BENNETT. No, but it was felt about the time of the election that it was very expedient to have him superannuated on account of the government receiving the very warm services of a gentleman who was to receive the position. The minister never heard of that ?

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, no.

Mr. BENNETT. I think he will soon hear of it.

Mr. PATERSON. That is certainly an age at which a gentleman might ask to be relieved from service.

Mr. BENNETT. I think so, and in view of the services the other gentleman gave, I think it would perhaps be quite right for him to receive the position.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, I do not know who the other gentleman is.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wish to ask the minister how the payment for overtime comes about. At the port of Sarnia you have paid for overtime during the past year $2,786, which is distributed over a number of names. How is the time computed ?

Mr. PATERSON. They are paid so much an hour. Up to two years ago a large part of that amount was paid by the transportation companies. The department and the House, however, took the view that it was only proper that, as the revenue was collected by our officers, they should be paid by us. Therefore we have assumed the payment of all overtime, and do not any longer charge it to the transportation companies ; but if the transportation companies ask for the services of our officers on Sundays, which happens in some rare cases, we do not pay for that ; the transportation companies have to bear it. Is the hon. gentleman's question how we divide it among the different officers ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I want to know how you can check it among the different officers.

Mr. PATERSON. They must serve so many hours, and the collector must certify to the fact. The work must be done before 8 o'clock in the morning or after 6 o'clock at night, and in every case they must state the amount of overtime they have put in. The collector has to certify the account, and they are paid 25 cents an hour.

Mr. FOSTER. As regards the expenses of the inspectors, on what basis are they regulated?

Mr. PATERSON. The actual travelling and reasonable living expenses for which they furnish vouchers.

Mr. DANIEL. How many revenue cruisers does the minister employ?

Mr. PATERSON. Really only one is under customs. In Cape Breton waters during the summer we engage a boat called the 'Gladiator.' We have many revenue cutters but they are under the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. DANIEL. Under whose authority do they work. The Customs or Marine?

Mr. PATERSON. The officers are wholly under my department and are under Mr. Jones. The repairs are done through the Marine Department but are charged against us.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the duties of the Board of Customs ?

Mr. PATERSON. They decide questions that are not very clear under the law. For instance, as to whether a certain article might be a woollen or a cotton. They have periodical meetings at which they rule upon the different questions referred to them. When a decision of theirs is approved by a Minister of Customs, he signs it, and it has the authority of law, but it is subject to an appeal to the Governor in Council.

Mr. FOSTER. Are the statistical officers all in Ottawa ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, fifty-seven. They are not all new. Under the old system they would be at Montreal and other ports. They get out reports every month giving us as complete information as you will find in the Trade and Navigation returns.

Mr. FOSTER. The work which was formerly done at the out ports by those who were removed to Ottawa is not now being done there?

Mr. PATERSON. No, it is done here.

Mr. FOSTER. But all the data for that work has to be frowarded from those ports?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not add very much to the work of those ports? The minister does not duplicate by appointing men to fill the vacancies caused by removal of statistical officers to Ottawa?

Mr. PATERSON. We did not fill the vacancies where men were engaged at large ports exclusively in this statistical work. But in so small ports, like Guelph or Brantford, where men were engaged partly in this work and partly in other work, we could not reduce the staff by the removal of one officer. But the increase in the business has generally justified keeping the staff up to what it was before.

Mr. HENDERSON. As to these monthly reports, I would be glad if the minister would tell us whether business men really value and appreciate them. My impression is that they are not much called for or used. But the reports would be much more interesting to me, I know—and I pay attention to the trade and navigation returns—if a column were added to these monthly reports giving the amount of revenue collected. It may be that these reports cost more than they are worth, but, if it is well to continue them, I would suggest that they would be exactly in the form of the trade and navigation returns.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the minister say what the expense of publishing these monthly reports is ?

Mr. PATERSON. We have not that separately from our other printing.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the minister would get that information. I confess it looks well to have monthly reports, but, as my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) says they may not be of enough use to justify

the expense of printing and distribution. I hope the minister will be able to tell us at a future sitting what the ordinary monthly circulation is and give us some idea of the expense.

Mr. PATERSON. This system of monthly report was established at the request of the Manufacturer's Association. Perhaps a merchant or ordinary business man may not value them much. But every one doing or contemplating an export business finds them of value. We have to do a great deal of this work any way in order to get out our yearly report. And it is always to be remembered that statistics in order to be of value must be fresh. Under the old system we were not able to get out the fiscal returns for the year ending June 30, until the February or March following, when the figures were of little or no value. Now the figures are fresh and they actually help and facilitate trade. So while it involves an expense I think the expense is justified by the good done to the trade of the country at large. It may be that comparatively few business men in the country subscribe or take an interest in them, but the trade that is helped by them is large and important.

Mr. BERGERON. How many employees are there in the Customs Department in the Yukon ? There is a vote of $42,000 for that.

Mr. PATERSON. There are 12 at Dawson and 11 at Whitehorse, the out-port.

Mr. BERGERON. This covers the salaries of all ?

Mr. PATERSON. Salaries and expenses.

Mr. BERGERON. What has been the method of the Customs Department so far as living allowance is concerned ?

Mr. PATERSON. It was thought better to pay salaries and living allowance so that if the cost of living went down there might be a reduction without a reduction of salary. Formerly we paid $150 per month living allowance. Now, we pay the married men $1,500 a year and the single men $1,000.

Mr. BERGERON. I see an item in tonight's paper headed 'Will have to send for Wives.' It says :

An order was issued yesterday in the administration building to the effect that all married men whose wives live outside the Territory should have $25 a month cut off their living allowance.

I gather that, for years officers have been drawing a living allowance as for the whole family though their wives and families have been living outside the territory. The Department of the Interior at least seems to have found this out.

Mr. PATERSON. If a man is keeping his family at one place and boarding in another I do not know that he gains much by it.

Mr. FOSTER. Has there been any revision of the allowances since it was first fixed?

Mr. PATERSON. It was $1,800, and is now $1,500 for married men and $1,000 for single men. Formerly it was $1,800 all round, no distinction made.

Mr. BERGERON. I would call to the hon. gentleman's attention something which I find in the Ottawa 'Free Press' of tonight—I do not know if there is any authority for it :

An order was issued yesterday in the administration building to the effect that all married men whose wives live outside the Territory should have $25 a month cut off their living allowance.

I understand from my hon. friend that married men get so much and single men so much. This report says :

Formerly married men received an allowance of $125 a month for living expenses. Now only the married men whose wives are with them will get this amount. The others will get but $100.

They are treated like single men when their wives are not there.

It is said that a couple of men whose salaries are affected by this order to the tune of $300 a year have telegraphed for their wives to come in at once. As yet it is not known how many men in the service this new order will affect. The heads of the departments will report on the matter and will tell how many men under them are married but whose wives are not with them.

Has my hon. friend any knowledge of this in his department ?

Mr. PATERSON. No ; I do not think that refers to the Customs Department.

Mr. BERGERON. I think all the departments having officers in the Yukon should adopt some like plan. There seems to be a different way of treating these men in the different departments. In the Department of Justice they are treated the best of all, and in other departments they are not all treated alike.

Mr. PATERSON. When you go into the legal profession, they are not governed by the ordinary laws. As concerns the Post Office, the Interior and the Customs departments, my impression is that we are all about on the same basis. I think, so far as those three departments are concerned, the living allowance is about on the same basis. At any rate, we have reduced ours from $1,800 to $1,500 for married men, and then make a distinction for the first time between married and single men.

Mr. BERGERON : Whether his wife is there or not ?

Mr. PATERSON. Of course, if the man is married, we assume that his wife will be with him. But sometimes they go into that country on temporary business. I know

the collector at Dawson has his family with him, although he himself is out just now. There are some single men there. I fancy that other officers have their wives with them. I do not know about the appraiser, he goes to Victoria ; there is no use keeping him at Dawson all winter, and his living allowance is cut off when he is in Victoria. I presume his family is with him in Victoria.

Mr. FOSTER. What proportion of the minister's officials are uniformed ?

Mr. PATERSON. I think all who come in contact with the public at stations as landing waiters.

Mr. FOSTER. Are the uniforms furnished by the department ?

Mr. PATERSON. I think they have to provide themselves once a year. We make an allowance of $8 once a year for the uniform. They buy the cap, and we supply the cap band and the buttons for the uniform.

Mr. FOSTER. Have they to get these uniforms at any particular place ?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. FOSTER. You take care that the uniforms are uniform—that your officers present a uniform appearance ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, it is rather a neat uniform ; it is certainly a great improvement on the former one.

Mr. FOSTER. You don't have to make any contracts, then ?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an item here of $12,474.65, which seems to be taken from the general expenditure and which is paid by the railways. What is that ?

Mr. PATERSON. That is a refund of money paid by transportation companies. In 1903 the committee of the House authorized the Department of Customs to pay their own officers. If you recognize the fact that trains should be allowed to run in the general interest of the country, it is part of our business to pay officers who are to collect the revenue for the Dominion of Canada. It involves asking for $60,000 or $80,000 more, and I hesitated for two or three years. But we take the position that we will not pay for overtime on Sunday, that if you are going to require men to work on Sunday you will have to pay for that. In this amount you find there are sums that are refunded to us by the transportation companies.

Mr. FOSTER. The revenue that you collect on Sunday, do you take that into the funds ?

Mr. PATERSON. The Sunday work they require to do is entering and clearing vessels, not to collect the revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. No revenue collected on Sunday ?

Mr. PATERSON. I said the principal work is entering and clearing vessels. We do not encourage, in fact we discourage, any Sunday work that can be avoided.

Mr. FOSTER. But the money which is collected on Sunday goes into the treasury of the Dominion ?

Mr. PATERSON. If there is any collected.

Mr. FOSTER. But as a matter of fact the sum is collected ?

Mr. PATERSON. I could not say that. I think it is very doubtful.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. minister sees that he is running up against a place where he cannot find an argument, because, if he takes the revenues which he collects on Sundays, on the ground that he himself has laid down he is bound to pay the expenses for collecting the revenues on Sunday as well as on any other day. We will not pursue that point.

Mr. PATERSON. I discouraged Sunday work as much as possible.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. minister himself does not work on Sunday.

Mr. PATERSON. No, I do not.

Mr. WHITE. And when it is done you do not pay for it.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, I suppose we have discussed this item enough now.

Mr. FOSTER. As far as I am concerned I am satisfied.

Mr. PATERSON. The whole item is carried is it not?

Mr. FOSTER. All right.

Mr. PATERSON. We might as well call it six o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. All right. What will be taken up to-night ?

Mr. PATERSON. We are ready to go on with militia, I suppose, if the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) is here.

Mr. FOSTER. You must look after your minister.

Mr. PATERSON. I know, but I was asking the hon. gentleman. I think the Auditor General's Report in reference to that is down.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, 'Militia and Defence' is down.

Mr. PATERSON. Very well, we will go on with that.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 14) respecting the Molsons Bank.—Mr. Ames.

Bill (No. 15) to incorporate the St. Mary's and Western Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. McIntyre.

Bill (No. 16) respecting certain patents of the Canada Car Company, Limited.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 17) respecting certain patents of the Goodwin Car Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 18) respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 19) to incorporate the Calgary Red Deer and Battleford Railway Company.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 20) to incorporate the Moosejaw and Edmonton Railway Company.—Mr. Scott.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Militia and Defence, pay and allowances, $670,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister might explain the large increase in this item.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). Before going on with these estimates I would like to make a suggestion to the committee, and to my hon. friends opposite. I would suggest that the same course might be pursued this year as we have been pursuing for the last two or three years, namely, to agree upon a day on which the main discussion of the state of the militia should take place, and that in the meantime some progress might be made with the items here, with the understanding that when that discussion takes place, any subject covered by any of these items should be open to discussion.

Mr. FOSTER. If anything is to be done at all that will have to be the way because the minister's report, I understand, is not yet down. We will go over these items and the minister will be able to give the explanations and we shall reserve one item for a general discussion. I think that will be satisfactory.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would suggest that the large item of $1,300,000 might be the one to be reserved. That is the item really on which the discussion has taken place in the last two years and it practically covers every branch of the militia service. I am sorry my report is not on the table but as the militia report is brought up to the end of the calendar year, it was impossible to get it into the printers' hands until about this time. As a matter of fact it has been in the printer's hands for a couple of weeks and I hope to have it in a couple of days.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the minister in the meantime explain these items ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This item of pay and allowances, as will be seen in the detailed statement on page 38, is for pay and allowances of the Headquarters and District Staff, pay of Permanent Corps, pay of officers and men attending Schools of Instruction, allowances to active militia, and guards of honour. There is an increase in the pay of the Headquarters and District Staff of between $8,000 and $9,000. This is due to the fact that some changes have been made at headquarters ; some additional branches have been created, and additional officers appointed. With regard to the second item, the $460,000, there is a very considerable increase.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the minister goes on to that he might say what additional officers have been appointed and what additional pay is given to the Headquarters and District Staff. What part of the $9,000 there is for new officers.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is a Director of Training and Intelligence whose pay is to be $2,800, an Assistant Adjutant General, a Director of Artillery, a Director of Transports and Supplies, a Director of Operations and Staff Duties, a Director of Cloth and Equipment. All these are really changes in name chiefly. There is a new officer, the Director of Operations and Staff Duties at $2,800 and an assistant at $1,700.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Whom have you appointed to these two offices?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They are not filled; we are simply providing for them. I may say in this connection that under the authority of the Act passed last session, a reorganization of the Headquarters Staff has taken place, under the direction chiefly of General Lake, who came from England a month or two ago, and who is Chief of the General Staff. He has assisted me in constituting a Militia Council under the authority of the Act, and these changes have been made at his suggestion, and with the approval of the Militia Council.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is that a case of an officer from the old country coming out to succeed one of whom the minister is reported not long since to have said that the chief function of each general officer commanding is to prove that his predecessor was an unwise man. Are not these the changes which were made necessary by the Bill passed last session ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Have the regulations and orders which were to have been submitted to parliament before the Militia Act of last session became law, been passed? If so, might I suggest that the minister have a copy sent to each member of parliament?

Mr. DANIEL. Who is the principal medical officer of No. 8 district?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Surgeon-major Bridges.

Mr. DANIEL. I saw in one of the daily papers yesterday or the day before that Dr. Bridges had resigned that position, and that Dr. March had been appointed.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am not aware of such being the case. I will get the information and let my hon. friend know at a later stage.

Mr. DANIEL. How are these officers paid?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Principal Medical Officers in districts where there are permanent depots receive the pay of their rank. While there are no permanent depots they are paid during the camp, and they are given $25 a month for any duties they may have to perform between the camps.

Mr. DANIEL. I see that Major Bridges is put down as receiving only $2 per day for 366 days to June 30, 1904, the whole amount being $732. If he were receiving the pay of his rank, I should think he would receive more than that.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, $4 per day would be the pay. I am informed that that was before the permanent appointment was made. Dr. Bridges was then a private practitioner and a surgeon in the active militia, and his services were utilized after the death of Dr. McLearn, I think it was, at the rate mentioned by my hon. friend. I will look into the matter, however. My attention has been called to it now for the first time.

Mr. FOWLER. Is he resident in Fredericton and does he attend to the military school there?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is the allowance of so much per month to these principal medical officers supposed to differ from the ordinary pay the militia officers draw for their services while in camp? In other words, does it constitute them permanent officers or not?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, it does not. For instance, in my own district, No. 9, in Nova Scotia, there is no depot; but still it is necessary to have the services of a Principal Medical Officer, not only in camp but at other times during the year, and he is obliged to be in almost constant correspondence with the headquarters here. He is called on to make the examinations of men who are going to attend the schools and to render other services, and it was thought only fair to allow him the small fee of $25 a month to indemnify him from loss.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The point I wish to make is this. In case one of these officers should have the chance of being elected to parliament, it will not affect his independence under the Independence of Parliament Act?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, it is not intended to do so. I think the Independence of Parliament Act specifically protects the militia officer from being affected by any amount of money he receives.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I would like the minister to bring down all the details in connection with the retirement of Colonel Gregory from the command of his regiment, for I can tell him that Colonel Gregory has been illegally retired, and he has a ground of action against the government if he chooses to take it. I have also received some correspondence in relation to Colonel Herchmer. The minister considers that he does not come under his authority; but I believe it was through the Militia Department that he obtained his dismissal. Then, what act did the government take, either through the Canadian authorities or through the imperial authorities, in relation to a Surgeon Devine, at Winnipeg, in regard to his distinguished services, how did he obtain his Distinguished Service Order and on what reports did he obtain them? I would also like the details connected with the proposed reorganization of the 16th glad to give the information required.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Those items will be in 'Hansard' and I shall be very glad to give the information required.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. minister give us some idea of the duties of these new officers, one of whom is receiving $2,800 and the other $1,700 a year?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This officer, as I understand it, shall have special control over the instructions to be given with reference to the movements of troops in the field.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is his rank?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Director of Operations and Staff Duties. He comes immediately under General Lake, the Chief of the General Staff. He should be one of the best qualified men in the service, because the condition of the troops, the knowledge they have of tactical work and the work necessary to make them efficient in

the field, will depend very largely on the instruction given by this officer. He will direct the officers in command of districts and of camps as to the instruction they are to give.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the hon. minister mean to say that this officer will be superior to the District Officer Commanding ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not at all.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Then how will he direct him ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Through the regular authority, through the Chief of the General Staff.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If the general staff determines what the duties are to be, why could the instructions not be sent by the secretary ? What is the use of this officer ? The district officer commanding has no right to take orders from a junior officer except as representing his superior.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. What I meant to say was that it will be the duty of this officer to study and perfect himself in matters of this kind and to prescribe, suggest and advise. When his advice is accepted, instructions are sent through the proper channel to the different District Officers Commanding districts.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the hon. minister suppose that an officer would occupy all his time laying out plans for drill in camp ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There are many other things besides that. There is the Intelligence Department. His business is to look over the whole field where military operations might take place—the whole country.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What will the rank of this officer be ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He will not necessarily be of very high rank—a Major, possibly Lieutenant-Colonel. I think the imperial officer to whom the place was offered had the rank of Major.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why did Col. Denny retire ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. His time was up in April and he was offered a position in the Imperial Service which he would have lost had he remained here. He, therefore, requested to be allowed to go and his request was granted.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It was on his own motion he retired ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Entirely.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not a military man but belong to the larger proportion of laymen. I understand from the newspapers that we are now to have a military council. That, I suppose, eliminating the minister, will be the highest authority in the administration of the Militia Department. Will the hon. member give us briefly the constitution of that council ? I do not quite see what this training master has to do.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I regret that I am not really in a position to make as clear a statement as I would like to make on this point. I do not think I can do better than read from the regulations we have just passed and which give the scope of the new proposals, copied very largely from what is being done in England. It will be found in the King's Regulations and Orders for the Militia of Canada, 1904, page 205, Appendix A.:

Extract from a report of the Committee of Privy Council approved by the Governor General, 17th November, 1904, as amended by Order in Council, 17th December, 1904.

On a report dated 15th November, 1904, from the Minister of Militia and Defence, submitting that by the Militia Act, 1904, section 7, it is enacted as follows :—

The Governor in Council may appoint a militia council to advise the minister on all matters relating to the militia which are referred to the council by the minister. The composition, procedure and powers of the council shall be as prescribed.

The minister submits that it is expedient that a militia council be appointed accordingly, and recommends that it be constituted under the title of the militia council and that it be composed of the following members :—

Pres.—The Minister of Militia and Defence.

First Military member—the chief of the general staff.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is he ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. General Lake. Second military member, the Adjutant General ; he is Colonel Vidal. Third military member, the Quartermaster General ; he is Colonel Macdonald. Fourth Military member, the Master General of the Ordnance ; he is Colonel Cotton. Civil member, the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence. Finance member, the Accountant of the Department of Militia and Defence, with a secretary to be nominated by the Minister of Militia and Defence from among the clerical staff of this department. Mr. Jarvis has been made secretary.

Mr. FOWLER. What position does Lord Aylmer hold ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He is Inspector General.

Mr. FOWLER. And not on this staff ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Is he not a member of the council ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No. Those whose names I have given form the council.

The minister further recommends as regards its procedure.

1. That the militia council shall meet once a fortnight or oftener, at his direction, for the transaction of business.

2. That a full, but not necessary verbatim, account of the proceedings of the council shall be kept by the secretary and printed for record, together with a schedule of the decisions arrived at.

3. That all such decisions shall be recorded as those of 'The Minister in Militia Council.'

4. That the business brought before the council may be any question which the minister may desire to refer for the advice of his council, and, in addition, any matter upon which the member charged with the administration of such matter may wish to obtain the opinion of the council, and the decision of the minister.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the hon. minister give a case in explanation of that ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The work of the department is divided up, as my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will see when I read the duties of the different officers of the council. This section means that a member of the Council, wishing advice on a matter in his particular branch, may bring that matter before the Council. As a matter of fact, I may say, all matters of any importance at all are brought before the Council.

5. That in the absence of the minister the deputy minister shall preside, but that, in that case, no decision affecting questions of general policy shall be carried into effect until the minister has signified his assent.

6. That any member who may dissent from the decision taken shall be at liberty to have his dissent recorded on the proceedings.

7. That the minister be authorized to make such further rules, regulating the procedure as he may deem expedient.

Mr. FOSTER. Have any rules been made ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There have been some, which I shall be glad to bring down.

The minister further recommends as regards the powers of the militia council, that the several members thereof be responsible to him for the proper administration of their several branches, and that they be charged with the following duties :—

CHIEF OF THE GENERAL STAFF.

The chief of the general staff, as first military member, shall be charged with :

1. Advice on questions of general military policy.

2. The organization of military forces for active service.

3. Military defence of the Dominion.

4. The collection of intelligence.

5. Training of the military forces and their employment when on active service.

6. Education of staff officers.

7. Telegraphs and signalling.

8. Selection and administration of the general staff in the field.

9. Preparation, jointly with the finance member, of estimates for the above services.

ADJUTANT-GENERAL.

The adjutant-general, as second military member, shall be charged with :

1. Raising and peace organization of military forces.

2. Maintenance of the establishments and officers and men.

3. Distribution of units to stations and orders for the mobilization of units.

4. Questions relating to the personal services of officers and men.

Mr. FOSTER. 'Personal service,' what does that mean ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In the event of an officer distinguishing himself in any way, or having a right to special consideration, the matter would come under the charge of the Adjutant General.

Mr. FOSTER. Or, if an officer had committed any fault, I suppose ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Precisely.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why is the word 'personal' used ? An officer has his personal individuality as well as his military individuality. The Adjutant General has nothing to do with an officer of the permanent force or the headquarters staff, in his personal capacity, except when he is on service.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It only refers to his service. The word 'service' is used.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It could not mean personal conduct.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. His conduct as an officer.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why not say that?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am not sure that it would be an improvement on this wording. However, perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) will agree that it is better that I should proceed with the reading, in order that this may go upon 'Hansard' in as connected a form as possible. We can criticise it later. Of course, if hon. members prefer to criticise it now, the matter rests with them.

5. Appointment, promotion and retirement of officers.

6. Honours and rewards.

7. Promulgation of orders to the militia.

8. Education of officers, warrant officers, non-commissioned officers and men.

9. Discipline and interior economy.

10. Ceremonial.

11. Administrative arrangements connected with military training and education, Royal Military College.

12. Selection and administration of adjutant-general's staff.

13. Preparation of militia list.

14. Medical and sanitary questions.

15. Preparation, jointly with the finance member, of estimates for the above services.

QUARTERMASTER-GENERAL.

The quartermaster-general, as third military member, shall be charged with :

1. The organization and training of all transports, remounts, supply and barrack services.
2. Settling the reserves of food, clothing, equipment, general stores and material to be held in depots, garrisons or mobilization stores, and the scales of such articles to be in possession of the troops.
3. Holding and issuing all military stores.
4. Administration of the transport, remounts, railway, supply, barrack, ordinance and veterinary services.
5. Compensation for injuries to men, animals or material.
6. Selection of officers for employment in the above services.
7. Administration of the ordinance store corps.
8. Arrangements for postal services.
9. Advising and assisting the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence in making arrangements for contracts for the above services.
10. Preparation, jointly with the finance member, of estimates for the above services.

MASTER-GENERAL OF THE ORDNANCE.

The master-general of the ordnance, as fourth military member, shall be charged with:

1. The armament of the forces, including mines, electric lights and all accessories.
2. Sites, designs and armaments for the permanent defences.
3. Settling scales of reserves of arms and ammunition of all kinds.
4. Patterns, provision and inspection of guns, small arms, ammunition and artillery and engineer technical stores and vehicles.
5. Inspection of the process of manufacture in the ordnance factories and control of ordnance workshops.
6. Instruction and maintenance of fortifications, artillery and rifle ranges. Preparation of general plans for all military buildings.
7. Maintenance of barracks and military buildings and lands in military occupation.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister build these buildings, or is that work in charge of the Department of Public Works ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The relative positions of the Department of Public Works and the Department of Militia are not changed in any way. Our work is limited to repairs and to the purely military structures.

Mr. FOSTER. Is he recognized by the Public Works as an officer of the Public Works Department, who had the duty of making plans for military buildings ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Then he only has advisory power ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is all.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Suppose a subordinate officer should submit plans of a building, would the Public Works construct them as the Minister of Militia wished ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We ascertain what the requirements are, and submit to the Department of Public Works a statement of our requirements. They make a plan and return that plan to us ; if we have any criticism to make we make the criticism and return the plan to the Public Works. There are frequent conferences between the Engineer in charge of this work in the Militia Department and the Architect in the Public Works Department.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you no architect in the Militia Department ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We have now in the Engineering Branch.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Do I understand the minister to say that this ordnance officer has control of the manufacture of small arms ? For instance, would he have supervision of the ammunition at present being manufactured in Quebec, and of the Ross rifle, and that sort of thing ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He would control the inspection. He has the right to go into these factories at any moment and see what is going on, to have a report of the work that is being done there, to see it himself, and to have samples of the ammunition which is being manufactured. So far as rifles are concerned, the inspection of small arms will be directly under his control.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. In the event of any defect being discovered in the small arms and ammunition, or in the rifle itself, with whom would the rectification of this fault lie ? Would he look after that himself, or would it be submitted to the council or a body of experts ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I should think it would be submitted to the Council. But the Master of Ordnance is primarily responsible for these things being properly done. He is responsible for the inspection, there is no question about that. We are now considering a board of inspection, but that has not been done yet.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In this connection I might suggest to the minister—I have no right to make a motion to this effect—but there has been from time to time, as he well knows, very grave questions arising as to whether this officer was acting within his authority. For instance, I claim that Colonel Gregory has not been dismissed from the service, although his name has been struck off the list. He is illegally dismissed, and I intend to bring up that question before the end of the session. Now I was hoping that the minister would have brought down an estimate this year for a judge advocate general. He has in his department an officer admirably qualified for that position, I mean Colonel Smith ; and in case he would not take the position, I believe it is possible to find another officer in Canada of great legal ability and broad training who would take that position. Al-

though the department has not lost a great deal in lawsuits they might have lost a great deal if persons who have a right to complain against the action of officers had followed up their complaints. I hope the minister will have a judge advocate general appointed.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is a great deal of force in what my hon. friend says, and that proposition is now under consideration by the Council, and before the end of the session the House may be asked to vote the sum necessary. I will now continue with the enumeration of the duties of the Master General of the Ordnance, the fourth military member of the board, so far as we have worked them out:

8. Administration of the engineer staff employed in the above works.
9. Personnel of the technical inspection staff.
10. Technical instruction at artillery and engineer schools and courses.
11. Technical artillery and engineer questions.
12. Preparation, jointly with the finance member, of estimates for the above services.
13. Advising and assisting the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence in making contracts for guns, ammunition and works constructed under his control.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I did not quite understand the minister in answer to my question as to who would be responsible in case of any defect being found in the small arms and ammunition.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Master General of Ordnance.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Would he have a staff of experts to decide whether they were effective?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Perhaps he would not be able to decide himself, although he is a man of technical knowledge in such matters, and one of the best qualified officers we have in Canada. But he would have the assistance of men technically qualified. For instance, at Quebec he would have in his employ a chemist of first rate capacity, whose services would be required to test the character of the cordite and a number of things that are used in the manufacture of the cartridge. But in any case when there is a complaint of the inferior character of the ammunition, it is always made to the minister, who would at once bring the matter to the attention of the Militia Council and of the officers specially charged with that duty.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I ask these question because at one of the rifle ranges last season there was a suspicion that the ammunition was not what it should have been, whether through defect in the manufacture or not, I cannot say. It is a very important matter upon which lives of men may depend. It is a question whether the Master General of Ordnance is able to supervise thoroughly himself, without the aid of qualified experts, the manufacture of ammunition and of the new rifle which I believe is about to be adopted.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Master General of Ordnance will have the assistance of the best technical knowledge that we can provide, and if it is not to be had here we will send away and get it. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has brought the question up and I will be pleased to hear from him in detail privately, if he likes, or he may write me a letter in reference to the particular occasions on which this failure in the ammunition was found to exist. I am told that the same trouble occurs in England. It is absolutely impossible to have the ammunition uniformly and always good. I am also told that our percentage of imperfections is not greater than it is in England.

Mr. FOSTER. It is all tested before it is issued, is it not?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, samples are tested. It cannot all be tested, of course. You cannot test it till you use it, but a certain percentage of the cartridges that are made every day are tested.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Would it be in order to ask the hon. minister if the department had any adverse reports in regard to the Ross rifle?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, I am not aware of any adverse reports. There has been some question as to the sight but it has been changed and improved.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Was there not some imperfection in regard to the breach?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not that I am aware of. Of course I am only speaking of my own personal knowledge. I have now come to the deputy minister.

The Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence, as civil member, shall be charged with:
1. The interior economy of the Militia Department.
2. The administration of non-effective votes.
3. Parliamentary business and reports to council.
4. Formal communication to other departments of state.
5. The preparation of papers for submission to the militia council, of official reports of its proceedings, and record of the decisions taken.
6. The administration of contracts, in consultation, with the branches specially concerned.
7. Arrangements for the construction of new barracks and other buildings.

In the case of new barracks to be constructed for instance at Montreal, the deputy minister would carry out the business part of it. The work is really done by the Department of Public Works, but the deputy head of the department would carry

out any business negotiations in reference to the construction of these barracks.

8. The custody of militia lands not in military occupation and purchase of land for military purposes.

9. Such other business as the minister may allot to him.

In the absence of the Minister of Militia, he will act for him in all matter of ordinary business.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. Minister of Agriculture will not act any more?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. You will have to ask him.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. The hon. Minister of Militia and Defence says that the deputy minister has charge of the purchase and selection of lands for military purposes including the purchase of sites for drill sheds. I will cite a little case that happened in my district. We were very anxious to have a new drill shed at Sherbrooke to replace the old one which existed in the vicinity of the parade ground, the only available place for drill purposes in the city, and several deputations waited upon the Minister of Militia and Defence, or his predecessor, in respect to the purchase of a site adjoining this parade ground. Nothing was done until finally an officer landed in Sherbrooke one day, who, in company with a noted publican who was a warm supporter of the government, drove about the city and on his advice purchased a tract of land which was far distant from this parade ground and which was not suitable for a drill shed. It was a site which the militia did not want and about which they were not consulted at all; in fact, the officer came down and in connection with this hotel keeper purchased this piece of land for the purpose of a drill shed. It was not until shortly before he was leaving on the afternoon train that he had the courtesy to call on the senior officer of that town and tell him what he was down there for. In spite of all the representations which have been made to the department, they have still persisted in retaining this land as the proposed site for the new drill shed. As the hon. minister knows several deputations have waited upon him and not on him alone but on the hon. Minister of Agriculture as well. I think I was a member of one of these deputations, and while I do not mean to say that the hon. Minister of Agriculture would entirely usurp the functions of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, I think that on that occasion he had everything to say to us. He went so far as to tell us that if this drill shed site did not suit us we could do what we liked about it, in fact if the proposed site did not suit our regiment it would do for another which might be formed. I think that matters in connection with the selection of a site for a drill shed should not be left entirely with the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence or with any one man. If you have an engineer, or an architect, or anybody who is competent and knows how to select sites of that kind he is the man who should be entrusted with the performance of that duty, but at the same time I think he should be instructed to consult with the officers in the district when buildings of this sort are to be erected. I think that the system of leaving the selection of a site of that kind entirely in the hands of one man is open to serious objection.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It does not follow because there has been this division of work that the particular things placed under particular officers are solely under the control of those officers. Not at all. They all come under the purview of the Militia Council, under the minister and finally under the Governor in Council. As far as the particular case which my hon. friend refers to is concerned, if he were not a young member of the House, I would say that he was rather out of order in bringing it in here at this moment. It is hardly apropos because the deputy minister, as a matter of fact, is not the officer who went there. The course pursued is this: An officer of the Headquarters Staff, the Quartermaster General or the Adjutant General—the Quarter-Master General, I think—is sent to the locality where the building is to be constructed and is asked to make a report.

Now an officer is not able to purchase. My hon. friend says that this officer, whoever he was, went down and drove around with some one whom he does not approve of, and that he purchased a piece of land. I do not know what he means by saying that this officer drove around publicly; whether he means to insinuate that it had any effect upon the officer's report or not, but as a matter of fact the officer who went down had no power to purchase; he did not purchase. He made a report to me—there was not a Militia Council then—with regard to certain lands available. I met several deputations of the citizens and officers of Sherbrooke, and after listening very carefully to the mayor of the city and other influential gentlemen, including a gentleman of the name of Col. Worthington, of that city, I came to the conclusion that the site recommended by this officer was a good and satisfactory site, I recommended it to the Governor General in Council, and an order in council was passed authorizing the purchase of this site. I have not the papers here, it is a very inconvenient moment to discuss this matter, but if my hon. friend wishes to discuss it I shall be very glad to bring down the papers later on and to discuss it as fully as may be necessary.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister undertook to read the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington) a lesson, and to intimate that he had violated the rules of the House or the rules of debate in bringing up this particular

matter at this particular time. I wish to say that in my opinion—and I am sure in yours also Mr. Chairman, and yours will have more weight in this house than mine, because of your official position—that the hon. member for Sherbrooke was not at all out of order in bringing up this particular matter at this particular time, because we are discussing the appointment of an officer who would be charged with the particular duty of going about the country and selecting sites when necessary. What more fitting time could the hon. member have chosen in which to bring this up?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I wish to call the attention of the minister to the fact that the deputation, of which my brother, Lt. Col. E. B. Worthington was a member, did not call on him to discuss the drill shed site, but to discuss the camp ground. Whether that question was brought up at that time or not I do not know, but the deputation were certainly not sent in connection with the drill shed on that occasion, but only in connection with the camp ground. As the minister does not understand what the connection was between the officer who visited Sherbrooke to select a drill shed site and this party to whom I refer, I may say that when this officer went to Sherbrooke he must have had some definite object and some instructions. What were his instructions? To whom was he to report? Was he to go around and pick out the first available site he saw or was he to go to some one who had some pull and ask for his advice as to where he should locate a drill shed? It seems to me he must have gone there with the intention of going directly to this man, because I understand that he was met at the station and spent the day with him and reported to nobody in Sherbrooke. Certainly it would have been an act of courtesy not only on the part of the visiting officer, but on the part of the department too if that officer had seen the military officers in charge of that locality.

Mr. FOSTER. Whilst this question is fresh would the minister take into consideration one thing which if carried out would, in my opinion, be a most excellent thing for his department. The case cited by the hon. member for Sherbrooke illustrates it exactly. If any body of men in a town should be able to form a good opinion as to where a drill shed site should be it would be the men who have interest enough in military matters to form a company and carry on drill at great expense and with great trouble. If the minister would make this selecting of drill shed sites, once and for all, entirely non-partisan, and have in view simply what is best for the militia of that district, putting out of view entirely what this man or that man who may be interested because he has something to sell would like to have done for his own personal or political advantage, and to have in view simply the suitability and fitness of a site he would do a good thing for the militia, for his own department and for himself as an administrator in that department. I have heard of so many cases of wrong selection that have taken place, not only with respect to military sites, but also with respect to post offices, and public building sites, that I think we are surely old enough, wise enough and strong enough to select these sites simply because of adaptability and suitability for the purpose for which they are intended. I am quite sure that the Deputy Minister of Militia, if he were left to himself, would prefer this. A deputy has no political leanings. He has no business to permit the least iota of a tinge of partisanship or political bias to influence his discharge of the duties of his office. If any political considerations are to be regarded that is the duty of the minister and not of the deputy minister, and you have the most useful deputy minister when you leave him entirely free from the trammel of partisanship or political bias. I am quite sure that if the Deputy Minister of Militia were left free to exercise his judgment he would make these selections perfectly well, honestly and fairly. Let us eliminate a little of this small partisanship and have these sites selected on the ground of suitability for the prupose.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I endorse every word that my hon. friend has said. While I am not going to admit—I do not think it would be correct to make an admission—that in this particular case any improper act is done.

Mr. FOSTER. We do not want any admissions.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Still I believe in the selection of sites for public buildings perhaps, both under former administrations and under this administration. too much attention has been paid to political influences. I think that the establishment of the Militia Council will enable the minister, who is genuinely anxious to act in the interest of the public, to act independently and properly and fairly. One of my objects in desiring the establishment of this Council was to be relieved, as far as possible, of any influence, political, social or otherwise, which might be used against the public interest in coming to a determination as to the selection of sites or otherwise. I am glad to know that my hon. friend takes the view he does and I hope he will stand by me in the independent carrying out of this idea.

Mr. FOSTER. It will be a great wrench to stand by you, but I will do it on this, sure.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. When these military properties are taken over by the department, under the control of which of these officers will they come?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Quarter Master General.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Then, why not make him the responsible officer for selecting the sites?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He has been. Because a certain duty has been allotted to a certain officer as being more properly within his scope, it does not follow that he has absolute control. As a matter of fact, all these things come before the Council, and in the future no selection of a drill site or a rifle range site will be made without the question being submitted to the Council.

Mr. OSLER. If I am in order in referring to the grounds which have been allotted to the Ross Rifle Company, I would like to state that about the end of November last, I was in Quebec with a number of visitors who were strangers to the place. We walked out to the Plains of Abraham, and as we did so the first thing that attracted our attention, and that was in evidence more than anything else, was an immense water tank erected on the top of one of the old Martello towers, the legs being driven through the tower, and the water tank standing sixty or seventy feet in the air, the one hideous thing on the landscape. If there was no sentiment about the place, it would be ugly enough; but the rifle buildings themselves are about as ugly as they can be, and a little further on this hideous water tower. It looks as if there were some sort of plan to destroy all the beauty and interest in the Plains of Abraham or the approach to them. I may say that the gentlemen who were with me, some of them on their first visit to Quebec, came away with the feeling that their visit had been spoiled because of the absolute want of appreciation by the people of Canada of the place and its suroundings. Surely it is not necessary to have such a hideous eye-sore erected there to ruffle the feelings of everybody who goes to look at that historic place.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am very sorry that my hon. friend's aesthetic taste and poetic feelings and those of his friends have been shocked in this rude manner. I have not seen the water tank, so far as I remember, but it is true that permission was given to Sir Charles Ross to place a tank in that Martello tower in order to enable him to protect his factory against fire. I did not understand that the structure was to be one so hideous and disagreeable in appearance, or I certainly should have insisted on some precaution being taken against that. I understood that it would not be visible from the outside at all.

Mr. OSLER. Why, the legs are through the roof of the tower, and there is an erection sixty or seventy feet high, the ugliest possible mercantile tank put on top of it. If that does not destroy the view, you might just as well suggest that a tank should be put on the top of St. Paul's Cathedral or the Tower of London, and not do damage to the surroundings. This is sentiment, it is true, but sentiment surely has something to do with the things of this world; and I can tell the minister that, little sentiment as he appears to have, if he goes down to Quebec and looks at that object, he will certainly order it to be taken down. Not a visitor will go to the Plains of Abraham who will not curse the man who put it up. It is so hideous and such an eyesore that I wonder that the citizens of Quebec have not torn it down.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We felt that it was a very desirable thing to have an industry such as that established by the Ross Company.

Mr. OSLER. I agree with that, but I do not think it should be put there.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. And even if a Martello tower has been a little disfigured, I think we shall have to try to put up with it. But as my hon. friend has referred to the matter, I will see if we cannot induce the Ross Company to make some changes. They might perhaps put the legs out of sight. Now, I want to finish reading these regulations :

The accountant of the Department of Militia and Defence, as finance member, shall be charged with :—

1. The consideration and compilation in concert with the various branches concerned, of the annual estimates for militia services.

2. The review of contracts and administration of the Militia Accountant's Branches.

3. General consideration of the cost of the militia.

4. Financial advice to the several branches of the department.

5. Audit of military accounts.

The minister further recommends that the distribution of duties of the officers of the headquarter's staff, approved by the Governor General in Council on the 29th October, 1903, be cancelled.

That is, briefly, the construction of the militia council. I may say that there is a regulation describing in detail the duties of these officers. I am sorry that I have not that here, but I will lay it on the table of the House at the earliest possible moment. I am sure it will give in concise language a better idea of the different duties than I can. I think I have read enough to show that we have framed a very careful constitution for this Militia Council and have included therein all the important branches necessary in the public interest for the carrying out of an efficient militia service.

Mr. FOSTER. You have these four military heads in the council and two civilian heads. You say that each one advises with the accountant in making up the estimates for the sums necessary to carry out the work assigned to him. How do you work out that system ? Will you have a separate staff under each one of these heads ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is what has been done.

Mr. FOSTER. So that, for instance, your General Master of Ordnance will have under him a special staff to carry out his work ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Exactly.

Mr. FOSTER. What staff has the deputy minister ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He is the permanent head of the civil branch, and has his clerical staff as before.

Mr. FOSTER. Then you will need quite an addition to your working force ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, not a very large addition. In fact, on the civil side there is no addition. On the military side there will be some additions, but not many, because we have been able to change around the officers in such a way that no very serious addition will result. The addition amounts to $8,200 for three or four officers.

Mr. FOSTER. Take the four military heads, will each one of those carry out what is assigned to him without having reference to any other head, or to the council as a consultative body ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He must go before the Council with any important question. I think that that is embodied in the regulations. It is of the first importance that the Minister in Council should have the advantage of hearing the discussions with reference to the different questions about which he may not be informed, and upon which it is absolutely necessary he should be informed. I may say, for the information of my hon. friend, that agenda are prepared a week or two ahead for the information of the Council, and are sent to every member of the Council, so that every one will know what is going to be considered at the next meeting.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. So that, practically, the minister, in consulting these officers, is merely carrying out what he formerly did individually ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. It is the one mode of communicating between these officers and the minister ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Precisely.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Where does the Director General of the Medical Service come in ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Under the Adjutant General.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. This is one of the most important branches of the service. The Director General of Medical Services should certainly be a member of that council. The health of the troops and the sanitation of military camps are of such importance that it seems only reasonable the Sergeant General or Director General of Medical Services should be a member of that council.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Council calls before it the directors of the different branches. Whenever an important question comes up on which the Council is not fully informed, those officers come before it, or they may request to be heard before it, and their request is always granted.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Apart from that, the medical officer is entitled to a seat in that council. Proper attention is not shown to medical officers. They should have as high rank as any other except the Adjutant General.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. While I do not yield to my hon. friend in my respect for the importance of the profession to which both he and I belong, still we modelled our system on the British, and in the British Army Council there is no medical officer.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. The British Army Council is open to improvement.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We could not put them all on. We made the best selection we could, and I think the medical service will not suffer.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have listened very patiently to the minister explaining the duties of the board. He wound up by defining the accountant's duty, and said he thought every precaution was taken to guard the public interest. I am not a military man, and am not looking at this matter from a military standpoint at all, but with the eye of a business man, and I do not see in the constitution of this board any provision for the proper laying out of the people's money in purchasing supplies. Let me just draw to the attention of the hon. minister certain items in the Auditor General's Report. Take page V—25, purchased for the Montreal harbour improvements below St. Maurice current, Portland cement, 600 barrels at $1.80. Every one who knows anything about cement knows that Portland cement is the best and most expensive we can get. Then turn up page Q—61. and you will find that the purchasing officer of the Minister of Militia, whoever he may have been, went to Mr. J. B. Jinchereau and bought 19 barrels of cement for improvements in the city of Quebec at $3 and 86 barrels at $2.50

Then he went to Mr. Larose and bought 5 barrels at $3 and 52 barrels at $2.50. Then he went to Mr. Louis Larose and bought 17 barrels at $3 and 86 barrels at $2.50. From Mr. Leon Magnan he purchased 6 barrels at $3 and 98½ barrels at $2.50. Then he went to Mr. Parent and purchased 75 barrels at $2.50 and 20 barrels at $3. From

another Mr. Parent, Pierre Parent, he purchased 35 barrels at $2.50 and 15 barrels at $3. From Mr. Renaud he bought 141 barrels at $2.50. In all, he bought 98 barrels at $3, 658 barrels at $2.50, and 237 barrels at $2.25. If he had bought all this at the rate which it could be bought in Montreal, $1.80, he would have saved the public not less than $702.05 on these few barrels of cement alone. I have brought these things to the attention of the government year after year, and still they send around in this manner buying these things and paying two prices. The cement for sale in Montreal at $1.80 was Portland cement, which as everybody knows, is the best brand manufactured. There is nothing to show what kind this other was—it may have been mere common cement and not worth half the price. Portland cement is imported and it ought to be landed at Quebec or Halifax as cheap or cheaper than at Montreal. I hope the minister, will arrange to have the supplies for the Militia Department bought under conditions of public competition, so that the public may be able to get the goods at bottom prices. This board should have a purchasing department, and let the board itself decide how these supplies should be bought in the best interests of the country. At page 67 the hon. minister will find that a bill as paid to Mr. N. E. Keefer of $3,183.56. Among the items is one for repairing roof of armouries, painting walls, &c., labourers 146 days at $3.50, and 53½ days at $3.25. and masons and slaters are paid at 45 cents an hour. It seems to me that $3.50 is a very big price for labouring men in Halifax.

Mr. FOSTER. Halifax came high all the way through—the minister knows that.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then I find at page Q-66, they charge for 32 cedar posts at $1 a piece. Unless they are carved or something of that kind I cannot understand how they cost so much. This was at Annapolis, Nova Scotia. If there were the ordinary posts that we buy at 20 cents a piece in Ontario, I do not see why they should cost so much at Annapolis. I hope the minister will take down these figures and give us an explanation of them.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. As to the cedar posts I have paid $1 a piece for an extra quality of post myself—a post that would square 7 inches. I shall be glad to make inquiry into the matters to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) has called attention. As to the cement, I fancy the price varies with the time and place and also with the quantity purchased. The Auditor General must have passed this account, and I do not imagine that he would have passed it if there had been anything seriously wrong. However, as to the general question which these items are used to illustrate, I agree with the hon. gentleman that it would be a proper matter for discussion by the Militia Council. As a matter of fact, I have already mentioned the matter and it is being considered by the Council with a view to adopting a plan under which the best results in the public interest may be attained in the purchase of supplies. These purchases cannot be always made by tender, but, so far as that can be done, it ought to be done. I have brought the matter before the council, and I hope that before the session is over I shall be able to submit the plan they have adopted.

Mr. BERGERON. A few moments ago we were talking about the Plains of Abraham. Will the minister please say how many acres there are in the government's purchase, what portion of it has been leased to certain parties for a factory site and whether the rumours are true that the government intend to dispose of the whole property ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not think there is any truth in the rumour that the government intend to dispose of the property. I have never heard it even proposed. I am not able to give the size of this property, but I will ascertain it. The quantity leased to the Ross Company is not large—in fact not large enough; for they are asking for more.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it part of the Plains?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is within a few acres of the Citadel, between the Martello towers which, as the hon. gentleman is aware, are on the top of what we call Perrault's Hill, the highest point west of the city, and the citadel. We call it the Old Cove Fields.

Mr. BERGERON. What are the dimensions of the Plains ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I believe it has been proven that what we have hitherto considered the Plains of Abraham is not the Plains of Abraham at all. It is a mile away from the Plains of Abraham. If the hon. gentleman is acquainted with the locality, it is on the other side of the road from the parliament buildings, behind a block of houses, about two acres to the west on the other side of St. Louis Street.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is that Martello tower?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The Martello tower is to the south, that is the one immediately over the cliff.

Mr. FOSTER. There was a disposition to laugh at my hon. friend from Toronto when he spoke about that, but I do not think it is a laughing matter at all. There are impressions that our own people get, and impressions that visitors get, that have a great influence upon our future. I think we ought to have some regard for aesthetics, and keep what we have got in

that line and treasure it particularly. Take one of those old historic landmarks about which so much has been written,and around which so many memories cluster; we find our own people visit them with the idea of history in their minds, prizing the old landmarks, and people come there from abroad with the same idea, but when they come into the actual presence of one of them they see a great big pair of legs protruding with a tank set up on top. It is an unsightly thing, and ought not to have been allowed. The factory's water tank should go somewhere else, and leave the Martello tower as one of the few landmarks we have in this country, a thing of beauty and a joy forever.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the minister please explain the relationship between the directors of the various departments and these members of the council.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Directors are assistants of the military members, they are in charge of the important subdivisions of the work of the different branches I have read. Some of the directors will have two or three subheads and some only one. For instance, in the department of the Master General of Ordnance we have engineering as one of the important branches of his department. The Director of Engineering is under him and the Director of Engineering again has officers under him. Then artillery is naturally one of the important branches of the duties of the Master General of Ordnance and under him also we have a Director of Artillery, an officer who has been in Canada for some time. That will fairly illustrate perhaps, what the duties of the directors are. Under the Quartermaster General we have the army service corps and the Director of Supplies. We have also a Director of Clothing and Equipment.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is the Quartermaster General not a director ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Quartermaster General is a member of the Council.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Who is the Quartermaster General ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Colonel Macdonald, he is the third military member.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. What are the duties of the Inspector General? Is he responsible to the Council or to the Minister? I understand he has sole control of the troops, subject to the minister.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will endeavour to explain it to my hon. friend. I would prefer to read the duties; as a matter of fact the duties have been prescribed and published but I have not got them under my hand. But this is the business of the Inspector General : After the general plans with reference to the control of the militia have been decided on they shall be submitted to the Inspector General, and his duty will be to carry them out, though he may act independently in accordance with his own notions. He shall make an independent inspection of all branches of the militia with reference to every one of these matters about which I have read, and to see whether the policy decided upon by the Council is being carried out. He will report to the minister and to the Militia Council with reference to what he finds. But he is absolutely free and untrammeled in every respect, except that there is placed in his hands a general scheme that has been decided upon by the Council with reference to these important matters. He has to inspect the militia and see whether the scheme is being carried out.

Mr. BERGERON. I want to ask whether there is any rule prescribing what uniform shall be worn by officers in the militia. I have sometimes had the honour to associate with some officers in Montreal, and I observed that some of them were in khaki uniform and others in the ordinary uniform of their corps. It is not a very nice sight to see them in different uniforms. Either they should all be in khaki or in the ordinary uniform. I would like to know whether an order has been given that all the Canadian militia should be dressed in khaki.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There are dress regulations which are promulgated from time to time, and occasionally changed, but I think there is a very distinct rule as to the kind of mess dress which is to be worn on occasions such as the hon. gentleman refers to, public dinners or private dinners. But there are exceptions in favour of the service dress. This is a pretty serious matter. In the rural corps——

Mr. BERGERON. I am speaking of Montreal.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In the city of Montreal, I think the rule is that mess dress should be worn, although there is an exception in favour of the service dress which is also permitted to be worn. In the country battalions it would be a very great hardship to insist upon the mess dress.

Mr. BERGERON. Do I understand that the officers have to pay for this uniform out of their own pockets ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. BERGERON. For an outsider it is a peculiar sight. It seems to me that they should all wear the same uniforms. Men of the same regiment are not dressed alike, and I do not think it is proper.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I admit that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The understanding is that an officer at a function should either go in the proper uniform of his corps—that is, dress uniform—or, if it is a superior function, he should go in evening dress.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I think one of the reasons for this mixture of uniforms to which my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) refers is due to the fact that he may have seen officers of the regular service in company with those of a corps of guides dressed in khaki.

Mr. BERGERON. I have seen officers of the 65th battalion, some dressed in khaki and some dressed in their ordinary uniforms. I have also seen some of the high officials there, some dressed in khaki and some in ordinary uniform.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Staff officers ?

Mr. BERGERON. Staff officers ; and the result is that one who is not very well posted is at a loss to know what their rank is.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Well, I think that is undesirable.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. At the same time, I would be sorry to see an officer obliged to go to the cost of providing himself with mess uniform. A young officer, a young chap with a small salary, perhaps not more than enough to keep him, should not be obliged to go to the expense of purchasing an expensive mess uniform. He should go to a function in evening dress.

Mr. BERGERON. That would be all right if they were all on the same footing.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. When a regimental function takes place, and the officer in command of the regiment has not all his officers properly uniformed, the custom is for them to wear undress uniforms, so that all will be alike.

Mr. BERGERON. If that were the rule, it would put an end to any difficulty in regard to the matter.

Military survey, $20,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This is reduced from last year. In this connection, I would like to ask the hon. minister who does the chartography for the Department of Militia?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Mr. Anderson is one of them.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I mean the map printing. The Department of Militia and Defence wants maps, the Department of Public Works wants maps, and each of the departments requires maps. There is no uniform system in the whole business. Would it not be a good plan for the Militia Department, or the Interior Department, whichever would have the better right to do so, to establish a map department and have all the maps of the country constructed at the one place ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think so. I think it would be probably the most convenient if that work were done under the Surveyor General, and I have suggested to my hon. colleague, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), that we should take the matter up some time, form a sub-committee of council and see what can be done. He agrees with me. But, in the meantime, this money is not being wasted. This is special work that is absolutely required by the Militia Department.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I understand it, but I do not think the committee understands what it means. Will the hon. minister explain to the committee how this money is expended ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is for a topographical survey of the country along the frontier and at various parts. It is not desirable, perhaps, to describe exactly where the work is done.

Mr. FOSTER. Does this work proceed in consecutive order, so as to cover the whole ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes. We began it in connection with the Royal Military College. We utilized some of the professors there; and the young men there, in connection with their education, find it a great advantage to them to be given a certain amount of work to do in their vacation. We have, of course, had to pay them. Since the establishment of the Intelligence Branch here the work has become more important. We have really taken it over here and have appointed several officers, mostly Royal Military College graduates, to go on with the work under the direction of the Director of Military Intelligence.

Mr. FOSTER. When once done it is really completed ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Absolutely.

Mr. FOSTER. It stands good for all time ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. For all time. Every road, every hill, every building is charted, and new buildings can be added.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes ; but the topographical part of it ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes. The closing of a road or the opening of a new road would be placed on record, but the work is performed for all time.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is there any object in reducing the grant ? I would like to see that part of the work kept right straight to the line.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We had to purchase certain instruments last year which we do not have to purchase over again, and that is the reason for the reduction.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. minister will not be able to get through much more to-night.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I thought possibly we might take some of these items in view of the arrangement. We have a rule that on an item to be agreed upon, and which I will suggest shall be the large item of $1,300,000, the whole question of the militia from beginning to end shall be absolutely open for discussion.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; the general question.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The general question, and any details that any hon. gentleman may wish to speak of. We might dispose of a few more items.

Mr. FOSTER. We will go on with the 'annual drill.'

Annual drill, $600,000.

Mr. FOSTER. This is exactly the same sum as was voted last year?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is it the intention that any part of this sum shall be expended for drill at the central camp, and will the hon. minister explain the central camp idea, or will that come up under another item?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, I think it would perhaps be better to leave that, because it is important.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. All right.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The item is the same as last year.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And for the same purpose?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Have you raised the pay of the force?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the pay of the force now?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The pay has been raised from fifty cents to a dollar a day. For the first year it is fifty cents plus twenty cents, for the second year seventy-five cents plus fifteen cents, making eighty-five cents, and for the third year a dollar. We do not treat it as pay. The pay is really fifty cents, but proficiency and good conduct pay is given to every man who behaves himself well in camp, and this system has worked admirably. I am told that last year's camps were the best camps ever held.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the length of drill?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Twelve days.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that include going and coming?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. So that the actual drill—

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN—is about ten or eleven days according to the distance. Some corps get in in part of a day and others take a full day.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not very long.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, it is probably not long enough.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. In connection with the establishment of a central camp I would like to ask the minister whether it is the intention to do away with the local camp?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Will the camps be maintained in the same old places, or will new camps be selected this year?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think it is very desirable that the camps should be held in the same places. If we secure good places I think we ought to stick to them. Sometimes it is necessary to change for good reasons, but ordinarily I think we should stick to the same ground.

Mr. FOSTER. How many does this drill?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Including the city corps, something like 40,000.

Mr. FOSTER. This includes the city corps?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. The reason I asked about the camps is that I would think it very desirable, especially where cavalry form the main branch of the service, as for example in the Eastern Townships, where we have the Eastern Townships Cavalry Brigade, to have the drill take place near the local headquarters. For several years back these mounted corps have been entrained at the different headquarters and taken by various trains down to Doucet's Landing, put on the ferry and taken across to Three Rivers, and the cost of transport for these mounted infantry corps is far greater than the cost of their whole term in camp. I think it would be far better to have these cavalry regiments drill in the country to which they belong. In the Eastern Townships we are right on the frontier and it is very essential that these men should know the country which they are expected to defend, know the railroads, and rivers and bridges and for that reason I think it would be far better for them to drill in their own districts. Those who do not live in the immediate vicinity of the camp grounds could march into camp instead of being entrained. No corps there would be far enough away to necessitate entraining in order to get to camp, and a day's march coming in and going out would

be very instructive on account of the route march, and the possible bivouacking and camping and the stops for meals and feed. This is a very essential part of the training. For instance in connection with the Eastern Township Cavalry Brigade, I think it essential that a camp should be held at a central point, say the headquarters of the brigade, Sherbrooke, which is right on the frontier. A number of very important railroads centre there, while there are many railroads within from 12 to 30 miles of that place, all along the frontier, which these men should know and be able to protect in case of actual warfare.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No doubt there is considerable force in what my hon. friend says, but at the same time I would point out to him that in case of active service the cavalry would be serving with infantry and artillery, and it is desirable I think, to bring the different arms of the service together in the camps, so that they may understand in some degree at least the relationship which they bear to each other in active service. As to my hon. friend's statement with reference to the cost of going to Three Rivers, he is altogether at sea in stating that the cost of transportation is greater than the full cost of the camp. It is really nothing of the kind, as I can show him at any time. Three Rivers was selected some time ago, very largely owing to the fact that an outbreak of smallpox had occurred among the Indians at La Prairie, where we had been holding a camp for some years. The Director General of Medical Affairs reported that it was absolutely unsafe, and it meant either having no camp or finding another location. A very favourable location was offered to us at Three Rivers at a low figure; and the city of Three Rivers offered light, water and various inducements, and the camp has been held there for two or three years. Last year we had a camp at Laprairie and one at Three Rivers also. I do not know where the camp will be held this year, but I am sure the Council will give every consideration to the question.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Why were the cavalry drilled last year at Laprairie and the infanty at Three Rivers if it is so essential that the various branches be drilled together ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Does my hon. friend deny that it is essential to have the different branches of the service drilled together ?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. No, I think it is very essential that they should be drilled together, but there is no place at Three Rivers where artillery can be drilled or where you can manoeuvre cavalry.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister has not given definite information with regard to the pay of officers. I am inclined to find fault with the small increase of pay he has given to officers as compared with the increases to non-coms. What is the pay of officers of the ordinary active militia ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There has been very little increase ; I think some slight increase.

Mr. FOSTER. The officers have the glory.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The lieutenant-colonel has a slight increase to $5 a day.

Mr. FOSTER. $5 a day? That is princely.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. A major, $4, a captain adjutant or quartermaster, $3 ; that is an increase; lieutenants, $2 ; that is a decided increase, the old pay being, I think about $1.25. Medical officers are paid according to rank ; veterinary officers, $3 ; paymasters, $3 ; regimental sergeant major, $1.25 ; quartermaster sergeants, $1 ; sergeants, 90 cents ; band masters, $1.25 ; company sergeants, 85 cents ; corporals, 60 cents, bombardiers, 60 cents ; lance corporals, 60 cents ; privates, 50 cents, plus of course the good conduct bonus.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Take a non-com. getting $1.25 or $1.50 with the addition of the good conduct money and it puts him almost up to the second lieutenant.

Mr. FOWLER. He has the glory.

Mr. FOSTER. Do they use military bands amongst the Japanese ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think so.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. They use 'banzai.' They are great fighters.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They evidently pipe it up fairly well.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. At all events I hope the minister will not cut off the bands of any of the corps ; they tried it one year and it was a great mistake. There is nothing like the music.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is right.

Grants to rifle and artillery associations, $60,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is an increase of $10,000 in this vote, in view of the increased interest taken in rifle shooting.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there an increase in the number of rifle clubs?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes. I am not able to give the number, but I will have that information.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like the minister to show the distinction between the civil and the military clubs?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will do that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the minister taken any steps to establish miniature or sub-target ranges?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is being done to some extent.

Dominion Arsenal, $150,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there more than one factory now?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, only one.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it the intention of the minister to establish another?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. How soon?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I hope before very long. I explained last year, and I think something was said about it the year before, that there were some people in this country and in England—they have taken out articles of incorporation since—interested in the establishment of a factory for the manufacture of ammunition ; and a condition will be imposed by the government that in case this is done, they shall manufacture in this country all the explosives necessary to be used for the manufacture of ammunition, both in their factory and in the government factory at Quebec. The matter is taking shape, and I hope before the end of the session to be able to lay on the table further information with reference to it, and possibly a contract.

Mr. FOWLER. Then, do I understand that it would be the intention of the government to abandon the manufacture ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not at all. We want to have more factories for the manufacture of ammunition. Practically the only factory in Canada now is in the government arsenal at Quebec. It is desirable that ammunition should be manufactured at several points, certainly somewhere in the vicinity of Ottawa. I think it is equally desirable that we should manufacture in Canada all the explosives that are used now, in our factory at Quebec, which are at present imported. I would not propose to give a contract to any company for the manufacture of ammunition which would not also undertake to manufacture explosives.

Mr. FOWLER. In my opinion it is inadvisable to hand over the manufacture of ammunition to any private company. I think the ammunition should be manufactured by the government itself.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is not done in England.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not care what is done in England; that is not necessarily a precedent for us. I think the ammunition should be manufactured solely by the government itself, so as to guard against the danger of its being faulty.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am afraid that would be a pretty expensive operation, and I have felt that it would be an advantage to encourage a private company to manufacture ammunition as a sort of check upon our own factory. That is what is done in the United States as well as in England. The government manufactures a part and the trade manufactures a part, and one is a sort of check on the other. The present seems to me a favourable moment for encouraging the manufacture of explosives in this country, when we are about to enter upon the construction of railways, perhaps to a greater extent than ever before, and large quantities of explosives will be required ; and it is a moment when private capital may be induced to go into the venture. But I can assure you that I have had very great difficulty in satisfying private capital that there will be any money in going into the manufacture of explosives for government use only, it would be such a very small quantity.

Mr. FOWLER. It might not be a bad idea to establsh these powder factories in connection with the penitentiaries. In case anything happened, the loss of life would not be so important.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That would be better than manufacturing binder twine.

Mr. FOSTER. When the minister brings down his budget of information, there is some information which I would like, and which probably the country would like as well. I would like to know just about what is the military equipment of Canada to-day —how many drilled militia we have, how many rifles we have for them, what stores of ammunition, what large guns, what fortifications, if any, looking towards the protection of our sea-board cities, we have. That indicates the kind of information I would like to get so far as it can be given without injuring our strategical position. I want to say this, that if we are pretty naked, as I think we are, I think it would not do much harm to confess that we are, and let outsiders see simply our brawny arms, provided we make up our minds to do better things and put ourselves in a stronger position. I think we are living on rather slender resources for the defence of this country, and if our people understood the exact position we are in, you might find a larger number ready to support any measures necessary to be taken for the proper defence and equipment of the country.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am very glad to find my hon. friend taking a greater interest in matters of this kind than perhaps any of us took a few years ago. I might

point out that there is some information which can be given out, but other information with regard to guns and rifles or location of ammunition which I think it undesirable to give. I would suggest that a committee of hon. gentlemen from both sides might meet me or the Council and learn exactly what the conditions are. If my hon. friend who leads the opposition will consider that suggestion I shall be very glad to have a number of gentlemen who take an interest in the matter meet the council and get all the information that can be afforded.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a good idea. You have to get the people to acknowledge that there is a want before you get their support.

Mr. INGRAM. If that suggestion were carried out it would mean that those composing the committee would be bound to secrecy and we could not take any advantage from a conference of that kind. There was a good deal of difference of opinion expressed last year on this point and regarding the publication of the Major General's report. Many military men, including the major general himself, thought that the report should have been submitted to the House in order that the members might know what an officer of the high character and ability of Lord Dundonald considered necessary for the defence of the country. Was any portion of the $110,000 voted for defences at Esquimalt paid the British authorities ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The whole of it was paid to the British authorities. There is an arrangement between the British government and this government with reference to payments for the expense of defending Esquimalt. Under that arrangement we divide the expenditure. The British government has charge of it and employs its own men very largely except during the annual camp once a year, and we reimburse it one half the expense.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood that a year or two ago our share was $35,000. Has it increased?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. A new arrangement was made three or four years ago and laid on the table, under which we pay half the costs.

Mr. INGRAM. This is every dollar that Canada contributes to the defense of the country from an Imperial point of view?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No ; the Canadian government has paid considerable money for the purchase of sites for large guns. We paid $25,000 last year. That was a part of the agreement. We buy all the land necessary for the mounting of the necessary guns for defence.

Mr. INGRAM. Has not some change taken place at Halifax also in the last year?

Sir F. W. BORDEN.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. According to the newspapers changes have taken place, but up to the present this government has received no official notice whatever with reference to Halifax.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Sir William Mulock, House adjourned as 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 2, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Mr. GEO. D. GRANT moved :

That in accord with the recommendation contained in the report of the Select Committee on Standing Orders, the time for receiving petitions for Private Bills and also the time for presenting Private Bills be extended to Thursday, February 23rd, and Thursday, March 9th, respectively.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE. So as to elicit an expression of opinion from the right hon. the First Minister, I would point out that the rule providing that petitions for Private Bills shall be presented within a certain time was intended to facilitate the work of the session. If that time be too short, we should amend the rule and give a longer time, but the judgment of the House was that the time limit provided was sufficient. This rule, however, seems to be more honoured in the breach than in the observance, and last session I drew attention to that fact on several occasions. I pointed out that we might as well have no rule as one which we did not follow, and I think the House should either decide to amend the rule or insist on its being observed.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). It is quite true that my hon. friend from Grey has more than once called the attention of the House, and my own in particular, to the fact that the rule in question has been systematically violated. But I do not think that my hon. friend himself ever objected to this first request, which is invariably made, to have the rule extended. Since I have been in parliament it has been the constant practice to allow one extension at least ; but of late years this permission has been extended unduly, and last session we had the Committee on Standing Orders reporting in favour of an extension of time, not only once, but three or four times. But according to practice, this first extension is granted at once.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not object to this one.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Committee on Standing Orders should take notice, however, that the rule will not be extended any further. Of course, there may be exceptions, but if so, each application should stand on its own merits, and only be granted on special grounds. My hon. friend from Grey suggests that the rule should be amended. Perhaps we may have to revise, not only this, but several rules. For instance, we have a standing rule, which is never observed, fixing the recess for dinner from six to seven thirty p.m. By tacit consent, however, we have always extended that recess till eight o'clock. In the present instance, I am glad to see that my hon. friend from Grey agrees with me that there can be no objection to granting this extension, but that henceforth we should refuse all such applications.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I cannot quite agree with what has been said by either of the hon. gentlemen. Parliament is here to serve the people, and the people should have all reasonable accommodation in getting the legislation they desire. We are not here to tell the public, you must do this at such a time or you cannot have what you want; but we ought to afford every reasonable facility to the public for getting the legislation they desire. There may be some very large interests desirous of obtaining legislation; they may not be able to give the necessary notice, and I think we would be meeting the public convenience by receiving the Bills. I agree with the opinion that an explanation ought to be given, but I still think that it is a good doctrine that we ought to try and accommodate the public in so far as we can in giving them the legislation they may require; we ought to accommodate them at least to that extent.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Certainly we ought to try and accommodate the public, but according to the British constitution, and I think also according to common sense, the public is better accommodated when there are rules surrounding that accommodation and which the public need to understand. But my hon. friend is a reformer, and perhaps he wants to accommodate the public without any rules at all. Perhaps he is in favour of some of those corporations who are generally suitors for private legislation.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) mistakes my point. The sessions are increasing in length, they are now four or five months long, and sometimes six months. There is no reason why these rules should not be liberalized—but, of course, the right hon. gentleman is always in favour of restriction.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The reason of the committee asking for this is this. The secretary of the committee said that the Senate had extended the time to February 23 to receive Petitions and one week longer to receive Bills and if we did not extend the time, all the petitions would go to the Standing Orders Committee of the Senate and none of them to the Commons committee, that is the reason why the committee unanimously recommended this to the House.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. So much for the discussion on the present subject. But there was one remark dropped by my right hon. friend to which I wish to refer. He intimates that by common consent it has come to be the practice in this House not to assemble after recess until eight o'clock in the evening. If that is so, I am sorry that it is so. I think we lose half an hour of very valuable time. For my part I would much rather meet here at half past seven, which is according to the rules, and leave half an hour earlier, if either end is to be sacrificed. Last night we came here when very important estimates were up; there was one minister ready to take his place and go on with his estimates. After a while another minister straggled in; but for quite a while there was scarcely any gentlemen on the other side at all. I am sorry to say that our own side was sparse as well. But the government side is the side that ought to set a good example. I do not think it speaks well to the country when the important business of criticising and passing the estimates for the expenditure come up, that we should not on both sides show our own interest in the disposal of public business by being present. We were here last night, and it was a quarter past eight, or nearly so, before we got to work.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, no.

Mr. FOSTER. It was after eight, and it seems to me we ought to get to work at half past seven. There is quite enough time from six o'clock to half past seven to eat what should be ate at a meal for an ordinary man.

CRIMINAL CODE—AMENDMENT.

Mr. D. W. BOLE (Winnipeg) moved to introduce a Bill (No. 23) to amend the provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada, 1902, with respect to common bawdy houses.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. BOLE. My reason for introducing this Bill is owing to the fact that a decision of the courts of Manitoba holds that disorderly houses kept by one woman are not liable under the provisions of the Act. The amendment is intended to make houses of this character kept by one woman or more amenable to law and order. The necessity of this amendment is demonstrated in the city of Winnipeg, which I have the honour to represent. In that city disreputable houses conducted by one woman have been established on some of our best streets, and the

good citizens have in some cases found it necessary to take the law in their own hands, by smashing windows and doors in their effort to suppress such nuisances.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

W. T. R. PRESTON, IMMIGRATION COMMISSIONER.

Mr. URIAH WILSON asked :

1. What was the object of the visit to Canada in the month of October last of Mr. W. T. R. Preston, emigration commissioner in Great Britain ?
2. Was Mr. Preston sent for by the government, or any member thereof, or did he come on his own initiative ?
3. Is it true that there has been any friction between officials in the High Commissioner's office in London and Mr. Preston ?
4. Have any complaints been made to the government, or any member thereof, or to any of the deputy ministers at Ottawa, or officials of the Department of the Interior, that Mr. Preston has been unduly interfering in the work of the High Commissioner's office.
5. Has Mr. Preston any jurisdiction over any of the staff in the High Commissioner's office, or do his duties confine him solely to immigration work ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. W. T. R. Preston did not visit Canada in the month of October last, but in the month of November. He arrived here about November 17, and came by permission of the Minister of the Interior (Hon. C. Sifton) in order to discuss with him private matters connected with the Department of Immigration. There has been no friction, so far as the government is informed, between the officers of the High Commissioner's office and Mr. Preston, and no complaints have been made to that effect to any member of the government, so far as I know, nor to any other minister. Mr. Preston has no jurisdiction over any members of the staff in the High Commissioner's office, and his duties are confined to immigration work.

I. C. R.—FUEL INSPECTOR.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. At what time was the position of fuel inspector on the Intercolonial created ?
2. What are the duties of such officer ?
3. Who holds the position at present, when was he appointed, and what is his remuneration ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. April 1891.

2. To supervise delivery of coal to locomotives, to inspect it on locomotives while in actual service generating steam and to formulate methods for burning the various sorts of coal supplied so as to produce the greatest efficiency.

3. M. C. Lockhart. Appointed July 5, 1904. Salary $75 per month.

CUTTING TIMBER ON BADGLEY ISLAND.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

Has the Department of Indian Affairs granted permits or licenses to any person or persons to cut timber on Badgley island, north shore of Georgian bay, during the year 1904 or 1905 ? If so, to whom, and to what extent ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) :

No permits or licenses have been granted by the Department of Indian Affairs to any person or persons to cut timber on Badgley island, north shore of Georgian bay, during the year 1904 or 1905.

DAVID ROUSE, CUSTOMS OFFICER.

Mr. URIAH WILSON asked :

1. Upon what date did David Rouse receive his appointment as customs officer at the village of Bath, in the counties of Lennox and Addington ?
2. What salary did he receive when he received the appointment ?
3. Has his salary been increased since that date, and when ?
4. What is his present salary ?
5. What have been the collections at the Bath customs office per year since the year 1896 ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1 and 2. David Rouse was installed into office as acting sub-collector of customs at Bath on May 18, 1898, at a salary of $150 a year on appointment in place of John Hogle, deceased, who had been receiving a salary of $450 a year.

3. Mr. Rouse's salary was increased to $400, a year from July 1, 1900.

4. His present salary is $400 a year.

5. The customs collections at Bath for the eight years from July 1, 1896, to July 1, 1904, were $362.73.

SALARY OF W. T. R. PRESTON.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What is the present salary of W. T. R. Preston, engaged in immigration work by the government in Europe ?
2. What amount has been paid to said Preston on account of travelling or other expenses during the past year ?
3. Where is he at present, and what work is he now engaged upon ?
4. What is the date of his last report to the Department of the Interior ?
5. How many reports has he made during the past year ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) :

1. $3,000 per annum.

2. $679.49 for the 11 months ended November 30, 1904.

3. In London, England, discharging the duties of Commissioner of Immigration for

Canada, with supervision over all agencies in the British Isles and on the continent of Europe.

4. June 30, 1904.

5. One, covering fiscal year 1903-4. This is now being printed.

EMPLOYMENT OF EXTRA MEN ON WELLAND CANAL.

Mr. LANCASTER asked :

1. How many extra men were employed on the Welland canal during the months of September, October and November, 1904 ?

2. At whose request and on whose recommendation were these men placed at work ?

3. What was the nature of their employment, and at what locks or weirs, or on what parts of the canals were they employed ?

4. What was their remuneration per day ?

5. When were they discharged, and why ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. September, 25 men; October, 74 men ; November, 42 men.

2. The superintending engineer required the men, and they were employed on the recommendation of those in whom the department had confidence.

3. General repairs, ditching in Humberstone and along the Feeder, locks 12, 15 and 16. Setting steel poles and building transformer in connection with the electric light plant.

4. $1.50 per day.

5. Some were discharged at end of October and some on December 1 last. Work at which they were employed being completed.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Annual report of the Department of the Interior for the year ending June 30, 1904. —Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

REPRESENTATION OF THE YUKON.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if the government has any information to lay before the House as to the cause of the non-gazetting of the return of the member lately elected in the Yukon ? I understand that in the election in the Yukon, held on December 16 last, Dr. Thompson is said to be elected. The return has not yet been gazetted and the House, I believe, has no information as to whether any return has been made. I would suggest that, particularly at this time, when a Bill to provide for the autonomy of the Territories is about to be brought before parliament, it is important that the Yukon should be represented. It would seem that, if any person is to blame for the delay, the sooner that is discovered the better.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). The question of the return of the member elected for the Yukon came under the notice of the Secretary of State, who made inquiry as to the reason why the regular return had not been made. He was informed by telegram from the Yukon that February 7 had been fixed by the returning officer as the day for the declaration of the result of the election. The Secretary of State, not having any authority to interfere, sent a telegram to press upon the returning officer the importance of settling the matter at once, so that the hon. gentleman who had been elected might take his seat at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. FOSTER. When was the writ returnable?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not that date in mind at the moment. I thought the question of this return would come up, and had a full statement concerning it, but, unfortunately, I did not bring the papers with me. I shall be prepared to make a full statement to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems a long wait for this return.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It does seem rather peculiar. I have made inquiry myself and I find that under the Yukon Representation Act there are certain provisions of the Dominion Elections Act that are not made applicable to the Yukon, and that, strictly speaking, the returning officer was within his rights in fixing February 7, as the day for making his declaration. Still, the delay is unusual, and he has been asked to make an explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the returning officer?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not remember the name. But I will have the papers with me to-morrow and will be ready to make a full statement.

BRITISH EMBARGO ON CANADIAN CATTLE.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I desire to call the attention of the government to an item appearing in the Montreal 'Daily Star' in reference to the embargo on Canadian cattle. And, as this is a matter in which every hon. member is interested, and one that effects very deeply the interests of the country, I will take the liberty of reading a few lines. In the special cable correspondence dated February 1, is the following :—

Hon. Henry Chaplin, ex-Minister of Agriculture, started yesterday at Oakham a campaign in the rural constituencies against re-opening British ports to Canadian store cattle. He hotly denounced Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman for so trifling with the heavy responsibilities which may soon be his as a minister of the crown by favouring the re-exposure of British herds to the risk of disease after the enormous trouble and expense of stamping it

out. If the Canadian store cattle are readmitted, British agriculturists would again find their herds decimated by disease. The removal of the embargo would be an act of insanity, ruinous to the British cattle feeders.

And the correspondent sums it up under the head 'Canada's Problem.'

A most interesting political situation is thus created. The question asked is 'Can the Canadian government enable Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman to prove to parliament that the Canadian herds are absolutely free from risk of contagion from the American States ?'

I see by the press, particularly in the Toronto 'World,' the statement that the government is about to take active measures to secure the removal of the British embargo. I do not know whether that is a fact or not, but am quite aware that the government in common with members on this side of the House appreciate the importance of having that embargo removed. I submit that it is very important that the agitation now going on against the removal of the embargo should be, in some way, counteracted.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON (Vancouver City). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) if he suppressed any of the despatch he has just quoted from. We had the spectacle last year of that hon. gentleman reading a letter in the House and suppressing part of it.

Mr. LENNOX. I will, as a matter of privilege, reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macpherson) at a suitable time. The public press, I hope, is open to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macpherson), and I commend it to his consideration. The public press affords exceptional means of enlightenment, and I commend it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I would ask the hon. gentleman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) to hand the paper over to me, or to lay it on the table, so that I can see it for myself.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) has brought to the attention of the House a most important subject which is, apparently, to-day engaging the attention of public men in the old country. For some time past references have appeared in the British press and in the cable despatches in our own newspapers to the utterances of public men on both sides of politics on this subject in the political campaign now going on. I have watched closely the reports of these utterances.

I have felt, however, that it was not for any public men in Canada to interject into a political controversy in the old land the view of the people of Canada upon this subject—I thought that it would injure the position that Canada might occupy in the discussion of the subject with the British government when the time becomes ripe for re-opening the discussion. I may say, that, some time ago, the then Minister of Agriculture in England declared emphatically that there was no use in discussing that question, because the embargo would not be removed. That statement was called forth, I might say, by representations made by the government of Canada on this subject. We have felt, since an emphatic reply of that kind was given, that there was nothing further for us to do until an opportune occasion arose for re-opening the question. I may add that, within the last few weeks what appeared to me to be an opportune occasion for re-opening that question occurred. There was a report, apparently authentic, that the present Minister of Agriculture had declared publicly that, from his observation, the people of Canada seemed to be quite satisfied with the present condition of affairs, and that being the case there was no necessity for further discussing the matter. I took the liberty of immediately making a recommendation to His Excellency, that a despatch should be sent to the home government drawing attention to this utterance, asking if it were an official utterance, correctly reported, and pointing out that if it were, the Minister of Agriculture was labouring under a most grave misapprehension as to the condition of opinion on this question in Canada. So far no reply to that despatch has been received. The question is an important one in the interest of Canadian trade and in the interest of Canadian stock raisers and those who are in the live stock trade between Canada and the old land. I want to assure the hon. gentleman and the House that the question is one which is constantly watched on behalf of the government, and that every occasion that seems possible on which the views of the Canadian people and the interests of the Canadian trade can be furthered will be taken advantage of and has been taken advantage of.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it would be more within the comprehension of the House if the hon. minister would lay that despatch from which he has quoted on the table for the information of hon. members. No doubt we would all like to read that despatch. It is strong and eloquently expressed I have no doubt.

Mr. FISHER. I will be very happy indeed to bring a copy of that despatch down at once.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Does the hon. Minister of Agriculture lay down the doctrine that it would be a good thing for Canadians to export their store cattle to England rather than fatten them here ?

Mr. FISHER. I have never laid down any doctrine on that point, but I do lay down

the doctrine that it would be in the interest of the Canadian live stock trade to have the embargo removed.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes, but not for lean cattle.

Mr. BENNETT. As the hon. Minister of Agriculture effected a change in the United State regulations, perhaps he may be able to effect a change in the English regulations. The hon. minister took credit all over the country for having done that, claiming that he alone and not the American government had been all powerful.

Mr. FISHER. I shall be very happy if I can do so.

FLOODS AT VERDUN, QUE.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved :

For copies of correspondence exchanged between parties in the town of Verdun, county of Jacques Cartier, and the Montreal Harbour Board, or the Department of Marine and Fisheries, respecting protection against floods at Verdun, along the shore of the St. Lawrence River.

He said : Mr. Speaker, the object of this motion is to obtain copies of letters which have been addressed by parties in the town of Verdun near Montreal either to the harbour board of Montreal or to the government in regard to protection against floods. I may mention for the information of the House, that the town of Verdun has extended probably with greater rapidity and has developed faster than any other suburb of Montreal during the past eight years. In 1896 there were but a few houses where the town of Verdun stands to-day. The number of people residing there was so small that it was not then deemed necessary to hold a political meeting during the elections of 1896. To-day the town has a voters' list, I think, of over 1,600 names, there are four polling subdivisions, the population is large, the number of houses has increased in an extraordinary ratio, the street cars from Montreal pass through the town, has electric light, water and drainage and the place is increasing every day. Last year the town suffered a very serious reverse in the shape of an inundation caused by the rising of the St. Lawrence river during the spring freshets. The water inundated the town partly by coming into the tail race of the Montreal waterworks and overflowing the banks of the tail race. The bank is larger on the side of the city of Montreal than on the western side, that is on the side of Verdun, and the water poured in there in a single night in great quantities. It also came in in the ordinary way from the St. Lawrence river overflowing the banks of the river. I may mention that the damage was very considerable indeed. The protection afforded in the vicinity of Montreal against floods only extends into a part of the town of Verdun. It would be necessary, to make that protection absolutely effective, to extend the wall higher up along the river St. Lawrence for some distance along the frontage of the town of Verdun. I saw by the papers that letters had been addressed to the harbour commissioners asking them to provide protection against a recurrence of such a disastrous accident as happened last year. I think it would be a very proper thing for my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine), or the Department of Marine and Fisheries, to cause an investigation to be made by an engineer of the department, and I know of no engineer possibly who would be more competent to make that investigation than Mr. St. George who was for so long a time the engineer of the city of Montreal and who had occasion particularly to study this matter of inundations. I think it would be only justice to the people of Verdun if the hon. minister would cause an investigation to be made as to what would be the best protection to be afforded against inundations of the town from the St. Lawrence in that locality. As I read the statute, 57-58 Vic., chap. 48, which is the last Act having reference to the harbour commissioners of Montreal, it appears to me, that that part of the town of Verdun which requires protection is outside of the jurisdiction of the harbour commissioners. I may be mistaken but I find in schedule 2 of the Act that I have just referred to that the western limit of the Montreal Harbour Board's jurisdiction is at the Little River St. Pierre and the inundation was caused by the situation of the land higher up than the entry of the Little River St. Pierre. If my interpretation of the schedule is correct it would be for the Department of Marine and Fisheries itself to look into the cause of that inundation and if possible to provide a remedy, because the results of last year's inundation were disastrous in the extreme. The damage was in a certain sense incalculable. These inundations, should they recur, would prevent the development of that thriving town, and if I am correctly informed by the people who know the locality well it would be very easy for the Department of Marine and Fisheries to provide adequate protection against inundation. I may mention, sir, that during the last election, the government candidate in the county of Jacques Cartier pledged himself solemnly as a supporter of the government that this matter would receive the immediate attention of the government.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. He was not elected.

Mr. MONK. There was no condition of course, as my hon. friend will naturally suppose, in regard to that pledge. It was to be done absolutely under any circumstances whatever. People have relied upon that pledge ; in fact I did not receive at the time that support of the electors of Ver-

dun which I might have received had the circumstances been different. I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, (Mr. Préfontaine) will appreciate the necessity of at least causing an investigation to be made. The continuation of the protection wall along the bank of the River St. Lawrence to such a point towards the west as would prevent the possibility of inundation from the river itself would not be very expensive. I think at any rate the engineer would be fully able to inform the department on that matter. The other point where water flowed in, that is to say the bank of the tail-race of the Montreal waterworks, just where it enters the River St. Lawrence is absolutely, as I understand the statute I have already quoted, under the control of the Department of Marine, and that department may either order the city of Montreal to provide there a sufficiently high bank to the tail-race to prevent the possibility of any flow in the future, or the department may itself execute the work if it thinks fit to do so. I commend this question, which interests greatly the town of Verdun, to the attention of my hon. friend the minister (Mr. Préfontaine).

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). In answer to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) I may state that there will be no objection whatever to the production of the papers mentioned, and those that are not in the possession of the department shall be procured from the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal. As regards having a special report made as to the state of affairs at Verdun, I shall consider the matter seriously and consult with Mr. St. George whose name has been mentioned. I know he is a competent man to do this work, because he has been connected with all the works of flood protection in Montreal during the last ten years.

Motion agreed to.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 8) to amend the Mounted Police Act, 1894.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1, pay of the force.

Mr. SPROULE. How will this compare with the salaries now given ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. At a previous stage I explained that the object of this Bill is to increase the pay of the officers by $400 and of the non-commissioned officers and constables by 25 cents a day. At present, for instance, the commissioner who has charge of the police at Regina receives $2,600. He will receive $3,000. A superintendent receives if I remember rightly $1,400 ; he will now receive $1,800. The inspectors receive $1,000 ; they will receive $1,400. I may say that this is the maximum, and it is not intended to give them that amount of increase at once. The plan we have adopted is that all officers who have been eight years in the service shall receive at once the increase of $400 ; all others will receive increases varying by $50 for each year that they have been in the service, until they reach $1,400. All those who have been eight years in the service will receive at once the increase of $400 ; those who have been seven years will receive an increase of $350 ; those who have been six years will receive $300 and those who have been one year in the service will receive an increase of $50. The same principle applies to the constables.

Mr. FOSTER. How many assistant commissioners are there ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The list of officers gives 55. Thirteen officers will at once receive the $400 ; two will receive $350 each ; two will receive $300 ; five will receive $250 ; eight will receive $200 ; two will receive $150 ; eight will receive $100 ; ten will receive $50 ; five will receive nothing.

Mr. BERGERON. Who is the commissioner ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Colonel Perry.

Mr. BERGERON. What has become of his predecessor, Colonel Herchmer ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He was superannuated in 1901 or 1902.

Mr. BERGERON. On how much ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot give the exact amount, whatever the law allows him. He came under the rules of the Civil Service and received just the amount that he was legally entitled to.

Mr. BERGERON. Before or after he went to South Africa ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. After his return.

Mr. SPROULE. This seems to be a somewhat large increase in salary all at once. To increase a man's salary from by $400 to $2,000 is an increase of 25 per cent. It seems to me there should be some good reason for such a large increase at one time. The Premier has not given us a reason for it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have on a previous occasion given the reason for it. Last year there was an expression of opinion on both sides of the House that the police were insufficiently paid, and my impression is that even with this increase in salaries the police will not be too highly

paid. Everything has gone up in price as my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) knows and in the west, where everything is growing very fast, the cost of living is far in excess of what it is in the east. For instance, the maximum pay of a superintendent is $100 less than that of a first-class clerk, and the maximum pay of an inspector is $100 less than that of a second-class clerk. Under these circumstances, I do not think the police are overpaid for the very important duties they perform, and in providing for them this very moderate increase I think we are simply doing what the country would expect of us.

Mr. SPROULE. Notwithstanding that, I still contend that an explanation is necessary, and it seems to me that, coming from hon. gentlemen opposite, it is doubly necessary considering the doctrine they preached years ago when in opposition, that if they came to power they would make this a cheap country to live in. Now it is a dear country to live in, and the right hon. gentleman gives that as an excuse for these increases of salary. I am not complaining of the work done by the Mounted Police, because I think they do their work very well, and are entitled to as high pay as any similar class of men in the country. But it seems to me that when the increase is not a very moderate one, or is what some would regard as an immoderate one, some special reasons ought to be given for it. Last year we increased the salaries of the civil service in Ottawa, but I do not think that in any case the increase reached the proportion of the increase now proposed for the Mounted Police, an increase of 25 per cent at one jump.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am afraid that the remarks of my hon. friend will make my modesty blush. It is true we said that we expected to make Canada a cheap country to live in, but we did not then anticipate that we would do as well as we have done, or that the country would be as prosperous as it is to-day, with immigrants going into the Northwest Territories at the rate of 150,000 a year. I am sure that my hon. friend will agree with me that the conditions are very different from what they were in his time. I am surprised at the criticism of my hon. friend, and in future I shall have to resist the blandishments of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. Last year they asked for increases of salary. I yielded to their demands, and now I am criticised. In spite of that, I think I shall have to persist in my good intention. For instance, Colonel Perry, the commissioner of the force, who receives $2,600, is to receive $3,000, which is certainly not an exaggerated price for the services he renders to the country. An inspector, who ranks, say, with a captain, receives to-day $1,000. There are men who have been in that class for twenty years or more, and they are to receive at once $1,400, while officers appointed last year will receive an increase only of $50, while those who have been inspectors for over a year will receive $1,100, and so on until they reach the maximum of $1,400. If my hon. friend will look at the facts as they are, and forget the speeches of former years, he will agree with me that these increases are very reasonable.

Mr. OSLER. I must say that for once I thoroughly agree with the right hon. gentleman.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear—for once only.

Mr. OSLER. I hope for more than once, but on this occasion at any rate. The Northwest is at the present time an exceedingly expensive country to live in. It is found by those who have business there that the salaries of almost every class of men have been raised, and the Mounted Police are certainly deserving of the most generous treatment that can be meted out to them.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What is the total number of the police now

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Six hundred in the Northwest Territories and 300 in the Yukon.

Mr. BERGERON. Was there an increase of the force last year or the year before ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There was an increase of 100 men last year.

Mr. FOSTER. How is the force distributed ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are about 85 posts distributed all over the Territories, from the American frontier to the mouth of the Mackenzie river and from the Red river to the Macleod district. We have established some new posts along the route of the Canadian Northern Railway, and we have two or three posts on the Mackenzie river between Slave lake and the mouth of the river.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the force generally being diminished in the eastern portion of the country, which is the more settled and the more rapidly increasing in population, and is the augmentation of the force in the parts farther west and north ? My right hon. friend knows that in earlier times, in the eastern parts of the Northwest Territories, the number of Mounted Police at the different stations was large, and they gradually came to do almost all the duties done by constables and police in the more settled districts. Before we went out of office we were gradually withdrawing the Mounted Police from the more thickly settled districts towards the east and sending them further north and west without augmenting the total number of the force. Is this process still going on, or is the force in the eastern districts still doing what the muni-

cipalities do down here, and what the municipalities will have to do up there as population flows in ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say that we have made very little progress in that direction, and, if I remember aright, I do not think that the progress made by the government of my hon. friend in that direction was very marked either. We have experienced the same difficulty that was experienced by our predecessors. When we have made attempts to discontinue posts in a district that is sufficiently well settled to enable the people to take care of their own protection, we have received from all parts of the district the most unanimous protests against the removal of the force. We have demonstrated to the people again and again that they must take charge of their own police, especially now, when settlement is going northward, particularly into the Saskatchewan valley, where we have been obliged to establish new posts. But I must confess that I am not satisfied with the progress that we have been able to make in that direction.

Mr. MACLEAN. Will it be possible to reduce the force in the eastern portion of the Territories when the new provinces are created ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIED. Instead of reducing the force, we shall have to increase it. According as the Territories become more settled along the American frontier, there are greater opportunities afforded for stealing horses and cattle and smuggling and in other respects violating the law. We intend increasing the pay of the force by 25 cents a day. The pay of a colour sergeant, which to-day is $1.50 will be made $1.75. The pay of the other sergeants, which is $1, will be made $1.25. The pay of a corporal will be raised from 85 cents to $1.10 a day, and of a constable from 50 cents to 75 cents. We propose to raise the pay gradually. One-third will receive an increase of 25 cents and two-thirds an increase of from 10 to 20 cents.

Mr. FOSTER. So far as the increase of pay is concerned I do not feel disposed to raise any objection. We have a splendid body of men out there, and the country has been well repaid by the services of the force for the money it has cost. I do not expect that for years to come the total of the force will be diminished. It will, on the contrary, rather be increased, at any rate until municipal institutions are firmly established and the population becomes sufficiently large to keep up these institutions. I venture to express the hope that this force will be, as it was under the late government, kept entirely free from the blight of political partisanship and administered with a sole eye to merit.

Mr. SPROULE. What is meant by the term 'unorganized portions of the North-west Territories ?' Is it that portion without provincial autonomy or municipal organization ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. By that is meant the Mackenzie River territory and the forts very far north, also the Hudson Bay territory. We give the men there extra pay.

Mr. MONK. Does any portion of the Mounted Police operate in Manitoba ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, on the southern frontier.

Mr. MACLEAN. How many men on Hudson Bay ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. A couple of years ago an officer and five men were sent there. I could not say how many are there now.

Mr. MONK. Is not the force at present the sole force charged with the maintenance of order in the territories not yet organized into provinces, and when that organization takes place will that not make a very considerable change in the duties of the force ? As soon as there is provincial organization there will be municipal institutions, and the duty of maintaining law and order will then devolve upon the local authorities ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I must say at once that even after the territories are organized into provinces we do not see the feasibility of dispensing with the services of the force. Of course when the municipalities are organized they will have to look after their own protection, but there is still a very large Indian population in the country and a great many immigrants coming in, and we have to provide, not only against violations of the customs laws, but for the protection of law and order of every kind. I do not think I am slandering the neighbouring country when I say that there is a lawless element coming in from that country against which we have to guard constantly, and we are bound to take every precaution to show new settlers that in Canadian territory life and property are amply protected.

Mr. MONK. When will the Bill for provincial organization be brought down ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. About the second week in February, but cannot say for certain.

Mr. BERGERON. The pay of the men is apart, I presume, from the rations ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, we provide rations beside the pay.

Mr. BERGERON. Of course, I do not want to annoy the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), but, remembering old days, I cannot but be impressed with the changes that time has brought in the opinions of hon. gentlemen opposite. I can remember, when hon. gentlemen opposite were on this side, when there was an urgent de-

mand from them for the reduction of the force, and reasons were strongly urged why the country should not be called upon to pay so much for a useless army. In fact, I believe, these urgings were so strong, that the government of that time did diminish the force by a couple of hundred men. But the right hon. prime minister and his friends later on, thought the force should be increased again. I hope that increase was not made necessary by the kind of immigration the government is bringing into the Northwest. The government boasts loudly of increasing the immigration by hundreds of thousands ; but it is not difficult to effect that increase considering the quality of some of that immigration, and considering that the government spend annually $700,000 more than their predecessors in the promotion of immigration. I will not follow the example of the right hon. gentleman and his party when in opposition by finding fault with this measure. It is a good thing for the Northwest that we should have a good police force, and when these men render good service, they should be well paid.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Penitentiaries—general, $9,450.

Mr. FOSTER. That seems to be a new item.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). No, that is the usual item. It provides for the expense of general administration at Ottawa. There is no change except a statutory increase of $50 to the architect.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an architect?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Formerly this officer was connected with the Kingston penitentiary. But I thought it better to remove him to headquarters. His salary is now charged against the general expenditure. He has been in the service for many years.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose his work is in connection with repairs?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And construction—additional wings and that sort of thing.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Department of Justice carry on construction of that kind?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. We get an appropriation for material, and use convict labour.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the staff at headquarters?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Two inspectors, the architect, officers contingencies and the expenses of the parole officer. That is a new officer appointed last year.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose he looks after the paroled prisoners ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. The man who is doing the work is not paid a salary but works voluntary. Mr. Archibald of the Salvation Army. He is doing an immense amount of good.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister explain what this officer does ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. When a prisoner is about to be discharged upon parole, the officer is informed. He endeavours, as far as possible, to obtain employment for the man to help him in any way possible. If, for instance, the man is a mechanic, the officer provides him with a kit of tools. We have a vote of $2,000, part of which is placed at the disposal of the officer for these purposes.

Mr. FOSTER. What conclusion has the minister reached as to the results of this work?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My conclusion is indicated by the fact that I have asked Inspector Archibald to apply for his release from the head of the Salvation Army, so that he may be able to devote his whole time to this work at a fixed salary. Mr. Archibald is an eminently satisfactory official, and will be in a position to do good service in this branch of the administration.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister find it less difficult to get employment for the paroled men?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is an institution in Toronto—I do not wish to mention the name openly—in which we have ten paroled men. We have received applications from employers who are ready to engage these men—of course, always on the recommendation of Mr. Archibald—and he takes the trouble to look after them after they leave the establishment.

Mr. FOSTER. How many men were let out on parole last year?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will look at page II the last report of the department he will find a comparative statement of the paroles, pardons, deaths and escapes. Last year, 122 men were paroled. We find the system to work most satisfactorily. One difficulty in connection with the parole is the reporting. The man paroled is obliged to report to the police officials of the locality in which he resides. I find that some of the police officials—and I make this statement here publicly in the hope that some good may come of it—are far too zealous. They go about and make trouble for the unfortunate paroled convict. I have a case in mind in which the convict himself told me that the police officers took the trouble to go to the employer and tell him that the man was

a paroled convict, and, in ways which I will not particularize succeeded in obliging the convict to leave his employment. That is an act of great cruelty, and I make mention of it that those who are guilty of such atrocious conduct may know that it does not receive the approval of parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the proportion of the lapses ? You had 120 on parole but the year before would furnish a better figure to take.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The year before the number was 113. I do not know that I can find here the exact figures, but some time ago I asked the Commissioner of Dominion Police, Col. Sherwood, who has control of these discharged convicts so far as police supervision is concerned, and the report he made to me was that it would be about seven per cent. That I consider very satisfactory.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the principle upon which the hon. gentleman acts ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In the first place, the inspector visits the penitentiaries once or twice a year, when every convict in the penitentiary is entitled to see the inspector separate from the warden or any other officer, that is separate from Mr. Stewart and from Mr. Dawson. If the convict wishes to have his case brought before the minister, he makes his complaint to the inspector, who, on his return, makes a report to myself, and I take up the different cases and look into them. Or the convict may make a petition, or his friends on his behalf, to the department ; or another method is that he may apply through Mr. Archibald, who goes about and visits all these penitentiaries, and who may make a request that a man be discharged on parole. Then the procedure is to apply to the convicting magistrate, or to the judge, for a report of his case.

Mr. FOSTER. On that one point—is it the practice of the department always to apply to the judge ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Invariably, it is a rule without exception. Of course it would be impossible properly to deal with these cases if I did otherwise, I cannot have any knowledge of the facts brought out on the trial. I get the magistrate's report, then I apply to the warden in order to ascertain what the conduct of the convict has been while he was in the penitentiary. Then having before me the report of the committing magistrate, or judge, and the warden's report, I consider the case myself. If this has been a second offence, the application is almost without exception refused, except in a case where Mr. Archibald might point out some particular reason why under the circumstances the man should be paroled. But if it is a first offence, or if the convict is a young man and I see that he has an opportunity of getting employment, unless the convicting magistrate has reported strongly against him, so far as possible I help the man along. It may be that I have dealt somewhat generously with these people, but up to the present I have had no occasion to regret it. A first offender always receives consideration as far as it is possible to give it, especially if he is a young man. Then if he is allowed out he is obliged to report every month to the police officer in the locality where he resides.

Mr. FOSTER. This is different, of course, from a case where the minister, under the authority vested in him, pardons out an offender.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it the rule of the department in such cases always to get a report from the judge ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. There are two things that are essential in all cases whether the application is for pardon or for parole, that is to get a report of the trial from the judge and of the conditions under which sentence was given, and a report from the warden. That rule is never departed from.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a case I have in my mind which I must look into a little more before I bring it to the attention of the minister. The minister may understand that something like this takes place : There are men who seem particularly willing to take up the cases of men who are charged with crimes, and after having gone through the courts of law are sent down for punishment; there seems to be in some cases almost a mania with these individuals to take up a case like that and approach the minister or authorities and make capital, and perhaps money for themselves, by getting these persons pardoned out. Sometimes they succeed, not so much from the justice of the case, or the merits of the case involved, as from the fact that the person who is interesting himself has, as he thinks, large influence in the party, and he uses that influence for all it is worth in order to commend his case to the department. Now there are one or two cases which came before my own observation, and which, from the apparent circumstances, seemed to me to be rather gross. One of them I intend to talk over with my hon. friend, and if it is such as I think it is, I have no doubt that he will pay every consideration to what I may bring before him. I think it is a great mistake for criminals or others to get an idea into their heads that by getting certain influential persons to act as intermediaries in their behalf they can escape, to a certain extent, the penalty of the crimes they have committed. But the parole business is quite a different matter from that. I am glad to hear the minister say that in all cases it is his invariable rule, before either pardon or

parole is granted, to get the judgment of the court giving sentence.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I may say in answer to my hon. friend that I have in my mind cases such as he refers to, and I can assure him that the gentlemen in question, probably the same person he refers to, has realized by this time that he has no access to the Department of Justice which any other person does not have. There is no royal road to the Department of Justice. I would like to add that there has never been a case decided by myself that had not previously been examined by Mr. Power, of the Department of Justice, a gentleman in whom we have the greatest possible confidence, who has had an experience extending over twenty years in dealing with matters of this kind. I can safely make this statement, that there is not a case in which I have taken action without a previous report by Mr. Power.

Mr. BLAIN. How frequent have reports to be made to the local authorities ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Once a month. The convict is obliged to report each month to the local police authorities. If he fails to report, his case goes to the commissioner of police. If he does report, nothing is said, but if he fails to report each month, the commissioner of police is notified, and as a result applies to me for a cancellation of the ticket-of-leave, and the man goes back to the penitentiary.

Mr. HENDERSON. Do I understand from the Minister of Justice that if a man fails to report he is recommitted to the penitentiary?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is the rule.

Mr. HENDERSON. What becomes of those who go to the United States, for example, beyond the jurisidiction of the minister ? How are they dealt with?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If a man goes to the United States without permission of the minister, he is dealt with as a man who has failed to report, and if he comes back he is recommitted to the penitentiary. Very frequently it may happen that there is a condition attached to the pardon, and if a man violates that in going to the United States, and if his relatives bring him back then he would have to go back to the penitentiary and purge his sentence. But in the case of a paroled convict he may apply for leave to go to the United States, and it sometimes happens that I grant leave; in fact, I almost invariable grant it if a proper case is shown.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like to know how many at the present time are out on this ticket-of-leave. This is a question that considerable interest is taken in throughout the country, and any information the hon. minister can give I am sure will be appreciated.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If my hon. friend will look at page II of the report on penitentiaries he will find a comparative statement of the paroles granted since the Act was brought into force in 1898. Last year there were paroled 122 convicts.

Mr. STOCKTON. The hon. minister states that on certain occasions he allows them to go to the United States. In that case does he require a report every month, and if so, to whom ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, if a man is permitted to go to the United States he is exempted from the obligation to report.

Mr. BERGERON. Every month ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. I am reminded of the condition under which the parole is granted. It is that they shall not leave the country.

Mr. STOCKTON. If leave is given, and if they leave the country you do not expect a report from them ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Mr. MONK. Are there any cases of any persons who have been allowed out on ticket-of-leave being sent back to the penitentiary?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, yes—about seven per cent. I have not the exact figures here, but the inspector tells me that it is about seven per cent.

Mr. MONK. Last session two returns were ordered by the House. One was a return in respect to the parties allowed out on ticket-of-leave within a certain period of time. The other was a return as to the parties convicted of arson and who had subsequently been allowed out on ticket-of-leave. I do not think that either return was brought down, and I would like my hon. friend to make a note of it and see that the returns are brought down.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If my hon. friend will look at page II. of the report on penitentiaries, he will find the number of convicts who have been allowed out since the Act first came into force. In respect to the arson cases I have not the slightest recollection of what my hon. friend refers to. If he will be good enough to send me a note I will see that the information is brought down.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand from the hon. minister that seven per cent of those who have been allowed out have been returned to the penitentiary. May I ask whether they have been returned for failing to report or for some other criminal offence ? I desire to ascertain what effect this leniency of the minister has had upon criminals and upon the country generally.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If a man fails to report he is returned to the penitentiary unless cause is shown. I referred to a case a few minutes ago in which a man failed to report because he found that by reason of

his reporting he was hounded to death by the local police officials, and on a report to me by Inspector Archibald to that effect, I relieved him of obligation to report. If a man out on ticket-of-leave commits an offence which of itself would not require that he should be returned to the penitentiary, the simple fact that he has committed a breach of the law makes it necessary to send him back to the penitentiary to purge his original offence. For instance, if a man had three years further to serve, if I allowed him out on parole, if he committed an assault and he was brought before a magistrate and convicted of this offence for which he would probably have to serve a month he would have to go back to the penitentiary and purge his original sentence.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that about seven per cent have been returned, some for failing to report and others for having committed a breach of the peace whilst out on parole. What proportion has been returned for some criminal offence committed whilst out on parole ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I certainly cannot give the information now, and I do not think that I have in my department the information to give that answer. But, I will say that as a result of the Salvation Army—or perhaps I should not say that—but as a result of the work of Inspector Archibald, there is a great improvement in reference to the parole system, and I think if it should be possible for him to devote his whole time to this prison gate work, that the result will be that we will have very few paroled men who will have to be treated as second offenders. Inspector Archibald is exceedingly sympathetic, he is exceedingly enthusiastic in the performance of this work, and I think the greatest possible good will result from his aid to the unfortunate whom we allow out on parole.

Mr. BARR. If the Salvation Army have accomplished so much, why should they not get the credit ? Why should you give it all to Inspector Archibald ? I think this is a recognition of the work they have accomplished which has done more for these unfortunate men than the machinery of the law, and in that case why not give them the credit ? It does seem to me that we should encourage the Salvation Army and try to further the work that they are now doing.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Originally the Salvation Army did prison gate work. When I became Minister of Justice it occurred to me that they were doing very good work and that they should be assisted. I entered into communication with Miss Eva Booth, then at the head of the Salvation Army, and as a result she suggested that Inspector Archibald should be specially charged with this work while maintaining his connection with the Salvation Army. But, she pointed out that the Salvation Army as a body could not conduct this work to an extent beyond what they were doing. Inspector Archibald undertook to deal with the matter while remaining a member of the Salvation Army and the result is what I have explained. But, I think it necessary, and this is the suggestion of Inspector Archibald himself, that he should give his whole time to this work. There is quite enough for him to do if he gave his whole time to it, and he has applied to General Booth as an official of the Army for leave to engage in this work so that he may become a permanent official of the government.

Mr. BARR. Does the Salvation Army receive any assistance from the government?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. None whatever. We are simply paying the travelling expenses of Inspector Archibald, and there is $500 which we place at his disposal, and on which he can draw for the purpose of procuring the ordinary necessaries that a convict may require to enable him to make a start in life again.

Mr. OSLER. Inspector Archibald is a member of the Salvation Army ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, he is the Inspector at Toronto.

Mr. U. WILSON. The hon. minister will remember that there was a small appropriation taken last year for this purpose and I would like to know how much has been spent?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The amount appropriated last year was $1,500 for travelling expenses and $500 for assistance to paroled and discharged convicts—about $2,000 in all.

Mr. U. WILSON. I presume that the hon. minister is quite as well satisfied as he was a year ago with the work ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, I am so well satisfied that I want to secure Inspector Archibald's services altogether for the department.

Mr. BERGERON. If I remember rightly, I think that some of the convicts in the different penitentiaries do not wait until the law comes to their aid and they are released on parole. How many convicts escaped from the different penitentiaries last year ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Those who took leave were one last year, one in 1902 and one in 1901. Of course, those who got away and were afterwards recaptured are not entered as escaped convicts.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend speaks only of the one who never returned. Are the authorities still looking for him, or have you given up ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I believe we are still looking after him.

Mr. BERGERON. What was the last news ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He has not written me lately, but I am not without hope that some information may be had of him.

Mr. U. WILSON. This is a large item, and I would again urge, as I have urged for several session the putting of the Auditor General's Report in the members' hands before the House meets. We have not yet got the whole report. I think it is most unfair to ask us to vote large sums like this without having been able to go through the details and to satisfy ourselves about them. This is in itself a strong argument for the printing of the Auditor General's Report in sections and its distribution to the members at their homes before they come here, because, as a rule, their time is fully occupied here with other matters.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not know the rule of other departments, but if the hon. member looks at page 115 of my report he will find all the details of expenditure.

Mr. U. WILSON. How long has that report been on the table ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think since Tuesday last, but the Auditor General's Report with respect to the Department of Justice has been on the table for at least a fortnight.

Mr. BERGERON. Does the ticket-of-leave system apply only to penitentiaries, or does it apply to those who are imprisoned in jails for terms of less than two years ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, it does.

Mr. BERGERON. It is the same law ? I understood the minister to say that before interfering with the sentence he takes the opinion of the judge who has passed condemnation. In the case of Brunet, of Montreal, was there a report from the Chief Justice who condemned him ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Would my hon. friend bring down that report ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is no need ; it was only about four lines. I never look for any report from the Chief Justice, beyond a statement to the effect that the jury passed on the facts, that he had passed sentence, and that that ended it so far as he was concerned.

Mr. BERGERON. So, in that case, the minister acted solely upon his own responsibility ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes ; I do not want to shift the burden ; I take it all on myself.

Mr. BERGERON. How many prisoners are there at present in the different penitentiaries ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If my hon. friend will look at page 1 of the report he will find the prison population from 1894-5 down to last year. At the end of the last fiscal year the prison population was 1,286. At the present time it is 1,400.

Mr. BERGERON. In all the penitentiaries ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there any way of determining, from the increase or decrease of population, whether there is an increase or decrease in the morality of the country, if I may call it that ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If the prison population is any index to the morality of the country, I would say that the morality is almost stationary. For instance, in 1894-5 the prison population was 1,250 ; in 1897-8 it was 1,415 ; last year it was 1,286, and at the present moment it is 1,400. So you see it does not vary greatly.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there no way of reducing the expense to the country of the maintenance of prisoners ? I have not made a special study of the matter, but I have read something about it, and in some countries they utilize the services of these men. All of us who have had dealings with the criminal courts know that many of these men are in the habit of living in penitentiaries. Some of them do not conceal the fact that they live better in the penitentiaries than at home ; they cost on an average about $300 a year. Could their services not be profitably employed, for instance, in the macadamizing of roads ? There was a discussion on the employment of prisoners some years ago, but some opposition was made to it by some of the workingmen's societies on the ground that it would encroach on their own revenues ; but if they were employed on such work as the macadamizing of roads, which is not now done, they would not interfere with the labour market. Any one who knows our province knows that the roads are in a dreadful condition, and my impression is that if these men were engaged in outdoor work from 7 in the morning until 6 at night, like ordinary workingmen, they would not be in the penitentiary so often. I am only throwing out a suggestion, and I think this plan would be in the interests of the country.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. One of the difficult problems connected with the administration of justice is to find useful employment for the criminals, not only for the advantage to be derived from their labour, but for the benefit to themselves from being employed. There is not a penitentiary which has not some industry connected with it. At St. Vincent de Paul we have a very large farm, in connection with which we employ a great many convicts. In addition to that, there is a great deal of stone cutting, and, until

recently, quite large building operations were carried on, while a certain number of men are employed in the tailor and shoe shops. That is to say, we endeavour, as far as possible, to utilize the services of the convicts for the purpose of doing all the work required in the penitentiary. At Kingston we endeavour to run, with more or less profit and success, a binder twine industry, and as far as possible, speaking generally, throughout the whole country we utilize the services of convicts. We realize what my hon. friend says, that it is necessary to keep these gentlemen busy.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand that the work they do is done for themselves, such as the making of their own boots and clothing; but, of course, a good deal of money is required to purchase the raw materials. I do not think this goes far enough in the direction I indicated. I would like the convicts to do outside work that would not interfere with the employment of other people, such as road-making. I mention this as one of the things that might be done.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have often thought of the possibility of utilizing these men, as on the continent, in connection with road-making. We have control of the convicts so long as they are within the penitentiary grounds, but not beyond the boundary of the penitentiary. The benefit of their work would result to the municipality in which the penitentiary is situated. We could not take the convicts to a distance, because we would have to provide for them.

Mr. BERGERON. It would not cost more than it does at the present time. The men could be taken to any part of the province at a cost of not more than $300 a year each, and it costs that much to keep them now.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We know what it is to take criminals about. We have sometimes to bring men from Manitoba to St. Vincent de Paul because there is not room for them in the Manitoba penitentiary, and it costs an enormous amount of money. My hon. friend would be shocked if I told him the number of guards that we have to send with these men.

Mr. BERGERON. It is done elsewhere. The convicts who are put to work on the farm or breaking stone are the ones that have nearly finished their term. They are looked on as the safest to be trusted, although two of those who last escaped were among these. There are guards to look after these men, and the only extra expense to which the country would be put would be for feeding the guards. The prisoners have to be fed now.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Where would you house them?

Mr. BERGERON. This work is done during the summer. An army of thousands of men can be provided for while engaged in making roads. They could camp.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Pic-nicing.

Mr. BERGERON. I am serious about this matter. We are paying an enormous amount of money for the maintenance of men whom we do not redeem. My opinion is that any man who has been in the penitentiary for a few years cannot do any good. Some time ago a man came to my office looking for work. He had formerly been in good circumstances, but had been in the penitentiary for eight or ten years. While there he had learned the trade of a painter, and he told me that although he had been out of the country, people knew that he had been a convict, and he could not get work anywhere.

Mr. AMES. In looking through the items given for Kingston, St. Vincent de Paul, Dorchester, Manitoba and elsewhere, and comparing them with the items in the Auditor General's Report, I find, roughly speaking, that about half the amount proposed to be voted for each of these penitentiaries can be classified under miscellaneous expenses, which are made up almost entirely of purchases of various articles, I presume, needed for the penitentiary. I would like to ask the minister what system is employed in the purchasing of these articles—whether tenders are called for, by whom they are purchased, whether instructions are given that they should be purchased in certain localities, and whether those who make the purchases are absolutely free to buy in the cheapest market.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The practice followed is that which has been in vogue ever since the penitentiaries were established. We call for tenders for everything.

Mr. AMES. Are the tenders called for by public advertisement or only from a few persons?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. By public advertisement. If my hon. friend will look at the newspapers for the month of June, he will see the advertisement calling for tenders for supplies for the penitentiaries.

Mr. MONK. Are there not a lot of articles which are purchased otherwise than by public tender?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think everything that can possibly be supplied is bought by public tender.

Mr. MONK. What does the advertisement cover?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Dry goods, groceries, coal, meat, bread, hardware, lumber, building material, leather—everything you can possibly expect to get in a penitentiary.

Mr. MONK. And the contract always given to the lowest tenderer?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. All I know is that the inspectors make a report to me and I approve of it. I do not think my hon. friend can point to a case where the lowest tender has not been accepted. I think there was one case where we were purchasing a superior quality of cloth. Our inspector says the rule is never departed from, that the lowest tender is always accepted.

Mr. BERGERON. I understood that St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary was lighted by electricity.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is now.

Mr. BERGERON. Do I understand that the whole village is also lighted by electricity?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We light the penitentiary and the street on which the penitentiary is situated, and which leads down to the station. That is for our own protection.

Mr. BERGERON. No other street?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No other street.

Mr. BERGERON. Are there not private citizens who are using the electric light and paying the government for it? I am not criticising, but merely asking for information?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No. The convent near by and some private persons asked if we would not supply electrictiy, but we thought it would be inconvenient to do so, and we did not entertain the application.

Kingston Penitentiary, $177,600.

Mr. BLAIN. I find here an item of $62,400 for salaries and retiring allowances. Will the minister explain that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In the left hand column of my report, at the top of page 115, my hon. friend will see that the total for the warden, Protestant chaplain, Roman Catholic chaplain, accountant, engineer, &c., is $61,355.02.

Mr. BLAIN. Was there an officer retired during the year ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, a keeper, named Weir, who became physically incapable of performing his duties.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to call the attention of the minister to certain items in the Auditor General's Report, page M-21. Beardmore & Co., Toronto, leather, $1,024; The Canadian Locomotive Co., of Kingston, $1,408 ; Garneau & Son, Quebec, dry goods, $1,980 ; M. McLaughlin & Co., Toronto, flour, $4,585 ; Rathbun & Co., cement, $652 ; Swift & Co., Kingston, hard coal, $2,691 ; Were all these items tendered for ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Those supplied by Beardmore, Garneau and McLaughlin certainly were, because they are staple articles. The Kingston Locomotive Works supplied the castings used in connection with the new wing. There was no public tender asked for in that case but tenders were asked for by circular.

Mr. BENNETT. Would not that be applicable to the Beardmore Co.?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, public tenders were asked for in the case of the leather, dry goods and flour supplies.

Mr. BENNETT. The Beardmore people and the Canadian Locomotive Co., are well known as pretty strong Liberals. The latter is the company in which the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Harty) is interested. Probably that accounts for their getting the contract.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend is not quite fair. The Ogilvies are supplying flour for the current year.

Mr. BENNETT. Take the case of the George Plunkett contract for coal. Kingston is very much nearer the American side, yet Geo. Plunkett of Cobourg, whose politics are very pronounced, got the contract. Were tenders called for ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, by public advertisement.

Mr. BENNETT. Who else tendered for it ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There were a great number of tenders for the coal. I am glad to hear my hon. friend criticise me for giving contracts to Liberals, because I have had a great deal of criticism for doing the reverse from other quarters. The McLaughlin Company has been represented to me as very strongly Conservative.

Mr. MONK. I would like to come to the assistance of the hon. minister with regard to the coal in Montreal. All the coal there was ordered from T. F. Moore & Co., and there can be no danger of any reproach from the other side with regard to that firm. I presume that coal is tendered for by everybody at the same price ? In Montreal the important bodies, such as the municipal and school boards, generally divide their orders among the coal dealers. I think my hon. friend next year, even at the risk of getting reproaches from his own side, might follow that plan and not give the whole order to Moore & Co.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Those bodies to which my hon. friend refers have greater latitude than I have. They have not got a critical opposition to take care of them. If we were to distribute the coal orders around among the different firms, we would be charged with not getting the lowest price.

Mr. MONK. It is all the same price.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, if it were, I might take care of some people that I cannot now. There was a firm which grievously complained that I could not give them any part of the coal contract; but the reason was their prices were not low enough.

Mr. AMES. Were all the goods purchased from Hamilton Bros., who received a contract to the extent of $1,330, last year for the Kingston penitentiary and $1,670 for St. Vincent de Paul, the result of tenders.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. AMES. What methods are used to know that the goods delivered are according to sample?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We have a storekeeper at St. Vincent de Paul, who has been there many years. He weighs and measures the goods, and I have never heard any complaint as to his work not being done properly.

Mr. AMES. Has he any samples or standards or descriptions which will enable him to make sure that the goods delivered are according to order?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. When the tenders are asked for, he has the samples and compares the goods delivered with the samples.

Mr. AMES. Was the same process followed in the case of Lewis Bros., of Montreal, who figure very largely? They supplied Kingston penitentiary with goods to the extent of $1,892 and St. Vincent de Paul $1,123.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. These goods were all purchased after tenders were called.

Mr. AMES. Will the hon. minister lay on the table the forms of tenders used?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not the slightest objection, they have grown sacred by long usage.

Mr. BENNETT. How many tenders were received for the coal supplied by Geo. Plunkett, of Cobourg?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I cannot tell the number now but I know there were several.

Mr. BERGERON. When are the tenders received?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In June.

Mr. BENNETT. Can the minister tell whether the coal was delivered from Cobourg?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The tenders required that the coal intended for St. Vincent de Paul should be delivered at St. Vincent de Paul and that for Kingston at the wharf at Kingston.

Mr. BENNETT I am informed that Mr. Plunkett is not a coal merchant altogether, but a hotelkeeper. We had a case of this kind yesterday, a publican—not necessarily a sinner—dealing in government supplies. I am informed also that Mr. Plunkett is not a dealer in a large way. Will the minister, when his estimates are next taken up, bring the tenders that were received? The amount involved is about $15,000—a considerable sum.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will bring the tenders.

Mr. AMES. Will the minister describe how the tenders are received and opened and the contract awarded?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is information called for to-day that has not been asked for in the last eight years.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a new House.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Evidently—a very new House, in some respects. So far, as I know, tenders are advertised for in the newspapers. They are received by the inspectors and opened by them. A tabulated statement of the tenders is prepared and I sign the order to award the contract to the person recommended by the inspectors.

Mr. BENNETT. I may say for the minister's information that attention was publicly directed to a number of these names figuring in the Kingston penitentiary accounts on the occasion of the recent Liberal convention in Toronto. I do not like to refer unkindly to the deceased—and I suppose we may say that the Ontario Liberal government is deceased—but during that convention, it was asserted in at least one newspaper that certain persons prominent in that convention were interested in the supplies for Kingston penitentiary, and that this would account for their enthusiasm at the convention.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the hon. gentleman specify? I do not think that Garneau was there or Lewis Brothers.

Mr. BENNETT. These were not connected with Kingston. I remember that there was a long list in the newspapers.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Let the hon. gentleman bring the newspapers when I bring the tenders.

Mr. BENNETT. I will.

Penitentiaries—St. Vincent de Paul, $99,750

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is an increase of $400 there. It is to supply another pair of horses. It appears that the horses there have reached the age, one of eighteen years and the other twenty-one years, and it is about time we got rid of them.

Penitentiaries—Dorchester, $59,700.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is no increase there.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the warden?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. J. A. Kirk.

Mr. FOSTER. At one time in parliament.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I never saw him.

Penitentiaries—Manitoba, $59,800.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There are several increases in this vote owing to the increase in population. We are obliged to have three more permanent guards at $600 a year, and one temporary guard at $500. There is an increase also in the maintenance of convicts, due to increase in the number. The population of the penitentiary is to-day 188—it has gone up even in the last few days—against 140 on June 30, 1903. The item of industries shows an increase, which is due to the fact that we need wood for burning brick to be used in building operations. There is an increase under the item of lands and buildings, because we are obliged to construct an additional wing for which we require material which will cost $3,500.

Penitentiaries—Regina Jail, $12,300.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is an increase of salaries to provide for the employment of a temporary turnkey from time to time as required. Maintenance of prisoners and discharge expense is increased because the population is now forty-two, as against an average for last year of twenty-seven. There is an increase on account of industries because additional farm implements must be purchased.

Penitentiaries—Prince Albert Jail, $8,650.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is an increase in salaries because, owing to increase of population, an additional turnkey must be employed at $600 a year. I have decided to increase the jailer's salary by $100. He threatened to leave because the salary was too small. The population now is twenty-seven against a daily average for 1903-4 of fourteen. There is a slight increase in the cost of uniforms owing to the additional officer, and in maintenance of prisoners and the discharge expenses because of the increase of population.

Penitentiaries—Edmonton Jail, $8,000.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is a new institution. The expectation is that the building will be ready for occupation in July or August. It will have twenty-five cells for convicted males, seven for males awaiting trial, seven for females, and three for insane—a total of forty-two. This will provide accommodation for prisoners from Alberta. At present there are twelve prisoners from Alberta in the jails at Regina and Prince Albert, and fifty-two more in the Northwest Mounted Police guard-rooms. I expect this Edmonton jail will be the penitentiary for the new provinces when they are established.

Mr. FOSTER. One of the new provinces.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. One of the new provinces or the new province.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the system of purchasing supplies for the binder twine industry at Kingston?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Two dealers in the hemp market in New York furnish quotations and the material is bought from New York, and sometimes from England.

Mr. FOSTER. Who makes the purchases?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The penitentiary officials send the prices here and receive authority to make the purchases, and they make them direct.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the result of that industry last year?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend will find the details at page 5 appendix A of the report of the Department of Justice.

1. Twine manufactured :—The following is a summary of twine manufactured :

Pure manilla, 600 feet..	415,925 lbs.
Mixed manilla, 550 feet	125,490 "
Rope yarn..	58,850 "
	600,265 "

On the next page he will find the quantity sold.

Mr. FOSTER. How does it work out as regards receipts and expenditures ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is a difference of opinion about that. The inspector considers that it works out satisfactorily in this respect, that receipts and expenditures about balance. We allow 30 cents a day for convict labour. It is about as much as the labour is worth, because they are not very expert nor desirous to learn.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you make the sales ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Sales are made to farmers only. Since July 1, 1901, farmers may send in club orders, and the order must be signed by the farmers who use the twine, stating the kind of twine and the quantity they require. The price is fixed by the inspector, who takes into account the amount that he has been obliged to expend to produce the article, and at the same time he pays some attention to the price in the market. But they generally grade their price a little below the market price, about a cent or a fraction of a cent below it.

Mr. SPROULE. We were told last year that they sold it at cost price.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is a little below the market price. Where you have convict labour of this sort and allow anything at all for the labour, it is almost impossible to tell what the real cost to the government

is. There is also interest to be taken into account, and the wear and tear of machinery.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that was all figured out, and that convict labour was reckoned at fifty cents a day. Could the minister tell us how much they sold last year to farmers, and if any twine was sold to any other parties but farmers ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not a pound to any one but farmers.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the whole output sold ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, during 1903-4 we sold 401,557 pounds. We had on hand June 30, 1904, 522,680 pounds. Since July 1 we have sold 209,705 pounds.

Mr. FOSTER. That makes 600,000 pounds that you have sold. How much did you make last year ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The total quantity offered for sale in 1903-4 was 924,237 pounds. Quantity manufactured in 1903-4, 541,415 pounds. So long as we have to observe the rule laid down by the House of selling to farmers only, we will have this result every year. We have now 382,822 pounds on hand, but there is an order of the House that we must sell to farmers at the price fixed. The proper way to do would be to dispose of it by public auction.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Is there any particular time when the orders have to be in from the farmers ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, we sell to farmers at any time.

Mr. COCHRANE. There is an impression amongst the farmers in our section of the country, that unless the orders are in at a certain time they cannot be supplied ; and that time is so early in the season that the farmers are not in a position to advance the money a month or two before they want the twine.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Orders may come in at any time.

Mr. COCHRANE. The notices given in the newspapers would not bear out that statement.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My information is that the difficulty my hon. friend refers to is caused by the fact that about two years ago we had only a certain limited quantity of 650-feet-to-the-pound twine, and that one class was exhausted, and when orders for it came in the applicants had to take the ordinary run of twine.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the whole twine business has this defect. Last year or the year before the surplus on hand was sold to a private party at five cents a pound, while in round figures you are asking ten cents a pound from the farmers. Now twine was offered at about the same price as you could get it in any country store. There was surely no inducement for farmers to send for it if they could buy it at a hardware store as they required it and used it up, they would prefer to do that than to send to the penitentiary for it weeks before they needed it. They would naturally go to the most convenient place to get it. But it is believed, and I think there were grounds for the belief, that the twine was not sold to the farmers at cost price. Add the one cent per pound, or the fraction of a cent that is added to cover any loss, to the price of the raw material, and the way it was turned out by others—all that left the impression, though the government states that they sold twine just a little below what others were selling it at, that in fact they sold it at about the same price. We were informed also from other sources that it was not the intention of the government to become competitors with others who were in that business, or to sell below them, because if they did they were destroying their market.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What my hon. friend says illustrates the difficulty we have in dealing with this business. We have a mill that produces 400 tons. I understand that is only a very small fraction of the total quantity required in Canada. Now we cannot attempt to regulate the market with such an output as that.

Mr. SPROULE. But you can sell the twine.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We are charged with favouring a certain number of individuals and giving them that twine at a low figure, while other farmers are obliged to compete in the open market and pay the regular price. We are charged with giving favourable treatment to a certain number of individuals. Now with respect to prices, I will give the prices that we charged in 1903-4, and my hon. friend will be able to say whether they are fair and reasonable. In 1903-4 during the harvest, the prices charged were those fixed on May 1, 1903 :

Pure manilla, 650 feet to the lb., 11½ cents per lb.
Pure manilla, 600 feet to the lb., 10¾ cents per lb.
New Zealand (Kingston special), 9½ cents per lb., ¼ cent less on ton lots or over.

During the spring of 1904, the prices charged were those fixed March 15, 1904, as follows :

Pure manilla, 600 feet to the lb., 10½ cents per lb.
Mixed manilla, 550 feet to the lb., 9¾ cents per lb.
New Zealand, 450 feet to the lb., 8¾ cents per lb., ¼ cent less on ton lots or over.

These prices were fixed in March, 1904, they have been in force since that time and are in force now, and notwithstanding that we have, I think, 375,000 pounds on hand.

Mr. BLAIN. Can the hon. minister tell me what kind of twine is that which he has on hand ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. COCHRANE. I think you are manufacturing a class of twine that the farmers do not use as extensively as they used to.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My figures only go to June 30 : Pure manilla, 600 feet to the pound ; mixed manilla, 500 feet to the pound.

Mr. COCHRANE. The hon. minister has an inspector of binder twine, and that gentleman ought to know the kind of twine that is mostly used by farmers. He should get that information, and the penitentiary should make the kind of twine that the farmers use now. One class of twine that was formerly used, the farmers do not find it expedient to use now, and if that gentleman would have the class of twine made in the penitentiary that is generally used in the Dominion, the hon. minister would not find so much on hand.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That gentleman does report, and the inspector tells me that we act on his report.

Mr. COCHRANE. Does he report upon that line ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. This whole business of manufacturing binder twine is a charge on the public. In my mind, there is no doubt about that.

Mr. FOSTER. How many men do you employ ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Forty convicts out of a present population of 448.

Mr. FOSTER. You do not give employment to 10 per cent of the prisoners.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not 10 per cent.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. I would like to ask the hon. minister if the farmers know that this twine is to be purchased there ? I venture to say that there is not one-quarter of our farmers who know that they can purchase twine any cheaper there than they can anywhere else.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If my hon. friend will take up the report of the Minister of Justice, and look at page 6, he will see the form of circular that is sent out all over the country, in addition to which there is an advertisement published in the newspapers.

Mr. COCHRANE. Which papers ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I cannot give the list.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am not talking from a political point of view. These advertisements should be published in the small papers. There are a great many people who do not take the papers from Toronto, but who require binder twine. If the local papers had a chance to publish this advertisement it would produce better results.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I understand that weekly local papers are chiefly used for this purpose.

An hon. MEMBER. In Ontario ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. CLARE. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he can give us the factory cost of these twines ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The figures I gave a moment ago as representing the price at which these twines are sold, are supposed to represent practically the cost of production, but I imagine that if you take into account the initial cost of the plant, the loss at which it had been run for several years, depreciation and one thing and another, you would find that we are paying a great deal more than we are charging for our twine. However, that is not the opinion of our officials. Here is what is represented to be the cost of the fibre for two years : Manilla fibre, January, 1903, $8.75 per cwt.; 1904, $9.25 per cwt.; average cost, 1903, $8.70 per cwt.; 1904, $9.50 ; sisal, average cost, 1903, $7.77 ; 1904, $7.45.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to ask the hon. minister if there were not quite a number of complaints from the farmers who got this twine last season about the inferiority of it ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not last season. There were complaints before, but not last season. We will occasionally have a complaint or two from people who do not want to pay their debts, but we have had three hundred letters from farmers in different parts of the country commending the twine.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I do not wish to get into a discussion as to whether the parties who made these complaints were able to pay their debts or not, because I know that the people with whom I was speaking were perfectly willing and able to pay their bills.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Where were the complaints from—Prince Edward Island ?

Mr. LEFURGEY. Yes. They usually pay their bills down there.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And they send men up here who do that.

Mr. LEFURGEY. We always try to do that, too. There were really some serious complaints from some of our most reputable farmers, who said that the twine knotted and broke, and they have made complaints directly to the department about it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Is my hon. friend quite sure that these complaints were made in respect to the twine sold during last season ?

Mr. LEFURGEY. I understand so. People claimed to have a great deal of twine which they tried to use, but which they finally had to abandon and were compelled to buy other twine.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The inspector, who is more familiar with the details of this matter than I am, says he has no recollection of any complaint during last season from Prince Edward Island. We did have a few complaints from Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, but none from Prince Edward Island.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I will recall the name to the hon. minister of one of the parties to whom I refer. Mr. Lee, of Victoria, sent in one complaint.

Mr. BLAIN. The fact remains that the sale of binder twine direct to the farmer has been a decided success. My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) shakes his head at that, but the facts bear out my statement. We find by the record that a few years ago twine was sold to supporters of the government without any tender at a very low price, and the complaint that was made in the House was that the farmers did not have an opportunity of purchasing the twine. Taking up the Auditor General's Report for this year, I find that since the new resolution was adopted by the House almost 500 farmers in Canada ordered direct from the penitentiary and secured their twine. I pointed out last year and the year before that in my humble opinion the penitentiary was manufacturing too many kinds of twine, that what the farmers want is pure manilla twine. That is about the only kind that is sold generally, in Ontario, at least.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We manufacture manilla and mixed manilla.

Mr. BLAIN. Mixed is not a pure manilla twine. It is sisal and manilla mixed. The farmers do not wish to use that kind of twine. The demand is for a pure manilla twine, and if the Kingston penitentiary were to manufacture a pure manilla twine and put it on the market at cost, or a little over cost, it is useless for any man to stand up in this House and say that the farmers would not purchase it. My hon. friend has already stated that the amount of twine manufactured at the Kingston penitentiary is very small in comparison with the consumption. I would like to ask the hon. minister what amount of twine remains unsold at the penitentiary at this moment ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. On June 30, 1904, we had on hand:—

Pure manilla, 600 feet to the pound, 320,085 lbs.
Mixed manilla, 550 feet to the pound, 120,900 lbs.

Of that we have sold since that date:—

Of pure manilla, 189,400 lbs.
Of mixed manilla, 17,745 lbs.

My information from the inspector is that we have manufactured about 20 per cent of mixed manilla, but that the greater part, 80 per cent of it, is pure manilla, the intention being to satisfy a demand for that sort of twine which the inspector says exists. It seems to me that my hon. friend will be able to judge, when I gave the figures at which we sold, whether we ought at these figures to have been able to dispose of this twine. He has had more experience with this matter than I have. My impression is that these figures were lower than the market prices ruling at the time.

Mr. HENDERSON. Referring to the matter brought up by the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Lefurgey) as to the quality of the twine, I may say that in going among the farmers—and I think that other members here have met with the same experience—I find there is throughout the country a prejudice against the twine that is manufactured at Kingston. There is only a limited amount made there and consumed in the country, and when I ask farmers why they do not buy Kingston twine they tell me that the American twine is far better. It is unfortunate that we have not in this country a sufficiently strong Canadian sentiment to enable us successfully to put upon the market an article such as the twine to which we are now referring. I have heard the Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding) within the last two years express similar views, and regret the fact that Canadian sentiment did not uphold Canadian products. Our people buy things because they are foreign. I will venture to say that 75 per cent of the farmers of this country will buy American twine because it is American. They have an impression that because it comes from the other side it is better, and the government of the day is largely responsible for this lack of Canadian sentiment. The whole policy of the present government is to cultivate a sentiment amongst the people of this country in favour of purchasing goods that are produced in other countries, and to lessen the purchase of Canadian goods. I attribute very largely the feeling that the penitentiary binder twine is inferior just to this lack of Canadian sentiment. People are willing to buy American twine because it comes from the other side on the principle that far away fields are green, and it is felt that if it is only brought from some other country it must of necessity be better. In the section of country in which I live a large amount of American twine is used. They use chiefly what is known as Plymouth. I asked one man : Why do you buy this Plymouth, and he said : It is so much better. Farmers will not use the penitentiary twine. For anything I know it is equal in all respects to the imported

twine and quite possible this very twine that is bought by our farmers as American twine is Canadian twine. I do not doubt that in many instances that it is a fact. because our Canadian factories are making twine, shipping it across to the United States and selling it to the very men who supply twine to dealers in this country, and I have no doubt that it goes there, comes back here as American twine and takes the market much better, selling as American twine in competition with the Kingston article, although it is of purely Canadian manufacture. It is as I said the lack of a good Canadian sentiment that interferes very materially with the reputation and sale of the Kingston twine.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry for Halton.

Mr. HENDERSON. The government to-day by their whole policy of preferential tariff and free trade in twine, &c., are cultivating that lack of sentiment, and until some change is made in the policy of the government I am afraid these difficulties will crop up from time to time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would like the hon. member to tell me how to cultivate that sentiment which will induce farmers to purchase our twine. I think my hon. friend ought to cultivate the sentiment in his own constituency, and instead of making that fine speech, which is addressed exclusively to me, if he would go to his own constituency and tell his electors what they ought to do in the premises, he would be rendering a great service, and I am quite sure we will all appreciate his efforts.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, I have been endeavouring to do that all along the line, but I confess that when I have the whole force and policy of the government against me I find great difficulty and what I complain of is that the government will not change their policy. If the government would join me in the principles I advocate, we could very soon change that sentiment for the better interest of the country and of the Kingston binder twine manufactory. I would like the Minister of Justice to join me in advocating a better Canadian sentiment and to shape the policy of the government along lines that will invite people to use Canadian goods, Canadian cottons, Canadian woollens, binder twine, binders and everything that you can think of, Canadian. Let us cultivate a purely Canadian sentiment. If you go to the United States and enter a shop you will see that if a piece of cotton is laid on the counter, probably ninety-nine out of one hundred ladies will buy that piece of American cotton because it is American. Will the Minister of Justice undertake to say that there is the same sentiment among our Canadian people? It is a matter of extreme regret to me and we must adopt some policy in this country that will produce a better Canadian sentiment.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am not in woollens or cottons or ladies furnishings; I am in binder twine and if my hon. friend will undertake to tell me how I can sell my binder twine I shall be very glad. I cannot deal with vague generalities about Canadian sentiment; I have to get back to binder twine. If he will help me to sell my binder twine I will be satisfied.

Mr. HENDERSON. Just create the sentiment.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And the taste for ladies furnishings.

Mr. HENDERSON. Give the Canadian market a taste for twine made in Canada, impose such protection as will preserve our market for Canadian twine, and inside of five years you will have such a strong sentiment in favour of Canadian twine that I undertake to say there will be no question about the quality of the twine you produce.

Mr. BLAIN. On the question of Kingston twine I wish to express my opinion. I think that the twine manufactured there is good and the farmers of this country have no ground of complaint whatever. The twine coming into my own county is generally appreciated by people of both political parties, if you wish to discuss the matter from a political standpoint. But what I say is that there must be something wrong in the department somewhere if the twine is not sold. I do not wish to complain—perhaps I would not be in a position to point out where the changes should be—but I think that if the Kingston penitentiary is manufacturing good twine, as in my opinion it is, the situation would be improved by manufacturing only pure manilla twine, abandoning the manufacture of the other kind altogether. Then I think that parliament would endorse the minister in spending some money to ensure the sale of the twine direct to the farmer. There must be something at fault in the department somewhere or this quantity of twine which is very small in proportion to the quantity used, would be sold every year. In view of the fact that an enormous quantity of twine is used in Canada, there is something wrong somewhere, or else the twine would be sold every year. I may say that in my own county a great many orders have been sent in during the last three years, and they have not been supplied, for the reason that the department stated that they were sold out of pure manilla twine.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is quite right—the 650 feet twine.

Mr. BLAIN. A few counties would consume every pound of twine almost, manufactured in the Kingston penitentiary, but my hon. friend is not manufacturing the kind the farmers want.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The inspector informs me that we are not now making anything except pure manilla.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Might I ask what has been done in reference to the claims that were made against the government on account of poor twine ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The inspector tells me that every claim that has been put in has been satisfactorily adjusted, and that there is not a single claim now pending.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I understood from the parties who spoke to me a few months ago that the claim that they had put in had not at that time been paid.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Would my hon. friend give me the name of the party ?

Mr. LEFURGEY. Mr. Lee, of Victoria.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If my hon friend will send us a note we will look into it. I want to say there is a prejudice all over this country against prison-made goods, and that prejudice applies to binder twine and operates to the detriment of the factory. It is a prejudice that is fostered in some directions probably by the labour unions. Of course, we think that our twine is good. I am so advised at all events, and I see no reason why in the interest of Canada at large, our twine should not be bought. After all, this is the people's factory ; the people of Canada are paying for this. It is an attempt honestly made by the government to protect the farmers of Canada against the combine outside; and even if it does cost a little to keep it going, it seems to me that the people of the country ought to appreciate the fact that we are making this effort.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. minister has told us that this is an effort to protect the farmers. I would like him to tell me how he is going to protect the farmers by putting his twine on the market at a price just a shade below the price fixed by the great American trust. It is well known that the cost of twine is not what fixes the price; it is just what the great American trust chooses to fix it at ; and yet the minister fixes his price just within a shade of the combine price. Under these circumstances, I do not think that he is offering much protection to the farmer. The way to fix the price would be upon the basis of the actual cost of the material and labour. I believe the best twine made in the country is not pure manilla. I do not think the farmers want pure manilla. They want a twine composed of about 60 per cent manilla and 40 per cent sisal. The quantity of pure manilla twine used in this country is quite small as compared with the mixed twine. If you take 60 per cent of the cost of a pound of manilla fibre and 40 per cent of the cost of a pound of sisal, and remember that about 20 per cent of the whole thing is coarse oil, a cheaper article. you will bring the cost of the binder twine very much below the figure which the minister gives. That would be the true way to fix the price if you wanted to protect the farmer, and not simply to shade below the price of the combine.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a good deal of this twine sold in my section of the country; but the farmers got a bad impression of it because at first they could not get the twine they wanted, and later on it was sold to a private dealer for about half the money they paid. For instance, the farmer paid 10c a pound and the private dealer bought the balance for 5c, and the impression got abroad that the department were selling at too high a price to the farmer, and were losing on what was sold to the private dealer. With regard to the price, it is generally conceded that whatever the raw material costs, binder twine can be made at a fair profit for about 1c a pound ; so that if the raw material cost an average of 8½c. a pound, the government could sell it at 9½c and have a fair profit. I would suggest that if the government would allow a small commission to some person to go around among the farmers and take orders, they would sell a very much larger quantity of twine. The complaint of parties who took orders in my section was that they practically got nothing in the shape of a commission that would be a fair compensation for their labour, or they could have sold a great deal more of it. That might be done for the benefit of both the department and the farmers.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I move that the House do now adjourn. My hon. friend yesterday asked me for some information in regard to the Transportation Commission. The Commission to-day is composed of Mr. Robert Reford, of Montreal ; Mr. Edward C. Fry, of Quebec, and Mr. J. H. Ashdown, of Winnipeg. It has not made a report. I think it made an interim report last year in regard to St. John. Mr. Reford, I am sorry to say, has tendered his resignation on account of illness. We have asked him to reconsider his determination, and have not heard from him since.

Mr. FOSTER. What business will be taken up to-morrow ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The resolution of the Minister of Justice with regard to the appointment of judges to the Railway Commission, then the Census Bill, and then Supply, taking up the Public Works estimates.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 6.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 3, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. GERVAIS presented the first report of the select committee appointed to supervise the official report of the Debates of the House during the present session as follows :—

Your committee recommend that their quorum be reduced from eight to five members.

H. GERVAIS,
Chairman.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 24) respecting the Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 25) respecting the Walkerton and Lucknow Railway Company.—Mr. P. H. McKenzie.

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Sovereign Fire Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. E. F. Clarke—by Mr. Osler.

Bill (No. 27) respecting certain patents of the Facer Solid Steel Car Wheel Company of Perth, Limited.—Mr. Caldwell—by Mr. Telford.

Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the Northwest Telephone Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 29) respecting the Canada Southern Bridge Company.—Mr. German—by Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 30) respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—Mr. German—by Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 31) respecting the Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Company.—Mr. German—by Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the London and St. Clair Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 33) respecting certain patents of Jean Effront—Mr. L. P. Demers—by Mr. Rivet.

Bill (No. 34) respecting the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Georgian Bay and Seaboard Railway Company.—Mr. Grant—by Mr. Scott.

BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved that the House do go into committee to consider a proposed resolution respecting the Board of Railway Commissioners. He said : Before you leave the chair, I may venture to say a word or two in explanation of this resolution. I am sure there are a great many people in this country, and probably there are some in this House, who do not fully appreciate the extent and importance of the duties that have been assigned to the Board of Railway Commissioners by the Railway Act of 1903. In that view I venture to trespass upon the attention of the House for a few moments while I attempt to explain some of the features of the Act which deal with the most important of these duties. Generally, the Board has control over all railroads in Canada with the exception of government railways, and with respect to those railways they control the incorporation and organization of the company, the location of the line, the construction of the railway, and its management and control after it is in operation.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. In what way do they control the incorporation ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They control the incorporation to this extent, that if the requirements of the Act are not carried out with respect to the incorporation of a company, the Railway Commissioners have power to intervene and see that the Act is complied with—to that extent only. Now speaking specifically, I may say that the board is called upon, in the first instance, after the company is organized, to see to the location of the line of railway, to control the grades, and curves, and general character of the construction; they have also the supervision over all plans, profiles and books of reference ; they are responsible for the location and construction being in accordance with the lines laid down by special Act. The board is called upon to act in the case of any omission, error or misstatement in any plan, profile or book of reference, and to correct the same ; also in cases of deviation which require to be made. In adition to that, they are called upon to deal with questions of expropriation of land, with the construction of branch lines, the control of crossings and junctions, interference with navigable waters, construction and operation of telegraph and telephone lines, drainage, farm crossings, fences, gates, cattle-guards, bridges and tunnels, stations and inspection.

Mr. FOSTER. Telegraph and telephone lines in connection with the railways.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In connection with the railways. Perhaps I might read a paragraph I have on that point, with respect to the construction and operation of telegraph and telephone lines, they have power to interfere in so far as the lines run along the railway, and supervision over the rates and charges to be made for the transmission of messages and of agreements for the use of such lines by other companies ; placing wires across railways, construction, operation and maintenance of telegraph and telephone lines, for the distribution of light, heat and power along, upon, under or over highways or other public places, under power granted by parliament, if the company cannot get consent of the municipality in that regard. That is to say, if there is a conflict between a railway company and municipality, the Board of Commissioners

has authority to act between the two. Now with respect to the operation of railways. The board has a duty to be familiar with the first equipment, apparatus and appliances used or to be used upon all trains and upon the railway generally ; the accommodation, running and operation of trains, the causes and prevention of accidents ; reports of accidents must be made to the board by the railway ; the causes of fire, removal from the right of way of weeds and inflammable matter. They also make rules and regulations for the operation of trains and to make them uniform among all railways. Then I think the most important duty that is given to them is with respect to the tolls that railway companies are entitled to charge. I would like to draw my hon. friend's attention to section 255 of the Railway Act which practically makes it obligatory upon all railways in this country to submit their tolls for approval before they can collect either freight or passenger rates. In addition to that, the board is entitled and is bound to see to the enforcement of all penalties which are incurred. They also have charge of the supervision and approval of all amalgamation and traffic agreements.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the hon. gentleman say whether there is any distinction in their jurisdiction over Dominion railways that are incorporated by the Dominion and those incorporated by a province.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This has reference of course only to Dominion railways, all railways under the control of the Dominion of Canada—perhaps I ought to add except government railways. I may also say that, by way of comparison, you will find that the Board of Railway Commissioners in this country exercise all the powers that are vested in England in the Board of Railway Commissioners which they have there, and in addition, all the powers with respect to control of railways that are vested in the Board of Trade in England ; that is to say, that our Board of Railway Commissioners in this country has as large powers as those two bodies have in England, and furthermore, if you want to go further in the way of comparison, you will find that our board has more ample powers than those that are conferred upon the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States, or upon the railway commissions of the states. Then, I think I may safely say that this board has the largest powers of any tribunal I know of at the present time outside of the parliament of Canada, speaking as far as Canada is concerned. In England two commissioners are appointed each one with a salary of £3,000 sterling and in addition to the two commissioners that are appointed there are three ex-officio commissioners. These ex-officio commissioners are the Lord Chancellor of England, the Lord President of the Court of Sessions in Scotland and Lord Chancellor in Ireland, so that there are in reality five commissioners, two appointed and three ex-officio. The Lord Chancellor sits I presume when the cases have reference to English railways, the Lord President of the Court of Sessions in Scotland sits when the cases have reference to Scotch railways and the Lord Chancellor of Ireland sits in connection with Irish cases.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the deciding quorum ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK : A majority, I believe.

Mr. FOSTER. A majority of those present or a majority of the whole board ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. A majority of those present. The Chief Commissioner with us is the most important person. The findings of the board on all questions of fact are conclusive in all courts in this country, but on questions of law the Chief Commissioner's opinion prevails. The Chief Commissioner, when a question is determined by the board to be one of law, has absolute control over the determination of that question.

Under these circumstances it is not necessary for me to say that it is exceedingly important that we should make a proper choice for this position. It is important to have a man of legal training and if possible of wide judicial experience. He should also be familiar with the necessities of the country, and it is most desirable that he should be as far removed as possible from all contact with the great railway corporations. It is important that we should get a man, who has not, recently at all events, been connected as counsel with one of our railway corporations. In the light of these requirements we think we have found a man who is prepared to accept the position, who is almost an ideal man for the place. The man to whom the position will be offered is Mr. Justice Killam, of the Supreme Court, This gentleman was educated for the bar in the province of Ontario, was called to the bar there and practised his profession in that province. He afterwards moved to the west settling in Winnipeg where he practised his profession several years, until 1885, when the government of Sir John Macdonald appointed him to the High Court of the province of Manitoba. He then became chief justice of Manitoba and within the last two years he was promoted to the Supreme Court of Canada of which court he is now a member. The legal profession, at all events, will agree with me when I say that he is a man qualified in all respects, by temperament, by reason of his intellectual qualities and by reason of his judicial experience, to fulfil the duties of this important office.

Mr. SPROULE. He has had no experience as a railway man.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He has never operated a railway as far as my knowledge goes,

but I think he has had experience in railway matters in connection with the Supreme Court and also as a member of the bar and as a judge in Manitoba. In any event the result of our selection makes it necessary for me to bring in these resolutions. The resolutions are not intended to add anything to the position in so far as Mr. Justice Killam is concerned, but they are intended to widen the field from which we may be able to make our selection for this important office. I will now proceed to explain in what respect. At the present time the judges of our high courts are entitled to a retiring allowance. If a judge has been on the bench of the superior courts of this country for fifteen years he is entitled to retire at the expiration of that period on two-thirds of his salary. If he has been on the bench for thirty years he is entitled to retire on his full salary. If he has attained the age of seventy years and has been on the bench for 25 years he is entitled to retire on his full salary, and the same thing applies if a judge has reached the age of 75 years and has been 20 years on the bench. Mr. Justice Killam has been on the bench since 1885 and he has now 20 years of judicial service to his credit. He is 55 years of age and in ten years from this he will be entitled to retire, if he remained on the bench, at his full salary. The intention of the resolutions is to allow this time to count; that is to say that the time he would spend on the Railway Commission, if he is appointed for ten years, will count absolutely in the same way as if he had continued to occupy a seat on the bench. He would not gain anything by his transfer, but he would not be put in a position where he would lose any of the benefits and advantages he has now acquired.

Mr. SPROULE. He will gain a larger salary.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He does get a larger salary. He gets $3,000 a year more, but at the same time he forfeits the right to his retiring allowance under the law as we now have it. I trust I have made my meaning clear. The intention is to make it possible for Mr. Justice Killam to accept the position which is now offered to him without in any way forfeiting the right to the retiring allowance which he has as a judge of the Supreme Court.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), in presenting this resolution has pointed out to the House what he says the main object of the resolution is, namely, to widen the field from which the Chief Commissioner can be drawn. I think I shall be able to show the House that the main intention of this resolution is to circumscribe the powers of the commission, and to bring to the attention of the House just what the situation is to-day, I propose to read an extract from the 'Weekly Sun' published in the issue of last week. It is to the following effect:

Time Judgment was Rendered.

It is now seven months since various farm organizations presented before the Railway Commission, at a meeting held at Toronto, a statement of some of the grievances which farmers have to complain of in the matter of freight rates. The statement included complaints as to the rates on small fruits, apples, beans, cattle, and the rate on grain, as compared with grain products.

A short time after the hearing, the railway companies voluntarily conceded a good deal of what had been contended for in regard to the rate on small fruits; a small concession was also made on apples in boxes, and on pears when mixed with apples, and these concessions were subsequently approved by the Railway Commission. But nothing whatever has yet been done to the question of the rate on apples in barrels, and the vastly greater grievances (because a larger number are affected by them), in the rates on beans, grain, and cattle. The decision in regard to these more important matters should have been rendered long since. The resignation of Mr. Blair, whilst it upset the work of the commission in dealing with some cases, did not directly affect these, because all three commissioners heard the complaints entered at the Toronto meeting, and the two commissioners still on the board are legally competent to pronounce upon the same.

One great advantage that was hoped for from the appointment of the Railway Commission was that the new court, being a movable body, would be easily reached by the common people. That advantage certainly has been secured. The commission is easy of access. The hope was also entertained that the commission would be more prompt in rendering its decisions than the old Railway Committee of the Privy Council.

That hope is being rapidly dispelled, and if there is much longer delay in the cases mentioned it will be altogether dissipated. Justice to the farmers affected and justice to the Railway Commission itself demands a prompt decision on the farmers' cases heard at the Toronto sitting.

In other words a newspaper which represents the great farming interest of this country has pointed out that the farmers are disappointed with the workings of this commission and most of all that they are disappointed in the slowness with which it has acted and the slowness with which the vacancy created over three months ago has been filled. I think I shall be able to show that it will be in the interests of the country that the government should not go on with this measure, but that they should actually abandon it and forthwith proceed as the law now stands to appoint a commissioner. The other day the Prime Minister, when speaking to a Bill that was up in the House dealing with railway matters, or rather dealing with this very important question, said that the government were negotiating with a gentleman on the Supreme Court who was to take the position, and that the main cause of delay was that the judge wished to finish his judgments before he would undertake to work on the commis-

sion. It would have been a good thing if the late chief commissioner, the late chairman of the commission, had been guided in the same way and had finished up his judgments before abandoning his position. I do not think the prime minister told us all the facts when he made that statement; he neglected to tell us that the judge not only wished to finish his judgments, but that he wished to make special terms with the government before taking the position. These special terms are contained in this resolution.

What does this resolution propose? In substance it proposes to abandon the good old principle that no judge in this country should be promoted. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) is on record as always advocating that there should be no promotion of judges, 'once a puisne judge, always a puisne judge,' and his colleagues in the government have always supported that in theory and avoided it in practice. The result is that the judges of this country are beginning to think that they can so conduct themselves on the bench as to earn promotion and they are looking for promotion. Promotion of judges seems to be the order of the day. We are getting away from the old practice and holding before the judges the idea that they can in some way merit political preferment. Another way in which the sanctity of the bench is being violated is by the appointment of judges on political commissions. We had a commission of this kind in Ontario and a very fitting comment on it was passed by a newspaper the other day. This comment on the Gamey case is an example of the criticism to which the judges are exposed.

Gamey vs. Stratton

Ontario reverses the judgment of Boyd, chancellor, and Falconbridge, chief justice.

That was a case where judges were taken from the bench and asked to try a political case. They gave their decision and the result is that the people think a great deal less of the bench for their being employed in these cases. Caustic criticisms such as I have just read are passed on the conduct of judges, and in that way the respect that we all ought to have for our bench is reduced. Judges have to try a great many political cases connected with elections in this country and they will see as everybody will see --and judges are not more infallible than any one else—that in trying these political cases they are subject to the temptation, at least people will say they are subject to the temptation, of looking out for themselves and earning preferment or promotion if they can see a way of making their decisions suit the views of the party that may be in power. Once a puisne judge always a puisne judge is a good principle; a judge ought not to be looking for promotion to be the subject of special agreements and special legislation in his interest when it is proposed to translate him from one position to another. I am in favour of the judges of this country being better paid, and if the government had brought forward a resolution of this kind and at the same time had proposed to reduce the number of county judges in Ontario it would have met with my support, but I can only say this to the judges of this country that in the meantime while their salaries are so low as they are to-day, they will be much better occupied in giving their sole attention to the judicial cases that may be brought before them, trying to live within their incomes, leading the simple life and not at all hoping to get preferment by any conduct of their own on the bench. Unfortunately, after all the promises that have been made, with special legislation of this kind coming down, the feeling is becoming general in this country that every one has not the confidence in the bench that they ought to have by reason of these promotions, and if this is the case something wrong has taken place. Respect for the bench is being broken down by a political party that seems to be trying to advance its interests through the bench. Let them employ everything else they care to, but let the administration of justice be removed from political influences, and above all let there be no hope held out to the judges that better terms await them if they should happen to please that political party. If a judge sees fit to come down from the bench, as this judge who has been named here to-day is doing, among the common herd, let him take the chances of the common herd. Why should special legislation be passed for any man who comes from the bench among ordinary people and takes up an ordinary occupation? Here we have another case of class legislation on behalf of a man who comes from the bench. If you pass special legislation and make special provision for the chief of the commission, does it not follow that the same terms must be awarded to his colleagues on that commission? If this commissioner's pension is to be provided for, if he is to be made non-removable from office, why was it not proper for the second and third commissioners to be treated in a similar way? Who is a lawyer in this country that he should have special legislation either with regard to his removal from office or any other matter in which he may be concerned? The lawyers and judges have enough privileges in this country, and when judges come down among the common herd, in the ordinary rut, there should be no special legislation in their interest.

This brings me to the worst aspect of this proposal. Let me read clause 1 out of the proposed resolution:

Resolved, That if a judge of any Superior Court in Canada is appointed chief commissioner of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada he shall not be removed at any time by

the Governor in Council except upon address of the Senate and House of Commons.

Let us see what illustration of that proposal can be found in the record of the debate when we passed this Bill. The then Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) at page 3,855 of 'Hansard' of 1903, speaking on the Railway Bill and on this very point, says :

The opinion of Council, in going over the Bill, was that it would be desirable to place the members of the commission very much in the same position as lieutenant governors under the British North America Act. It is a very cumbrous proceeding to invite the action of the Senate and House of Commons by an address. Cases might arise in which it would be very important and desirable that prompt action should be taken without waiting for a session of parliament.

Now, the serious thing in this Bill is that the chairman of this commission is to be put outside of the jurisdiction of parliament, where he was put by that Act. The great argument held out to the country from one end to the other in favour of the Act was that we were to have a chairman on that commission who could be removed from office by the Governor in Council, whose conduct could be discussed in the House, and who, if that conduct were found to be not in the public interest, could be removed from office forthwith by the government of the day. And yet, a year after all these assurances were given to the people, a Bill is introduced, the first clause of which proposes to put the chairman of this commission beyond the possibility of removal by the Governor in Council and beyond the control of parliament. That is the main object of this Bill. Its object is to emasculate the Act passed two years ago. And just to show you how powerful that measure is, let me read what Mr. Blair said on this point when he was dealing with the measure. He said :

When you come to read some of these clauses it may seem that the powers that are given—if they are pressed to the extremity of their literal meaning ; if an interpretation is going to be given to them by the board right up to the limit which their language would bear—it might seem that you are giving to the Railway Commission power which would enable them to crush the railways, or to do serious injury to the business interests of the country.

These great powers were given to this Railway Commission ; but now an effort is being made to put a man into the position of chairman of that body who will or will not exercise these great powers without being amenable to the criticism of parliament, or even the criticism of the Governor in Council. The powers of the commission are immense, I grant. There never was a tribunal so empowered as this one is ; but that being so, its powers ought to be kept under control, and it ought to be where parliament could regulate it and enforce the performance of its duties. But, instead of that, we have before us a proposal to put these great powers into the hands of a man——

Mr. COCHRANE. A Czar.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. A Czar who will not be amenable to parliament or to the Governor in Council, who can only be removed by an address from the Senate and House of Commons, which the man who created the commission said is a cumbrous method and hard to carry out, which, in fact, cannot be carried out. Here is the object of this Bill unfolded to us—not to widen the limits from which the chairman of the commission may be drawn, but to nullify what was expected to result from the passing of the Bill. When Mr. Blair brought down the Bill he also said this :

The Bill which we submitted last year contained, and the present Bill, when printed, will be found to contain a clause providing that the members of the commission are only removable on an address of both Houses of parliament to the Governor General. This, on full consideration, we concluded to change, and although the Bill when it is distributed will contain such a clause, it is an oversight which will be remedied in the committee. We propose that the members of the commission shall be removable in the same manner as the lieutenant governors of the provinces, namely, by the Governor General in Council for cause.

This vital principle of the Bill it is proposed, one year after it has been the law, to wipe out and abandon altogether.

Then the question comes up, in whose interest is this proposal made ? Why this change in policy ? Is there any possible doubt what the reason of it is ? The railways of this country have found out at last what the great powers of this commission are, and they have set about, in a very clever way, to have them 'cribbed, cabined and confined'—to have the powers of the commission reduced ; and they are out now looking for a judge, if they can get this amendment passed, to go on that bench who will be friendly to them. In the lobby here to-day, whom do you see ? You see the twin railway lobbyists, Mr. Charlie Drinkwright and Mr. Willie Rainwater, as I heard them called the other day. These are the two men who are to select a man to fill this position. They are the men who are engineering the lobby here to-day, to have a judge put on the commission who will not be amenable to parliament or to the Governor in Council, and who can only be removed from that position by an address of the Senate and House of Commons, which the late chairman of the commission said is a very cumbrous method. I want to tell the new men who have come into this House, especially the men from the west, that the promise made to the farmers and business men of this country was that this tribunal would be speedy in its methods and simple in its procedure, that the men in charge of its administration would be easily removed from office, and that absolute justice would

be done. Instead of that we are to have a chief commissioner who cannot be removed —who will be selected on the advice of the railway companies, as I believe, because they are the dominating influence in this country. There are no twenty men in this House who have the influence of a Drinkwater or a Wainwright in matters of this kind. I regret to say it, but these men have found out, on the advice of their solicitors, that this Railway Act does contain a large measure of protection to the people, and they have set about in this peculiar way to try to offset the merits of that Act. I say to the men representing the farmers, whether of the west or of Ontario, and the men representing the business interests of this country, that an effort is being made to-day by these resolutions to stifle that great piece of legislation, which ought to stand to the credit of the Liberal party, but which to-day, one year after its birth, they are proceeding to strangle. Now let me read what Mr. Blair's promises to the farmers were :

> In considering this, bearing in mind that it is the strength and pressure of the public opinion which has been aroused by what the farmers of the country have felt to be their particular grievance ; having regard to the enormous extent of these interests, not only in eastern Canada, but growing with such tremendous rapidity in our great west, I am satisfied that I speak with the approval of all my colleagues when I say, that the selection which we will make to occupy a place on this board, particularly in respect to the business interests of this country which are connected with transportation, will be such a selection as will commend itself heartily to the approval of the farming community, and will promote and further their interests.

If you want to tell me that the business and farming interests are to be protected and get speedy justice from the Railway Commission, by putting a man at the head of that commission who can only be removed by an address from parliament, you are asking the farmers to accept something they will not accept. What we want is a court which will render speedy justice, which will not be paralyzed by cumbersome procedure, and which will be composed of men responsible for what they do. Speaking on the question of responsibility, Mr. Blair made this statement, which will be found at page 3858 of the Official Debates of 1903:—

> I think that having declared that no commissioner shall hold these things, we can rely upon the Governor in Council enforcing it. It seems to me that the control of the government would be more effective than any other.

And he made that an argument in favour of the Bill, but now this control by the government is to be abandoned. What will the farmers think of this proposition when they recollect what they were promised ? Besides just look at the great powers vested in the chairman of this commission. He has not only the privileges I have mentioned, but in clause 8 still further powers are given him—powers that I have tried to have restricted, but so far have tried in vain. Clause 10 says:—

> Not less than two commissioners shall attend at the hearing of every case, and the chief commissioner, when present, shall preside, and his opinion upon any question, which, in the opinion of the commissioners, as a question of law, shall prevail.

Not only is he to be not removable by the act of the government and placed beyond criticism in parliament, but he is to be the sole judge on questions of law, and thus is to be more than equal to his two colleagues. The government are not even proposing to remove that power but are instead increasing the powers of this irresponsible man, and are placing the people in such a position that they will have no effective control. An hon. member the other day spoke of the procedure before this court and showed that it was very much like that followed in other courts. You will have to file your petition and there will be joinders and rejoinders and all that sort of thing which create indefinite delay. The Minister of Justice told us in reply that the chairman will have power to prevent any unnecessary delay, but who is to compel this irresponsible man to administer the law in such a way that it will be speedy and effective, if he cannot be removed. It may be his duty to do this, it may be his duty to see that the lives of the people are protected, but how is he to be compelled to do his duty? Hon. members are aware of what happened only yesterday at one of these railway crossings in the United States. Ten women were killed in one sleigh by reason of a bad crossing, and similar accidents are happening here every day, yet we are told that the chairman of this commission is to be made an irresponsible official and that the government, instead of proposing wiser legislation, intend putting the whole administration of the Railway Act in the hands of this irresponsible man, in whom is vested this extraordinary power of overruling his two colleagues on questions of law. What the intention of the government is was very fairly brought out the other day. We had the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Minister of Justice both telling the House that they considered all these matters affecting the safety of the people and their protection from railways should be left to the commission to decide, that parliament should wait and not interfere, and that this commission would do everything. And three days later they come down with a proposal to emasculate the Bill and give the head of the Railway Commission special powers over everybody else. I have not a word to say against Judge Killam as a man, a citizen and a judge; but I do object to the Railway Act being emasculated in this fashion, and I do not believe that such a

proposal will meet with the endorsement of the people.

Before this discussion is through, I intend to go into another feature of it, and that is the peculiar circumstances under which the late chairman gave up his place. If ever there was a shameful act committed in this country, it was the act of that man who himself had that law put through creating this Railway Commission, who subsequently resigned his cabinet position on account of some difference with his colleagues, and whom the government, we are told, with some idea of benevolence or conciliation, made chairman of the commission. They asked us to vote, and we voted readily some $50,000 to $75,000 to pay for the organization of that commission. It will cost at least $100,000 a year. We are paying about $4,000 or $5,000 rent to house that commission. We voted last year $22,000 to buy a special car in which this commission could travel about the country administering justice. Then, all at once, this man abandoned his office and left unsettled a lot of cases which were pending before it. If ever there was a disregard of public interest, it was that. If ever there was a man to whom ought to be meted out some kind of punishment, who deserves particular ignominy, it is that man who abandoned his office and refused to decide the cases that had come before him, and in which consequently to-day all the procedure will have to be gone over again. That was the most shameful act I know of in connection with the history of this country; and not a word of explanation has the government condescended to give us of that incident. I do not know the reasons which actuated Mr. Blair. I have my own suspicions, but is there anything worse in our history than such conduct, and then to have no explanation made of it, to have no reason given us why he left that commission in the manner he did without the slightest regard for the public interest? The government to-day should be engaged rather in making provisions to avoid a similar occurrence in the future. They should be engaged in framing some law which would prevent any man, who may in the future hold that position, from abandoning office and leaving a host of cases unsettled, as was done in this case. Instead of trying to pass this Bill through the House, the government should at once abandon it. They should rather seek, not on the bench, some competent man who will take the chairmanship of that commission, without requiring any special legislation to divest him of all responsibility. Let them man that commission properly and let judgments be given in those cases that are pending without further delay and thus do justice to the people. That is a reasonable proposition. But instead of that, they propose to emasculate the Act by making the man who is to be head of the commission utterly irresponsible to the government and the country. It may be all very well for hon. gentlemen in this House to be parties to legislation of this kind.

It is very fine to sacrifice public rights to corporation interests, which seems to be the impelling force in this matter; but, if anything has been proven by recent events, it is that the people do rise when they find that corporation interests are being placed ahead of public rights. The greatest assertion of the public determination to defend its own rights was that in the province of Ontario the other day. True, the people voted for cleaner methods in elections and in favour of cleaner public life and better conduct on the part of ministers of the Crown and other representatives. But it was also a rising of the people against a government that had abandoned public rights. Hon. gentlemen opposite may think that, just after an election and at the beginning of a new parliament, they can afford to strangle this law for the adoption of which they have taken so much credit. But the people will hold them responsible. And I want to tell hon. gentlemen who are new members of this House, on whichever side of the House they may be that they will be held responsible by the people if they support a measure of this kind. And I want to tell them also that, after the decision in Ontario there are no safe seats in this country for men who turn their backs upon the rights of the public. An hon. friend behind me asks me, how about North York. Did you ever see such a revolution as there was there ? Was there ever such a condemnation as that of a minister of the Crown who had been the constant foe of public rights ? And Hon. J. M. Gibson, formerly Attorney General, the man whose office above all others was consecrated to the maintenance of public rights and municipal rights, was snowed under. Five ministers identified with the attack upon the rights of the people were buried under the landslide. A great, a dominant party, was swept from power because they had forgotten the rights of the people. I call upon the men here who represent the farmers, I care not whether of the maritime provinces, Quebec, Ontario or the west, to stand for public rights, and I tell them that if they have the hardihood to vote for such a Bill as this, a Bill that emasculates the law by placing at the head of the commission an irresponsible appointee, and makes provision for him above all others in the community, they are not acting in the interest of the people who sent them here.

Mr. W. A. GALLIHER (Kootenay). My hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in his usual energetic way, has discussed this resolution at some length and with some warmth, and has held up certain bogeys with which he hopes to frighten

new members of the House. He speaks of this measure as being in the interest of corporations and against public rights. From his own argument I fail to see any justification for that conclusion. He knows little, personally I presume about Mr. Justice Killam. I have had the opportunity of practising at the bar with that gentleman, and I have had the honour of practising before him when he occupied the prominent position of a judge of the Supreme Court of Manitoba. I know his personal worth, and I know that as a lawyer he was considered among the first in the Dominion. As a judge he has been noted for his fairness and ability. That, I think, will not be disputed by any one who knows him. That he will be influenced in his new position in favour of the interests of corporations, I emphatically deny, basing that denial upon my personal knowledge of his character. Why my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has termed this proposed new appointee an irresponsible head of the commission I fail to see. It is true that if this Bill passes, his removal is taken out of the hands of the government. But it is put in the hands of what I consider a higher tribunal, the parliament of Canada. To appoint one under these conditions is hardly to make him the irresponsible head of the commission. If, as we all admit, we need at the head of this commission a man of ability, a man of honesty, a man of fairness, we have in this gentleman, if he is placed in that position, a man who fills the bill in every one of these respects. If he receives this appointment and performs his duties with equity and impartiality, in what way can the public interests be said to be sacrificed by the change proposed in this Bill? It is well enough to raise the cry that public interests are being sacrificed for the benefit of corporations but, for my part, I would certainly require more than the statement of my hon. friend from South York to convince me that that cry was justified. The hon. gentleman again raises the old cry that the chief commissioner has more power than the other two put together, because he is the judge of the law. Well, the object of appointing to this position of chairman of the commission a man learned in the law is that he may, in that position determine, in all cases in which the law is involved, what the law is. A layman however cognizant of facts or capable of marshalling facts, yet, when it comes to deciding what the law of the subject is, can hardly be expected to do the work of one trained in the law and experienced therein. The other two members of the commission have their duties to perform. A majority of the court must agree upon the facts of the case. That is an important point to remember. The majority have agreed upon the facts, it is right, in my opinion, that questions of law should be decided by the man who is capable of deciding what the law is. My hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has referred to the late commissioner abandoning his office on pretty short notice. I agree that it was deplorable that, after all the trouble and expense gone to in making investigation into certain matters by the late chairman and his colleagues, those matters were left in an unfinished condition on his resignation. But I hope that my hon. friend does not blame the government for that gentleman resigning his position. It was quite within his right, if he saw fit, to retire from his position at any time, and the government could not prevent him from doing so. I agree with my hon. friend that it is something that ought not to have been done, and, in some respects I would go as far as he does in commenting on the facts. However there is another point in connection with it. We must remember, as I have suggested, the importance of having at the head of the commission a man in whom not only the government but this parliament and the people have confidence. Such a man is Mr. Justice Killam.

That gentleman occupies at the present time a seat on the Supreme Court bench. I agree with my hon. friend in his objection to the preferment of judges from one place to another, I object to that principle as thoroughly as he does. For instance, I deprecate holding forth an inducement to a judge on the bench that he may at some future time be promoted to a higher position on another bench. I agree with the hon. gentleman in that respect. But it is to be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that we are desirous of obtaining the best possible talent for the position of chief commissioner on that board. We believe, at all events, I do, knowing that gentleman well, that he possesses the highest qualifications, and I am sure the majority of us recognize his abilities, and believe that if Mr. Killam is appointed to that position we will have a man in every respect fitted for it. He will be abandoning what we all recognize as a life long position to take a position on the Board of Commissioners which may not be a lifelong position.

Now as we all know, a judge holds his position practically during life, or good conduct, and at a certain period he can retire and receive an allowance proportionate to the salary he has been getting. It is therefore a serious matter for a judge on the bench to consider whether he shall step down from that position and accept another position which may only last for a short time. I think it is not unreasonable to ask that some provision should be made for him in that regard. It is not a question of whether Mr. Killam or any other judge can be dismissed, for he can be dismissed. He cannot be dismissed perhaps, in as summary a manner as he could under the Act in its present form, but he can be dismissed by this parliament if his conduct as commis-

sioner is not fair, or if he is found incapable of performing his duties. Therefore, looking at the matter as I do, knowing this gentleman as I do, knowing his ability and his absolute fairness, I have no hesitation in saying that I believe he will fill that position, if appointed, both to the satisfaction of the farmers whose interest my hon. friend so laudably champions, and to the satisfaction of the country generally. For these reasons I shall have no hesitation in supporting the resolution.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). It has always seemed to me, since parliament met, that some explanation was due this House regarding the vacation of the position of Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners by the gentleman who held that post, but up to the present time we have had no explanation in this House. I think parliament was entitled to it, and especially so when this resolution was proposed. That appeared to me to be the proper time and opportunity to make an explanation. But the government has not vouchsafed the House any explanation; in fact, so far as parliament was entitled to it, they have treated parliament with contempt. Now I think that the government is not doing its full duty in keeping us in the dark in regard to that incident, so long as it persists in withholding an explanation.

I have nothing to say with regard to the qualifications or non-qualifications of Judge Killam, except this: that when it was first contemplated to appoint a railway commissioner, we were told that it was a sine qua non that the commission should be composed of three men, one of whom should be a railway expert. Now Mr. Justice Killam cannot fill the bill in that respect. Another member of the board was to be well versed in law, one whose qualifications and experience would enable him to perform satisfactorily his duties on that board. The third was to be a man of common sense. How far Mr. Justice Killam will come up to that standard, I do not know. But at any rate he is not a railway expert. Now one of the strong reasons why the government justified their selection of Mr. Blair for a commissionership, was that he was a railway expert in the highest sense of the term. We recognized all over the country that he was a man of experience, versed in the law, and one acquainted with parliamentary usages and parliamentary life. Now if these were essential qualifications for the chairman of that commission, certainly Mr. Justice Killam does not possess the whole of them.

But what chiefly strikes me in the government making this appointment is that they are weakening and lowering the dignity of the bench, and destroying the respect of the country in the judiciary, there is no doubt about that. If you have to take men from the bench to fill positions that can only be filled by a party government, the result will be to lessen the respect of the people for the bench. As my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has said, you offer a temptation to those who are on the bench, and who are always looking for promotion to a situation with higher emoluments or something else, and when that promotion can only be made by the party in power, it seems to me you are holding out a temptation for the bench to pander to the political party in power. Now I think that is wrong. We have always been led to believe in the past, and the late Sir John A. Macdonald emphasized that principle in the strongest possible way, that when a man was raised to the bench he was put there, so long as he performed his duty, for the rest of his life. We should always respect the bench and look upon its occupants as the very embodiment of fairness, for that reason, if for no other. Well, then, what becomes of that principle in this case? It is a total abandonment of that principle, and the consequence I say, must result in lessening the respect we have for the bench.

Then this is legislation for one special class, the judges. Why don't we make a provision that this position may be filled from any other class in the community? But here we make a special provision for only one class in the community, the judges. We take a judge from a bench where he is entitled to a superannuation allowance after he is worn out in the service of the country, and where he is given a salary, perhaps, lower than he would otherwise get because of that superannuation allowance which he is to receive after he is worn out. But we put this gentleman in a position where there is a larger salary and a large superannuation allowance as well. I do not think that he is entitled to either the one or the other. If he abandons the bench to take a lower position he should be satisfied with the emoluments that go with that position, and not expect those that accrue to another position, not only accrue to it by virtue of the law now on the statute-book, but which would accrue to it in the event of an amendment to that law giving a larger salary to judges and with a larger superannuation. This gives him the advantage of both, and it is only for the purpose of one class, the judges. Now I think in that respect the principle is wrong, it is making a specialty of that one class, taking them out from the rest of the community, and holding out inducements to them that are not offered to any other class.

Then it deprives parliament of the right to remove these men. It is true they can be removed at the end of ten years, because the term of office expires at the end of that period. But it deprives parliament of the right to remove them except by impeachment, on an address from both Houses of parliament. Now, that cannot be done. In

the experience of Canada I do not know whether it has ever been done or whether any judge of this country has been called to account. At the present time I have no remebrance of it ever having been done. remembrance of it ever having been done. a position that parliament will not or cannot remove them, no matter whether they do their duty faithfully and properly or not. There is practically no redress and they remain in power for ten years or until the expiration of their term. The government take away that supervision that parliament only a few years ago regarded as one of the essential powers to be exercised as a controlling influence over the party who occupies that position. I think it is wrong. Then again, I would like to ask why it is found desirable or proper that service in the admiralty court should count in this case.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Some gentlemen want to be called 'judge,' or 'your lordship.'

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, I do not think it is at all necessary for the purpose of making the resolution applicable to the judges that this is introduced. When the resolution goes into committee I intend to drop that clause.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that makes it a little less objectionable. That is subsection 5.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think when we discuss this resolution in committee and my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) thoroughly understands it he will see it is not objectionable.

Mr. SPROULE. These are my main objections to the resolution. I do not think the principle is a good one, and I do not think that by adopting the resolution we will be making the commission more effective than it has been heretofore.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, I have heard upon the floor of this House more than once some extraordinary doctrines enunciated by my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean)—but I think on this occasion he has fairly excelled himself. He has presented a doctrine which I think he has never heard before, which he has attributed to one party, but which he cannot justly attribute to either party in this country. The hon. gentleman has stated that it is a vicious principle that judges should be promoted from their first sphere of action, that it is a vicious principle that judges should ever be removed from positions to which they are first appointed. Once a puisne judge always a puisne judge. If we appoint a man to be a puisne judge then it is shut out from the government to appoint him the chief justice of the court of which he has been a member. If we appoint a man to be a judge in a lower court it is shut out from the government to appoint him to a higher court. I do not think that such a principle was ever proclaimed by any party in this country. I do not think that it should be admitted by any party, because I think it is a vicious and a wrong principle. If a man is appointed to the bench and if he is found to be a fit and proper person for a higher position, why in the world should he not be placed in the position for which he is fitted ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Because he will look for preferment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Is there any reason why a judge should be prevented from looking for preferment ? Is there any reason why a judge should not look forward to be the chief justice of the court of which he is a member ? Is there any reason why a deserving man should not be rewarded whether he sits on the bench or occupies any other position ? Or, is a judge to be the only man who is to have no incitement to do good ? Shall virtue be his reward and his only reward ? Has that principle ever been supported? On the contrary, Sir John Macdonald made it a boast that he would select the best men for the positions he had to fill, and we shall see how he did it. Let us take some examples from the courts. The government of Sir John Macdonald promoted Mr. Justice Casault to the chief justiceship of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec. It was also the government of Sir John Macdonald which made Mr. Justice Stuart chief justice. Could any fault be found with the government of Sir John Macdonald on either occasion ? Could better men have been selected ? When Mr. Justice Casault was appointed chief justice of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec, could any other man have been found who was preferable to him ? According to the doctrine of my hon. friend which we have just heard and which has been endorsed to a certain extent by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), though Mr. Justice Casault was the best man for the position, though he had proven by intelligence, fairness, education and experience that he was the best man for the position, yet once a puisne judge always a puisne judge. If that principle had been adopted the province of Quebec would have been deprived of the services which have been rendered on the bench by a most useful man in his sphere. Then, again, take another example which was afforded at the time the Supreme court was established. True, it was not established by Sir John Macdonald, it was established by Mr. Mackenzie, but the men who were appointed to the bench or most of them were taken from the benches of the provincial courts, Mr. Justice Taschereau was taken from the bench of the province of Quebec, Mr. Justice Strong from the bench of Ontario, Mr. Justice Richards from the bench of Ontario and Mr. Justice Henry

from the bench of Nova Scotia. They were all on the benches of these different provinces. Then, later on Mr. Justice Richards, upon having completed a career of great usefulness on the bench of the supreme court, was replaced. By whom was he replaced ? Did Sir John Macdonald, who had named Mr. Justice Richards as chief justice of the supreme court, go out of the supreme court for a new chief justice? Did he go out amongst the bar ? Sir John Macdonald chose as the successor of Chief Justice Richards, Mr. Justice Ritchie of the supreme court promoting him from the position of a puisne judge to that of chief justice. Later on Chief Justice Ritchie himself was removed and then another appointment was to be made. I forget whether it was made by the government of Sir John Macdonald or not ; at all events it was made by a government of the Conservative party who promoted Mr. Justice Strong to the position of chief justice. I am able to say, and everybody will admit that all these gentlemen were eminently fitted for the promotion which they received, and I have heard for the first time that either the government of Mr. Mackenzie or of Sir John Macdonald, ever did anything wrong when they selected men whom they thought best fitted for the positions and promoted them from the positions which they then adorned.

But, I go farther. My hon. friend stated also that judges should not be appointed on commissions ? Is that a principle of British justice ? Is it the position taken by my hon. friend that no judges may be appointed to be commissioners if there are facts to be investigated ? Let me refresh his memory with some facts which he has forgotten. When the Parnell commission was appointed to investigate a most important affair, who were the members chosen ? There were three judges taken from the bench and they were Mr. Justice Hannen, Mr. Justice Day and Mr. Justice Smith. I do not think in the face of these precedents that the position taken by my hon. friend is maintainable for a single moment. Then again, there was another case. We had thirty years ago a most important question, known as the Pacific scandal, to be investigated, and a commission was appointed by Sir John Macdonald. It was a political affair, the commission was organized to judge and to try a political offence, and who were the commissioners appointed? They were all taken, two of them, at all events were taken from the bench of the superior courts—Mr. Justice Pollette from the province of Quebec, Judge Gowan who was the judge of the county court in the province of Ontario and Mr. Justice Day was a retired judge. Not only that, but I would say to my hon. friend from East Grey, who also thinks that in these matters the example set by Sir John Macdonald was an example that we should always follow, that Sir John Macdonald went much farther. I remember, everybody remembers and hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have not forgotten, they have no reason to forget—on the contrary they have good and sufficient cause to remember—that an eminent judge of the province of Nova Scotia on a certain occasion was promoted to be what ?—to be chief justice ?—no, Sir, but brought here as a member of the government of Sir John Macdonald, brought here as Minister of Justice. The late Sir John Thompson was a member of the superior court of Nova Scotia and he was taken from the bench and brought here to be a member of the government of Sir John Macdonald. Under all these circumstances I do not know whether the party then in power made a mistake, but, now, because it suits an hon. gentleman opposite to put a slur upon a most honourable man, the hon. gentleman wants to put forward a doctrine of this kind.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says I have cast a slur on somebody. I have cast a slur on no one.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I leave it to the hon. gentleman to say if he did not cast a slur on him. If he says not, I shall withdraw the expression. He said that Mr. Justice Killam has been selected by two men who were here lobbying.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I said that the lobby would see that they got a judge, and would use their interest with the government to get a judge appointed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is what I call putting a slur upon a most honourable man. Mr. Justice Killam has been for twenty years on the bench ; he was not appointed by the party now in office, but by the party of the hon. gentlemen opposite. He was appointed to the Supreme Court of Manitoba, and he was an ornament to the Supreme Court of that province. Nobody ever said a word against him. He was promoted by this government to be a judge of the Supreme Court, and I think it was a good promotion and a well deserved promotion. I think it was a wise action on the part of this government to bring him here to be a member of the highest court of the land, and nobody until this moment ever said a word against him. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) has propounded extraordinary doctrines to-day. Because we looked about to secure a good man to fill the place of chairman of the commission—the hon. gentleman will agree, I suppose, that there is no more important position in this country than that of chairman of the Railway Commission, and that we want a man of good character, a man of ability, a man of experience, to fill that position—because we looked all over the land to find such a man, the hon. gentleman criticises us. We thought that we had found such a

man in Mr. Justice Killam; we think so still, and I do not believe any one in this House or out of it will bring a charge and say that this is not a good appointment. But Mr. Justice Killam had to abandon a most important position, a position in which he had greater opportunities than he has now; he is a man like everybody else, he has a family to look after, and no one expects that while serving the country he should give up any advantage he now enjoys in order to make a change. Therefore, we introduce this resolution which provides, what? That he shall lose nothing by the change, that he shall continue to have the advantages he has to-day. Yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean), in his extraordinary logic, tells us that the farmers of this community will be less secure than they are at the present time, because, as he says, the chairman of the Railway Commission shall not be removed by the government, but by parliament. This is an extraordinary doctrine for a man who poses as a radical. My hon. friend says that to-day, because the chairman, under the law which we propose to amend, is removable by the will of the government—for we have only to pass an Order in Council to remove him—because we propose to put around him more security, more independence, and to say that he shall be removable solely on an address of both Houses, my hon. friend says we have emasculated the commission. This is extraordinary logic. By the enactment we now propose, the new chairman of the Railway Commission will be more secure, more independent of the government, more independent of everybody and more distinctly liable only to his own conscience than before. We thought last year, when we made the appointments to the commission, that it would be safe to have the members removable, as lieutenant governors are, simply by action of the Governor General in Council. We think yet that perhaps that is sufficient, but we say if we appoint a gentleman from the bench, then, in order to have the public possess the same confidence, and more, in that man, he should continue to have the same privileges that he would have if he remained a member of the bench. If we find a man, as Mr. Justice Killam is, eminently fitted for the position, and go to him and say: We want to appoint you to that position, and he says: But I have a good position, why should I leave it? I can serve the country in my present safe and secure position, in which I give satisfaction to the public; why should I go and try a new position that holds out no inducements to me? We come to parliament and say we have selected the man whom we think best for the position, and ask parliament to see that he shall be as secure in the new duties that he is to discharge as he was in the duties he is now discharging, and I am sure that parliament will agree to that very reasonable proposal.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Then my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) says that this is emasculating the Act, and is lessening the security which the farmers and the public generally have. If there was a scintilla of reason or common sense—if he will pardon the expression—in his argument, I could understand him, but if he will reflect a little he will agree with me that there is not a scintilla of common sense in his argument. If a man is removable by the government to-day and if he will be removable next year, after this law is passed, not by the government, but by the joint action of the three branches of the legislature of Canada, then certainly he has far more security for himself under the new condition, and if we pursue the logic of the thing to the end, we will see that the people themselves have more protection than they have at the present time. We thought last year that with our mode of dealing with the commission the public were amply protected, but nobody can find fault if to-day we make the protection still more secure.

Mr. FOSTER. In what way would both Houses of parliament remove the commissioner? What would be the method?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The method would be the same as in similar cases; there have been cases of impeachment before. A petition would be brought to this parliament, and this House, after having the matter investigated, would pass an address and, the matter being taken to the Senate, an address would be passed in the Senate.

Mr. FOSTER. And if they disagreed?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Then there is no impeachment.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Would it be cumbrous?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Am I to believe that gentlemen on the other side of the House have come to this, that they have no more faith in parliamentary institutions? Are we to understand that because, possibly, a complaint is brought against a judge, and the two Houses disagree as to his impeachment, that we are to abandon that safeguard? Are we come to this, that the safeguard we give to the judges, that they are to be removed only by addresses of both Houses of parliament, is not a good and safe remedy to the public, because, forsooth, there may be disagreement? If this is the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, it is not my policy. I believe, on the contrary, that the system which has prevailed in England, and which prevails here to-day, is the best possible policy to guarantee the independence of the judges, and I do not believe that hon. gentlemen will seriously advance any other opinion. These are the reasons why we have introduced this legislation, and I believe it will commend itself to the good sense and good judgment of gentlemen on both sides of this House.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, as to the appointment intended to be recommended by the government under this Bill I have no objection to raise. I know the gentleman perfectly well; he was a judge in Manitoba and afterwards became a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada. He is a gentleman against whose honour, whose integrity and whose ability, no man says a word. But that is not the question before the House at the present moment. The question before us is the consideration of this resolution. The Prime Minister seemed to be astounded by the doctrine laid down by the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) as to the position the judges should occupy in this country. The position of a judge in the old country is this: Once he receives his appointment, if it is a county court judgeship or a puisne judgeship, to follow the words of the Minister of Justice, quoted by the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), he always remains so. That was the doctrine advocated by Sir John Macdonald. I have heard him impress it on this House again and again.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Lord Alverstone is an exception.

Mr. HAGGART. It is true that the practice was more honoured in the breach than in the observance, but I maintain that it is the principle which is followed in the great country which we admire so much, and whose record we regard with so much attention.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I may say that the same rule applies in England as applies here. The present Chief Justice of England was formerly Master of the Rolls, and the late Chief Justice Russell was a Lord Justice of Appeal when he was promoted.

Mr. HAGGART. Sometimes a judge in England receives a promotion to the chief justiceship of the court to which he belongs; but the hon. Minister of Justice cannot mention an increase in which a county court judge or a judge of an inferior court, has been promoted to a higher court. The rule in England is that once a man is appointed to a judgeship, he must make up his mind to remain there for the rest of his life, unless he receives promotion for seniority, as I think it ought to be, or for some exceptional cause, in his own court. The rule is a good one. A judge, once appointed by His Excellency the Governor General, is not removable except by impeachment of the Senate and House of Commons. He is placed in that position in order to be independent of any influence, especially from the Crown, that could possibly affect his judgment. The people of Great Britain are so careful to protect the rights and liberties of their judges against any encroachment of the Crown that they insist that no communication shall take place between the government of the country and a judge of any of the courts. What do we meet with here to-day? A set of resolutions showing that bargaining has been going on for a couple of months between a judge of the Supreme Court and the government of this country. The judge is offered the position of chief commissioner. He refuses to accept it unless certain conditions are agreed to. These conditions are set forth in these resolutions. I do not blame the judge. He occupies an important position upon the bench. In that position he is entitled to retiring allowance, and from it he cannot be removed, except by impeachment from this House and the Senate. He tells the government that under the conditions attached to the appointment of a commissioner he will not accept the position, notwithstanding the increase of salary offered. It is a matter of agreement, then, between the government and the judge. Is that pardonable in this country? Is it pardonable or just or in the interest of freedom, that negotiations should be carried on for a couple of months between the government of this country and a judge who is perhaps trying cases in which the government are interested? In Great Britain such a thing would not be allowed; there resolutions of this kind dare not be introduced. As my hon. friend from South York has pointed out, the chairman of the commission has a different position from that of the other two commissioners. They are removable by the Governor in Council for cause, while he is not at all amenable to the government or to this House except under the cumbrous form of a charge being made against him; and that charge must be either that some corrupt influence has affected his judgment or that he has not sufficient intelligence to conduct the business of the court over which he presides. These are the only two reasons for the impeachment of a judge. Under the British North America Act a judge can be removed only by impeachment of both Houses. That is a part of our constitution which we have not the power to alter. I suppose that we would have the power at some future time to alter these resolutions if we thought proper or to make the conditions under which the chief commissioner is appointed, the same as those which apply to the other commissioners. But here is the odd thing about this matter: one commissioner holds his office on different conditions from the other two. Two are removable for cause by the Governor in Council, while the other one is removable only by impeachment of both Houses. Why should there be this distinction? As my hon. friend from South York says, if the government want to improve the commission, let them alter that provision which makes the chief commissioner virtually the dictator in two out of every three cases that come before them. Most of the questions are legal questions, and on these he has the sole

decision. But what I rise particularly to protest against is the fact of arrangements being made between the government and a judge for the purpose of taking him from the highest court in the land in order to make him the chief commissioner. As I said before, nothing can be said against the gentleman who is to be recommended for the appointment. He is capable in every respect of filling the position, because I have heard his brother judges and others speak of him as a man of noted probity, intelligence and knowledge of the law; and I have no doubt that if he is appointed to the position, he will fill it with dignity and with satisfaction to the country. But that has nothing to do with the question under discussion. I never before heard of resolutions such as those before the House, on which the government intend to introduce a Bill for the purpose of carrying out the bargain which they have made with the judge. That bargain is a bad one on principle. The true principle is that no judge, once he is appointed, should ever hope for promotion from one court to another. Once you depart from that principle you render a judge susceptible to political influence. I heard Sir John Macdonald give that as a reason for the non-promotion of Senator Gowan and Judge Clark, both of whom were perfectly qualified for positions in the Superior Courts. Once you depart from this principle, you will make every judge in the country use his political influence in order that he may be promoted rather than give his undivided attention to the honest fulfilment of the duties of his office.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If that was the rule laid down, why then was Judge Landry promoted from the county court of New Brunswick to the High Court?

Mr. HAGGART. By whom?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. By Sir John Macdonald.

Mr. HAGGART. He never did it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The appointment was made by a government of which my hon. friend was minister.

Mr. HAGGART. Sir John Macdonald was dead.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. But you were alive.

Mr. HAGGART. It is the first time I have heard of it. I understood the Minister of Justice to say that Sir John Macdonald did it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That was my impression and I am sending for the book. At any rate he was created a county court judge, and afterwards was appointed by the government, of which my hon. friend was a minister, to the High Court of New Brunswick.

Mr. HAGGART. We will take the statement of the Minister of Justice for what it is worth.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The hon. member for St. John knows all about it.

Mr. HAGGART. It is the first time I have heard of it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Ask the leader of the opposition. He has not forgotten it. These general rules are sometimes very awkward.

Mr. HAGGART. There are some principles of good government and righteousness which were observed in every province and throughout the Dominion but sometimes——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. HAGGART. Let me say anyway, in all earnestness that the sound principle, when appointing a judge, is to let it be known that he is appointed for life, and never to have any communications with him for the purpose of preferment, especially for the purpose of taking him from his judgeship and making him the head of a Railway Commision, which is to a certain extent quasi judicial. We should never in any case, when appointing a judge, appoint him under special arrangements. I am glad to hear that the Minister of Justice intends dropping the last clause of the resolution in which this condition is extended to judges of the Admiralty and Exchequer Court. I do not know who the judges of the Admiralty and Exchequer Court are. I suppose there are three or four. I would like to know if there is a possibility of a vacancy soon occurring in the Railway Commission and if so who is likely to get it. If my memory is right, there are only two judges of the Admiralty and Exchequer Court.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There are five.

Mr. HAGGART. There is Mr. Anglin and there are a couple not filled yet. There are two in Ontario, Mr. Anglin and Mr. Hodgins.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Hodgins in Ontario, Routhier in Quebec, Macdonald in Nova Scotia, and Hunter in British Columbia.

Mr. HAGGART. Just fancy calling this a commission which is to serve the farmers and give them speedy justice. I knew what the result would be of passing this Act, which, as my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) says, vests the chairman of the commission with more powers than are to be found given a judge by any other Act in the civilized world. We were told that this Act was for the purpose of doing justice between the farmers and the railway monopolies. We were told that its object was to give cheap and speedy jus-

tice to the farmers. The result, I think, will be a disappointment. If the contrary should prove to be the case, I shall be very agreeably disappointed. The resolutions are the most extraordinary I have ever seen introduced into this House. They are for the purpose of carrying out a bargain made with a judge of the Supreme Court in order that he may consent to be removed from that court and placed in a better and more profitable position.

Mr. S. BARKER (Hamilton). My hon. friend the Minister of Justice and my right hon. friend the First Minister have dealt with this matter as if the only question for the House to consider were the fitness of Mr. Justice Killam for the particular position to which he is to be appointed. But that point, it seems to me, is one that has the least possible bearing on the question with which we are dealing. By this resolution, we are not asked to vote the appointment of Mr. Justice Killam. It is simply a general law which we are called upon to enact, and which will place it within the competence of the government of the day to select any judge from any Superior Court in Canada and appoint him to this commission. It is quite possible that in a year, or even less, Mr. Justice Killam, if appointed, may see fit to withdraw from this commission. He may get some other appointment, and then we will have negotiations entered into by the government with another judge of the Supreme Court or some other court mentioned in the resolution we are asked to pass. The result will be that we will have our judges looking forward to the possibility of getting the handsome salary of $10,000 instead of the $7,000 which they receive as judges of the Supreme Court or the lesser sum they receive as judges of some other court. Therein it appears to me is the vice of this resolution. I am not for a moment questioning the fitness of Mr. Justice Killam. Not one word has been said against him in that regard. No one has ventured to cast a slur upon that gentleman in any sense whatever. We all respect him, we all know his capacity, his sterling character. Nobody says a word against him. The remarks that have been made in this connection would have been equally made no matter who should be the judge the government might see fit to select. Therefore we should deal with this resolution exactly as it is, namely, as a proposition on the part of the government to acquire the power by statute of taking any judge from any Superior Court in Canada and appointing him to this office. There is the objection. Judges are human beings and might consequently be influenced by the possibility of getting such a promotion. I do not think that when a gentleman goes upon the bench he alters his nature very materially. He is still subject to all the human weaknesses that he had the day before his appointment; and if before his appointment he sought by political influence with the ministers—or worse still by political influence with gentlemen who have influence with ministers—to get an appointment upon the bench—and no one can doubt that sometimes such influences are used—that same gentleman would hardly hesitate to use similar influences to obtain a position which would give him a handsome increase in his salary. The very fact, as my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) points out, that negotiations have been going on in this case, shows the danger that may occur in other cases

A government having political questions before the Supreme Court for decision—matters, perhaps, involving the fate of the government—might negotiate with a judge for his acceptance of the very handsome salary involved in this commissionership. Surely, that ought to be avoided. Surely, it will not be pretented that Mr. Justice Killam is the only competent man in this Dominion to occupy the position of chief commissioner. We had nearly a year's discussion on the Railway Bill? I do not think it was hinted or even thought of by any person that Mr. Justice Killam was the man of all men who should get the appointment to the chief commissionership. We never heard a suggestion that a man should be taken from the Supreme Court or any other court. But it happens that, at this moment, it is convenient for the government to appoint Mr. Justice Killam. He is a capable man, undoubtedly, and would probably be a fitting man to hold the position. But it will hardly be said that there is only one man in this whole Dominion fit to occupy that position. And, if there is another man anything like equal to Mr. Justice Killam, surely the government should avoid the danger of appointing a judge from the bench, an appointment involving to him a very substantial increase of salary.

But, Sir, there is more, a good deal more, in the case. The resolution is proposed to enable the government to appoint a judge from any superior court in Canada. I presume that would include the judge of the Exchequer Court, Mr. Justice Burbidge. Now, very important questions are constantly coming before the Exchequer Court, cases between contractors and the government involving enormous sums of money. What would be said of the appointment of Mr. Justice Burbidge to this commissionership? What would contractors who had litigation with the government involving many thousands of dollars say, if a judge who might be seeking such a promotion from the government were asked to decide the questions between themselves and the government. Surely the very fact that such a man could be given a reward of that kind would detract from his usefulness. It

would create suspicion. Even if he were not appointed, many people would be inclined to think that he would be influenced by the expectation that such a reward might come to him. I have as high a respect for Mr. Justice Burbidge as for Mr. Justice Killam. I do not mean to say that either of these gentlemen would be influenced by such a consideration. But it is essential that the people should respect and have confidence in the courts, and it is of the utmost consequence, I think the minister will admit, that there should not be even a suspicion against the integrity of our judges. Therefore, I think the government makes a great mistake when it brings in a resolution of this kind, which cannot fail, it seems to me, to cast suspicion upon any judge who might possibly be available for such an appointment.

There is another feature of the measure. The government does not undertake always hereafter to appoint a judge from one of these superior courts. If they appoint a man, who is not a judge, whether a railway expert or a lawyer, or a combination of the two, that appointee may be a man equal in every respect or even superior, as the occupant of such a position, to Mr. Justice Killam. Yet, such a man, being appointed after this resolution is carried and becomes law, will be dealt with differently from a superior court judge. He will be dismissible by the government whereas an appointee from the Superior Court bench would not. Why such a distinction? Why should a thoroughly capable man appointed from any rank in life, if fit for the position, be put in a worse situation than another simply because that other had been a judge? This, it seems to me, is an invidious and unnecessary distinction. This resolution speaks of a 'Judge of any Superior Court in Canada.' I do not know whether the Minister of Justice can refer us to any Act which defines the meaning of 'Superior Court in Canada.' I know that the Revised Statutes of Canada have a definition for these words and that definition would not include the Supreme Court. But, there may be another Act.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That point was considered in connection with the drafting of the resolution.

Mr. BARKER. I can only say that it would have been better to use some other words than these, because, under the interpretation clause of the Revised Statutes, the expression 'superior court,' applies to certain courts in the various provinces. This might cast doubt upon the question whether the very gentleman sought to be appointed would not be excluded by the wording of the resolution.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. We hope so.

Mr. BARKER. We do not want to pass a resolution which will not do what it is intended to do. I submit the point for the minister's consideration. My contention is, however, that there is no justification for the resolution unless the government tell us that throughout this whole Dominion they cannot find a man for this position without taking a man from the bench. Unless that is the case, the government should avoid interfering with the independence of the judiciary. It all comes to that, to my mind. I would not have any one suppose that I have any doubt of Mr. Justice Killam's capacity and integrity. But, an injury will be done to the judiciary of this country, if this resolution is passed.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I have a few observations to make, but I promise the House I will not occupy much time. In the first place, the very fact of bringing down a resolution of this kind to fill a vacancy which formerly was filled by nomination of the government, I think, called for at least this courtesy to the House, that either the minister who introduced it or the First Minister who spoke upon it should have given some reasons why this position became vacant. This resolution is introduced because of the resignation of the former chief of the Railway Commission. That gentleman was an appointee of the present government. He was an appointee of the present government under somewhat peculiar conditions, and we must not forget to hold a government responsible for all its appointments, as well as for the grievances and losses which result from those appointments.

There was a peculiarity about the appointment of that gentleman to the head of the commission in its very inception. Here was a member of a government, on an equal plane with the other members of the government, who had charge of a special department, in the line of which department this appointment and this legislation lay. The members of that government had not sufficient confidence in their colleague, their representative, the Minister of the Railway Department, had not sufficient confidence in that minister to give him the place that he should have had in the inception, the negotiations and, I may say, the completion of certain business matters culminating in legislation which had to do entirely with that gentleman's department. Under those circumstances, no self-respecting man could have remained in the position which he occupied, and consequently there was a resignation. Now, this question arises, a pertinent question: If there were a Minister of Railways appointed because of his fitness for that position, because of his special knowledge with reference to railway matters, but who had so far forfeited the confidence of his colleagues that they would not entrust him with the negotiations of what fell particularly to his department, it must have been because they considered him

unfit to undertake these negotiations and carry them through to their fulfilment. If he were unfit for that, by what process of reasoning was he considered fit for taking the chairmanship of a great railway commission such as this ? Is the old evil the same evil to-day, that hon. gentlemen in the ministry look upon office, not as a sacred trust of the people, but as a plaster to bind up, and to heal, so far as they possibly can, the exigencies and the wounds of the party ? Now, I wish I could make that even more emphatic than I have. That parliament and that country are taking a step in a perilous direction when they lose sight of the fact that the offices of the country are a sacred trust for the good of the country, and are not simply means by which the exigencies of a party may be met and overcome. The initial difficulty in this appointment to that Railway Commission lay there, that it was to get the party out of a bad fix that they appointed to that office the man in whom they had declared their lack of confidence, that made him the chief officer of that commission, lauded him to the skies as the man especially fitted to take hold of it ; and within a few months we find him equally under that old delusion that an office of trust and emolument in the interest, and to be carried out for the good of the people, was to be looked on as a pawn upon the board for the especial interest only of one man, the office holder.

It was incumbent upon the First Minister or the Minister of Justice to say to-day what circumstances intervened of such overshadowing and overwhelming importance and urgency, that the responsible commissioner, having heard cases which could not be decided unless he remained to give the decision, and having heard them by dozens and scores, perhaps hundreds, involving grievances of the people which, for seven months, had been exposed before the tribunal and all the evidence collected, and that then, without a thought as to the people, without a thought as to the gravity of the questions, without a thought as to the results which would take place if he hurriedly left that office, without having made arrangements with his co-commissioners, but simply looking upon the office as a private appurtenance, left his position and brought all this damage and harm upon the country. It was incumbent upon the First Minister, it is incumbent upon the government, to give to the House the especial, the overwhelming, the urgent reasons that made it necessary for the chairman of the Railway Commission to act in the way he did. Does the country know of any such reason ? Has the world turned upside down suddenly since that gentleman left the chairmanship of the Railway Commission ? We have not heard that he has been called to give advice to the Czar of Russia, or to the Emperor of Germany, or even to the King of Great Britain. We find that there is great public concern in this matter. Why could he not have remained there for a fortnight, for three weeks, for a month, and done his duty ? That duty not being done, the fault for it not being done, is placed on the head of the men who made the appointment. And yet, Sir, these gentlemen think that parliament is so much of a dumb show that they do not need to act as sensible men ought to act, sensible men representing the government, and give a reason for the action in this matter. Either they were wrong in their choice, and they, therefore, have to take the responsibility, or there must have been some urgent reason, and it would be easy for these gentlemen to give that reason if such reason existed. So I say I am here, and I think we ought to stand here and say that we need an explanation on this point, and that for all the damage, and loss, and delay, which have occurred, this government must be held responsible, because incurred through the action of their own appointee.

So much on that phase of the subject. There is another point I wish to touch upon. I am here to assert that, so far as I have been able to read the cool judgment of the country, the commission appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite did not come up to the importance of the duties which were to be performed by that commission, did not go so far as the country thought they ought to go. I listened whilst my hon. friend the Minister of Justice read the almost autocratic powers which are placed in the hands of that commission. From the inception of the incorporation of a railway company, the principles upon which it ought to be organized, the conditions which ought to be attached to it, until you get out into that wonderfully complex work of fixing rates and tolls upon the traffic of a country like this, with its diversity of sections, its long hauls and its short hauls, and everything in connection with that, it seems to me that there is no set of duties you can conceive of, which require abler, stronger, more experienced and better versed men than those duties which are imposed upon the three railway commissioners by the law passed in 1903, under which we are now acting. Now, I do not say anything personally of the commissioners ; but I do say that the formation of that board in the first place did not, in its selection, meet the exigencies of the case, and did not meet the reasonable and, I think, well warranted expectations of the business men of this country.

What have you ? You have a gentleman as one of the commission who, though very estimable, perhaps, does not bulk before the public as being a man versed in large business affairs, in the great traffics of the country, in the currents of its trade and in all those complex problems of transport and distribution which meet the railway commissioners almost in every case. I leave

that to the sense of this House. But, there was another reason and a very good one. A colleague had to be provided for, a vacancy had to be made because there was some one else who wanted a vacancy made and between the government who wanted to make a vacancy and outside influences that wanted a vacancy to fill the unoffending and mild-mannered gentleman who filled the position of Minister of Inland Revenue at that time had to be got rid of and he could not be got rid of unless a place were found for him. There was a convenient place found and into it he went. Does any man sitting in this House believe really in his heart of hearts that you could not have gone through this country and found amongst its business men a better representative for this work than even that gentleman whom I personally respect very highly? I will not pursue the personnel of the commission further. I will say this that it struck the country that men of expert knowledge, men thoroughly well versed in the business and trade currents of the country and in technicalities of railway administration, were not the kind of men who were appointed upon that commission. I am in favour of a railway commission. I acknowledge that this is one of the most complex, one of the most difficult problems that ever was given into the hands of a set of men to carry out. It is not simply the farmers who have interests at stake but I have just as much solicitude in another way for the carriers of this country whose interests are at stake as well and when you come to adjudge between all the delicate questions, between the freight producers of this country far and wide and the freight and produce carrying portion of the community, when you come to adjust these delicate questions as to interests impigned, when all interests may be heard and equally as well all interests may be made better and may be helped by this commission what is the principle that should guide you? The very first thing that should have been done was not to find places for political adherents, that two of these places were found for and nothing else. The exigencies of party, the desire to provide a place for a man that they no longer wanted to keep in the cabinet; and the desire to find a place for another gentleman whom they despised in their hearts, from whom they had withdrawn their confidence and whose influence and power they dreaded at the time of the coming election, caused them to make these appointments. So much for that branch of the question.

Now, I want to go to another. I am not going to lay down any principle as to puisne judges, or county court judges, or promotions in any way. I am not an authority upon that subject. But, if I can give a common sense view I will leave it to the members of this House to say whether this principle is a good one to be adopted in this country. If from a junior county court judge up to the Supreme Court it is known that there is a possibility of promotion from the lowest to the highest, and that it can be got if you can bring the proper influence to bear upon the appointing party I want to know if that conduces to the stable and equable frame of mind that should characterize justice in this county? Why, Sir, a lawyer who is appointed as a judge has to leave behind him all party and political considerations. They should never again enter into his judgment. He becomes the protector of the grievances and the innocence and the rights of the people of this country in the sacred name and in the majesty of the law. He should put aside from himself all thoughts of political preferment, should give his whole attention to his justice and his law and his equity, and if he has promotions in view they should be promotions which come only naturally within the sphere of his own proper administration of justice. How different it is! If you establish one political office can you not establish another? Is this a political office or is it not? It is a political office. It is a political office just the same as a post office inspectorship is a political office, It is a political office just the same as the position of an officer of the Marine and Fisheries Department is a political office. Here you have a political office and you have the statement made to all these superior court justices that it is possible for any one of them at some time, if he can only bring the proper influence to bear to become the recipient of that office. Does that militate in favour of or militate against a proper and equitable administration of justice? If you can create one you can create another and you may have a series of political appointments to which judges may look for a betterment of their salaries and their positions, provided they can make sufficient court in order to get the appointments from whom these appointments come. In the matter of judges and in the matter of the appointment of the judges it has been a credit to our country in the past, and I hope it will always be that politics do not enter as an overwhelming consideration into the appointments of judges. They have been appointed for their fitness. When they went on the bench they were supposed to be dead to all the currents and excitements of political and party work, to have gone into the serene, staid and steady atmosphere where justice is administered and the laws are interpreted to the people of the country. You can quote all the precedents you like for having judges translated from a lower position to a higher in his own court and in his own sphere, but it is outside of that entirely when you create a separate political office and make it possible for judges to look to that office for a betterment of their salaries and positions.

That is why I think it is not the best thing to do and will not have the best influence upon the judiciary and justice of this country. Now, I want to ask my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), a question: Did he and the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) sit down together and approach the question something like this: We have lost our dear chairman of the Railway Commission.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. By whose fault?

Mr. FOSTER—If anybody knows the government ought to. He was their servant.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. They are responsible.

Mr. FOSTER. We have lost our efficient chairman of the Railway Commission, now we must sit down and legislate on this business of a chief commissioner. What are the proper lines that we ought to lay down, what the conditions, what the salary in order to ensure that we shall get the very best talent we can get in this country to act as chief commissioner? Did they sit down and first make the legislation on general principles and then seek their man according to that legislation? I will warrant you that neither of them will rise in his place and state that that is the case. They are legislating from a particular point to the general. They do not legislate on general principles and then choose the particular person to fit into that broader legislation. There is every evidence that they went first to find out the terms on which they could get the judge to act and then after a month or six or eight weeks of pourparlers, more or less intimate and confidential, they found out the lowest terms the judge would accept and then made legislation to suit his demands. Let me put a question to my right hon. friend. He takes credit to himself for providing that this chief commissioner shall be removed even from the rude hand of a ruthless government and placed where he cannot be removed until parliament in both its branches acts. Is that a right principle? If so, why not apply it to any chief commissioner whether he be a judge or not. Does my right hon. friend mean to say that from this time forth no one but a judge of the Supreme Court shall be a chief commissioner? He will not take that ground because any good government looks over the whole field to see which is the best man. This government looks over the field and says Mr. Justice Killam; another government may look over the field and say: Here is the best man in Canada but he is not a judge of the Supreme Court. They will approach him and ask: Will you take the chairmanship—but he is told at the same time: My dear man, you are capable of filling this position, you are the ideal man in every respect, but you are not going to get as good a position as would be given to a chief commissioner if he happened to be a judge of the Superior Court; we cannot give you the emolument or the conditions that were given to the late chairman, because he was a judge and you are not. Why should he not have the same salary and the same consideration? I doubt very much if any self-respecting man, not a judge, will hereafter accept a chief commissionership when a judge for any reason, has vacated it, unless you give him as good a position as you gave to the former chief commissioner. You may have a lawyer who knows much more law than any judge, a man who has a wide knowledge of the business of the country, who could fill the position just as well or better than any justice of the Supreme Court, and why, in the name of common justice and fairness, should he not be paid according to the work done, according to his merit and according to the value of the man who does the work. I object to this legislation because it makes a distinction where there should be no distinction, and I ask the Minister of Justice if it would not be better for him to introduce legislation by which, no matter who the chairman of the commission shall be, he shall have the very same emolument, the very same conditions of affluence, safety and permanence as a judge would have if he were taken to fill that position. Surely there can be no getting away from that. It may be that four years out of the House makes some change in a man's way of looking at things, but I do not suppose that even with the perfection to which caucus government has gone in these latter days, my right hon. friend called in all his followers together and went over this resolution page by page and got them all to say: That is the perfect thing and we will stand by you in that. I imagine that most of the hon. gentlemen who sit opposite knew nothing about what these resolutions contained until they were brought down and placed on the order paper, and it did seem to me peculiar—may be it is inevitable—that the very moment they came out, everybody on the other side of the House felt that he had to stand by this and not urge a word in criticism of the resolutions. Not one of the vast surplusage of talent on that side of the House had a word of criticism. We saw the same thing the other day on the Seeds Bill, and to-day again on this resolution; no man seems to think he is there for any other purpose than to say 'ditto' to what the government says, Let us stand for every line, every dot and every vowel of what the government proposes to do. But are we not here to-day to make this measure as good as it can possibly be made? I do not wish to do anything but to make this as good as it can be made, but I deplore the discriminations which have been introduced into this legislation. I think you should make the same legislation

for your chief commissioner no matter who he may be, a judge or anybody else, for you certainly must contend that when you appoint a chief commissioner, you are getting a man who will fill the contract and do the work. If you get such a man you ought to make his position equally as good as that of his predecessor or his successor. I am also opposed to the principle that this chief commissioner, simply because he is a judge, shall only be displaced by the action of both Houses of parliament. When you have a chief commissioner who is not a Superior Court judge he will not be in that position ; the Governor in Council may dismiss him for cause ; but in the other case simply because he is a judge you make the other provision. I do not believe it will be found to work well, and I think the very same provisions that are in this legislation should be adopted for whatever man holds the office of chief commissioner, whether he be a layman or a judge from the Supreme Court. Now I am not going to carry my criticisms any further ; these are just the thoughts that came to me as I listened to the discussion and as I read the resolution. There is no use trying to import into this discussion a charge that we on this side are saying something against the judges. If the Minister of Justice had not mentioned Mr. Justice Killam's name no one would have known about the matter ; what we were discussing was simply the abstract resolution, no matter whether the appointee be a judge, a duke or simply a man of business. It is cheap party tactics to try to force on us the odium that we are objecting to the character of the judge. I am not going the least step in the direction of suggesting that Justice Killam would be influenced by the corporations, and it is idle to attempt to use that argument against us in any sense. In the first place, we want an explanation from the government as to why their appointee left the office in the way in which he did and with the haste with which he did. We have received as a parliament no explanation of that whatsoever. My second objection is to the distinctions in position which are made by this Bill where no distinctions exist in merit. I would have the chief commissioner placed on exactly the same plane and level as the other commissioners, whether he happened to come from the Supreme Court or was a man who had not been a judge previous to his appointment to the commission.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we have all enjoyed the eloquent remarks of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Foster) upon this very important question, especially that part of his remarks in reference to the promotion of judges from inferior courts to superior courts. It requires a great stretch of imagination for us to believe that in the year 1893 the hon. gentleman who now leads the opposition was one of the cabinet ministers from the province of New Brunswick. It is a well-admitted fact that the judges in a province are generally appointed on the recommendation of the cabinet ministers from that province ; and on that occasion Mr. Justice Landry, who was then a judge of the county court of the county of Kent, was promoted to a superior court judgeship on the recommendation of the present hon. leader of the opposition. And yet, Mr. Speaker, we have been to-day for a considerable length of time lectured upon the enormity of the crime of promoting judges from an inferior court to a superior court.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. It was in a moment of weakness.

Mr. LOGAN. My hon. friend who has said that it was in a moment of weakness, should have quoted another adage even older than that : 'Consistency, thou art a jewel.' If there is any man in Canada who should not have a single word to say about promotion from an inferior court to a superior court, that man is the present hon. leader of the opposition ; because I believe that that was one of the few cases, if not the only case, in the Dominion of Canada in which a county court judge has been promoted to the position of a superior court judge.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can tell us whether it was Sir John Macdonald who made the promotion.

Mr. LOGAN. My hon. friend heard me say a moment ago that it was in the year 1893.

Mr. HAGGART. Then, the Minister of Justice was mistaken.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I was mistaken ; but the hon. gentleman gave the explanation when he said that unusual things occur in New Brunswick.

Mr. LOGAN. I will admit that it was not the government of Sir John Macdonald; but it was a government of which the present hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) was a distinguished member, that established the precedent by promoting Judge Landry, I believe a very eminent judge, to the Superior Court.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps the hon. gentleman does not know the fact. I do not know that the council were ever consulted in reference to the appointment of a judge.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LOGAN. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that there was not a bolt in 1893 as well as in 1896. I presume that the Governor General in Council made this appointment, and if my hon. friend from South Lanark was not present in council, and was not consulted in the matter, he would not presume to say that the hon. member for North Toronto

(Mr. Foster) was not consulted, he being the minister for the pronvince of New Brunswick at the time. Many instances have been cited here to-day of the promotion of puisne judges to chief justiceships, because of the eminent fitness which they have shown for the higher position. That practice has been fairly well established in this country. Many instances have been mentioned here to-day, not only in Canada but in Great Britain. If I mistake not, the Hon. Mr. Justice King, a gentleman than whom none better or brighter ever adorned a court, was promoted from the Supreme Court of the province of New Brunswick to become a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, on the recommendation, I presume, of the hon. member for North Toronto, who was at that time the minister from the province of New Brunswick. We might go on giving other instances; but, after all, the question whether a judge should be promoted from an inferior position to a superior one, is a question whether he possesses those eminent qualifications to fit him for the higher position.

I regret that the hon. leader of the opposition to-day endeavoured to create a distrust and disrespect in this country for the Railway Commission. He stated that two of the appointments to that commission had been made for political exigencies and for nothing else. Well, Mr. Speaker, that commission is a semi-court of this country, and we should endeavour, it seems to me, to inculcate the idea in the minds of the people that that court is one which knows what it is doing, and will hold the scales of justice even as between all parties. When the commission was appointed, the Hon. Mr. Blair was made its chairman. Mr. Blair, I believe, was eminently fitted for that position. No man on the other side of the House up to to-day has ever risen to say that, from his knowledge of law and his experience in this House in connection with the Railway Act, he was not fitted to be chairman. The government, I know, were blamed, even by their own supporters, for appointing a man who had differed with them on a very important question; but the government rose to the occasion, and, though he did not agree with them in regard to the transcontinental railway project, they decided to appoint him, because they believed him to be the best man for the position; and my hon. friend the leader of the opposition did not complain of the appointment. But the time came when Mr. Blair suddenly, in the twinkling of an eye, while many cases were standing for judgment, resigned his position; and my hon. friend asks the government to-day for an explanation of Mr. Blair's resignation under these circumstances. I think the answer to the question, why did Mr. Blair resign, should be given by these hon. gentlemen. The government cannot explain it—there is no question about that. It is beyond explanation on this side of the House; but our hon. friends on the other side, who formed a partnership with a gentleman who said that he had persuaded Mr. Blair to resign, should explain to this House and to the country why it was that their political agent, their partner in political crime at that time, made that statement.

But no explanation comes from the other side. Mr. Blair was appointed by this government because they considered him the best man to fill the position. But why was he persuaded to resign, and how comes it that he did resign at so opportune a moment for hon. gentlemen opposite? What are the facts, as near as we can gather them, and no doubt they will all be public within a few months. The facts are that these hon. gentlemen opposite knew of Mr. Blair's resignation before the government were aware of it. They proclaimed to the world that inside of a certain forty-eight hours he would take the stump. Why was it that the chief Tory organ in the Dominion, the 'Montreal Star,' proclaimed that Mr. Blair would take the stump. How comes it that the 'Star' knew of Mr. Blair's resignation even before the government knew it. These are questions which hon. gentlemen opposite should answer in order that the people may be on their guard against similar political bombshells that may be sent out in any future campaign. But when Mr. Blair did resign he was elevated by these hon. gentlemen to the highest of political fame. They proclaimed him the saviour of Canada. They sang his praises ad nauseam. This country was made blue by their fulsome eulogies from one end of the country to the other. Not only did they sing his praises upon every platform and in every Tory newspaper in the land, with perhaps the possible exception of the 'Toronto World.'

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear. A sound newspaper.

Mr. LOGAN. Not only did they do that but it is a fact, which I think will be proved in time, that these same gentlemen agreed that if the government should be defeated by their efforts assisted by the diabolical machinations of men who should have kissed the hand of the Prime Minister rather than have endeavoured to pierce his side, they would make him Minister of Railways. I repeat it is the duty of these hon. gentlemen to explain to this House and the country why Mr. Blair resigned from the railway commission.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 22), respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway—Mr. Oliver.

BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (King's and Albert). With the major portion of the resolutions before the House I have no fault to find. They are not in accord with my views respecting these matters, but they are in accord with the custom of the country as it has been ever since the Canadian colonies acquired the right of self government. But to the first portion of the resolutions I do object. I fail to understand why a resolution of this kind should be brought down to this House, particularly in view of the very explicit statements made to this House and to the country when the Bill to establish the Railway Commission was under discussion. I do not see why, because the chief commissionership is to be given to a judge of the Supreme Court, he should be treated differently from any other person who might be chosen for that exalted position. And I fail to see why it is necessary to take a judge from a Supreme Court bench to fill this office. Surely it speaks but ill for the talent and ability within the ranks of the Liberal party, if it is necessary for the government to go to the Supreme Court for a chief commissioner. There are hundreds of men within the Conservative party as well qualified for the position as is Mr. Justice Killam, however high his attainments may be. I have not a word to say against Mr. Justice Killam. I have not heard all this debate, but I believe I am right in saying that no member on this side of the House has made any attack upon him in any way. Mr. Justice Killam's character or legal attainments are not in question here. But what is in question is the proposal to make an exception of Mr. Justice Killam's appointment to the chief railway commissionership, and, as already pointed out it seems to me that great danger lies along this line. It would be much better if he were placed upon the same footing as any other person who might be offered this appointment. My own belief is that any judge appointed as puisne judge should have no opportunity even to become a chief justice, to say nothing of receiving political appointments. However, as I have said, it has been the custom to allow these promotions ever since this was a self governing country, so I do not quarrel with that part of the resolution.

I would not have spoken on this subject, had it not been for matters being dragged into this discussion which really have no place in it, though, perhaps, incidental to the subject. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), who spoke last, tried to connect the Conservative party with what he alleged to be a plot or conspiracy to defeat the Liberals in the late election. I wish to give a categorical denial to the charges that the hon. gentleman hurled at this side of the House. There is not one atom of truth in any of these statements. Not an ex-member or a member of this House on the Conservative side, or anybody having authority to speak for the Conservative party was mixed up in any way with a scheme, plot, conspiracy or whatever these hon. gentlemen choose to call it with Mr. Blair or any person on his behalf. They ask why did Mr. Blair resign his chief commissionership? Why Mr. Blair has told us. He says he resigned in order to reiterate his strong opposition to that most iniquitous scheme, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. But I would ask hon. gentlemen a question: Why did not Mr. Blair reiterate his strong objection to that Grand Trunk Pacific scheme? Let hon. gentlemen on the other side answer that particular question.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Ask Dave Russell.

Mr. FOWLER. If I were to ask anybody I would go to a person higher up than Mr. David Russell.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Ask Hugh Graham.

Mr. FOWLER. I would go to a person higher up than Mr. Hugh Graham, if I wished to find the person who had the authority and the personal knowledge to answer the question truthfully as it should be answered. We who read the newspapers remember an account of a certain interview between Mr. Blair and a certain person prominent in the Council of the Liberal party. And even the sanctity of the Sabbath day was invaded by these counter-plotters. They did not respect the holy calm of the Lord's day itself. And, Sir, if the secret history of that interview is ever written, if what took place is disclosed, nothing will be shown that should make any Conservative ashamed. If this investigation that the hon. gentlemen opposite are talking about is held, perhaps the two high contracting parties to that interview will be called before the investigating committee and will be asked to tell under oath just what passed in that particular interview on that particular Sabbath day. Plots! They say there was a plot that a certain prominent lawyer in Montreal and certain promoter in Montreal, both Liberals——

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, no.

Mr. FOWLER. Certainly. They are the arch plotters always. They say there was a plot between these gentlemen and Mr. Blair and some other persons, to do, what? To stab in the back the leader of this House; destroy his government and set up another. Well, it is not the first time by any means that we have heard of plots within the ranks of the Liberal party. I take up the Ottawa 'Free Press' to-night, the leading Liberal organ of the Capital, and I find there an account of a plot in the Liberal cabinet of Quebec, to stab in the back the premier of that province. Why, it is only a case of history repeating itself. If there was a plot to destroy the prime minister of the

Dominion, it is only another Liberal plot such as we have known before.

The honourable member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) is a splendid exponent of political morality. If we are correctly informed, a gentleman answering to his description, and with just as much right to a vote in the late election as he has, presented himself at one of the polling booths in this city at the late Ontario provincial election and attempted to vote, it cannot be possible that a small city like this contains within its necessary narrow limits two gentlemen of such magnificent form and such perfect beauty of face as the hon. gentleman and his double—if he has a double. Therefore, we are forced to the conclusion that it was the hon. gentleman himself, the member for Cumberland who presented himself at that polling booth in the city of Ottawa and attempted to vote in the late election. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman has told us that we should kiss the hand of the prime minister rather than attempt to pierce his side. I do not know what he meant by that, but I want to say that is not the kind of osculation that hon. gentlemen on this side prefer. It may suit the hon. gentleman to kiss the hand of the premier; it may suit the hon. gentleman to kiss the foot of the premier; it may suit him to kiss any other part of the anatomy of the premier he may prefer—but when it comes to a game of that sort, I think I am entitled to speak for my hon. colleagues, and to say that we wish to be counted out.

Mr. LOGAN. That is about your sort.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to be about the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Logan's) sort, and he was the gentleman to whom I was referring.

Mr. LOGAN. Nice language.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not think the argument he put forward, or the argument he attempted to bring into this debate, has tended to the dignity of the debate. The hon. gentleman threw down the gauntlet; he gave the challenge to this side of the House; and if he has got the worst of it, he has only himself to blame. As far as I am concerned I propose to vote against this resolution.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). Mr. Speaker, I am glad as a new member of the House to have had an opportunity of listening earnestly and carefully to the debate on these resolutions which have been offered by the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick). They contain within them the elements of a great many deep principles which are involved and by which the country will judge this House. They contain a collection of principles which it is of the utmost importance that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House should consider carefully before consolidating in a measure of this importance. I do not know that I can add much light to what has been enunciated in support of or in opposition to these resolutions, but I am constrained by the attitude which has been taken by hon. gentlemen opposite to add my quota, my mite in opposition to this legislation, because of the principles which are involved in them or rather because of the want of principle. The question at issue is not the irrelevant question which has been dragged into this discussion as to whether hon. gentlemen on this or that side of the House, or hon. gentlemen who have since passed from the scene, revered statesmen of Canada, or hon. gentlemen still in the House and holding prominent positions therein, have committed themselves to principles such as are inculcated in these resolutions. We are beside such questions at the present time. They are wholly extraneous, and foreign to the question under consideration. We should lift the plane of this debate a little higher, we should elevate it to the point of declaring that we are prepared to enunciate in concrete form on the statute-book or in the shape of a resolution the principle which we have always upheld and which certain hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have always upheld and stood for, namely, that the judiciary of our land is separate and apart from all political influence, is entirely free from all influence and is uninfluenceable. If the belief be involved in this resolution that the judiciary is not to be free, as it has been free in the past, notwithstanding some errors and mistakes, which have been pointed out by certain hon. gentlemen opposite, errors capable of explanation in connection with particular circumstances, if there be involved in these resolutions of the hon. minister a desecration of those principles which are applicable to the judiciary and for which this country has long struggled and to which we have been committed, then I say we are lowering the plane and lowering the standard of the judiciary in Canada. It is not an answer, although it has been admitted and I am sorry to say it has been the only answer we have had so far from the other side of the House, to the very clear and forceable enunciation of the principles involved in the discussion on the part of the opposition that those on this side of the House, or certain other gentlemen who have been on this side of the House, have been guilty of similar acts, or have adhered to principles, or have made mistakes which are now deplored from this side of the House. The cry of tu quoque was ever a dangerous one. We have had it enunciated very recently in the provincial elections in the province of Ontario. We have seen the people rise in their might as against an hon. gentleman who had led the legislative assembly in the province for many years, and who, from the hustings, defended his own party on the cry that the

other side was just as bad. It was not an answer to the question as to whether the judiciary shall be impugned, as to whether efforts shall be made to lower the standard of the judiciary and to drag it into the political arena to say that such and such an appointment had been made in the past when such and such a party was in power, but I should have been glad personally had I been able to listen to arguments from the other side of the House in support of these resolutions along a higher plane than the mere throwing back of charges that similar mistakes have been made and similar principles enunciated by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. To what purpose are these resolutions offered ? They are to the effect that from henceforth it can be said, by reference to the records of this House, that hon. judges, when they are, as we suppose, removed from political preferment and from hope of preferment, are as a matter of fact not so removed, that they are still open to further preferment, to be removed from the high positions to which they are promoted, and that they may look for greater preferment along political lines. I always had the idea, Sir, that when a gentleman from the bar was elevated to the bench he was removed from all political influence and from all political associations. I was under the impression, having great regard and respect for the judiciary, and desiring in every possible way to uphold it in its pristine purity, that when a member of the bar was elevated to the bench he was politically dead as far as political preferment or political associations were concerned, but here we have had introduced resolutions involving a reversal of that salient doctrine. We find that even so far as the chief justice of the supreme court is concerned he may, after he is elevated to that high office, look forward hopefully and may strive earnestly, and there is no objection to his doing so, for that preferment which can only take place by reason of political favours being granted to him by one government or the other. That, Sir, is an insidious principle to advocate, it is aiming a blow at the prop and pillar of the judicial system of this country, and it is a blow which I verily believe hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, as well as the great people of Canada, will have reason in the future deeply to deplore and vainly to regret.

There have been chapters in recent history—hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have referred to them—where distinguished members of the judiciary, men who are entitled to the utmost respect, and for whom I as one entertain the most profound regard, have been dragged into the mire of politics merely by reason of the acceptance of political commissions such as is now to be put upon a chief justice of the Supreme Court of Canada. Is that an elevation of the standard of our judicial system ? Is it a thing to be encouraged. Is it a thing to be lauded to the skies, to be applauded by the hon. gentlemen who introduced this measure and are advocating it ? Is it not rather the commencement of the lowering of the standard of that judicial system for which we all entertain great veneration ? Sir, I desire to enter my feeble protest against such an interference as is now being made upon the judicial independence of this country, as has been well and cogently set forth by hon, gentlemen on this side of the House. I hope that this is not a question of political necessity, I hope that these resolutions do not grow out of expediency.

We had a challenge from the other side recently, from the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) I think, to demand an explanation of the reason why the Hon. Mr. Blair resigned the chairmanship of this commission. Well, Sir, however strange, however ridiculous that challenge may be, I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite whether it would not be more pertinent to ask them to explain, whether it does not rather lie at their doors to answer the question why Mr. Blair was appointed to the chairmanship of the Railway Commission in the first place ? What were the necessities, what were the qualifications and what were the expediencies, if the necessity did not exist, for that appointment ? It was an extraordinary thing to contemplate. We see that hon. gentleman, finding that the government of which he was then a member was not in accord with his own ideas, resigned his portfolio in the government and that he then received probably the highest appointment within the gift of the government. I say it is an extraordinary thing to behold what is now taking place, as is apparent from these resolutions, a transaction, a negotiation between the government and a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada. That, Sir, is a principle which, having due regard to the upholding of our judicial system and the creation of that profound respect which we all have for it, cannot be encouraged and cannot be extended. It is the commencement of a danger that will increase, it is the first step towards creating a great difficulty in the future, it is sowing a seed which may spring up later on and produce a direful harvest. When it is necessary, when it is desirable or expedient for the government of the day to choose for this high position a judge of the Supreme Court to fill a political appointment, then I say there is the commencement of a state of things which it is undesirable to approve of or to continue.

If it can be said that this appointment might be made elsewhere, that there are other gentlemen, as undoubtedly the House knows well is the case, qualified for this exalted position, possessing perhaps more business qualifications than are possessed by the estimable gentleman whose name

has been mentioned, then why not make the appointment without regard to the judiciary? Why establish the precedent which will create emulation and rivalry and political aspirations among the members of the judiciary. Where is the necessity for it? And if the necessity does not exist why drag political expediency into the judicial system of this land? Sir, I would rather have heard from the Minister of Justice some explanation of these resolutions which would have shown them to rest upon a higher plane of public interest; I would like to have heard less of extraneous matter dragged in, and less of that which is not pertinent to the question involved. When one comes to consider the dangers that are involved by this appointment, one cannot but regard the resolutions as a menace to that system which we hold in the highest respect. There has been, and there is, a necessity for further strengthening the hands of the judiciary of this land; there is now an opportunity to demonstrate to this country that the judiciary stands supreme in the respect of the country, and cannot be assailed by the government of the day. I trust that hon. gentlemen opposite have not lost sight of that desirable principle. I hope that in the passage of these resolutions, respect will be paid to that principle; and it is much to be desired that, if the overthrow of the principle involved in this appointment is inevitable, the judicial system should be tampered with as little as possible in the creation of public offices. Sir, there is a time coming when this great Canadian people will need the solidity and the calm independence of the judiciary. As this great country grows, surely we need a stable, and independent judiciary, that cannot be influenced by political considerations. It is of vital necessity that its independence be preserved, no matter what other systems in our land become subject to political influence. I say that to interfere with the judiciary as these resolutions are doing is not a step towards that progress and towards the attainment of that true prosperity which we would like to see prevail in our country. I am opposed to the principle, opposed to it because of the absence of necessity for it, opposed to it because of the utter lack of expediency—if that fateful word has to be dragged into this discussion—and I am opposed to it because it is lowering to the dignity of the country and is aimed against and weakens the greatest safeguard that the people of Canada have to-day.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). After the charge that was made by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) this afternoon, that the present leader of the opposition, who will soon be in his seat to defend himself, had by some plan or scheme induced Mr. Blair to resign his position as chairman of the Railway Commission, I think that members on both sides of the House expected that the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice would have risen in his place before this debate closed and stated officially that there would be a thorough investigation into the matter, and I kept my seat in the vain hope of seeing either these gentlemen or some other member of the House rise——

Mr. LOGAN. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me? I did not mention Mr. Borden, or refer to him in any way whatever this afternoon.

Mr. BENNETT. I am within the judgment of the House, and certainly the gentlemen on this side understood the hon. member as referring to Mr. R. L. Borden, and to no one else. The hon member went further, and stated that he was to be Minister of Railways in Mr. Borden's coming administration. That, I think, effectually clenches the statement. Be that as it may, the hon. gentleman made another statement which should have been either denied by the government or else the government should have claimed that they had no connection with it, and that there would soon be a complete investigation or a disclosure of the whole matter which would show who was at fault. If the government are going to shoulder the responsibility of that investigation, some member of the government should have risen and stated that it would be commenced. I have heard the Prime Minister in this House on more than one occasion threaten hon. gentlemen on this side of the House that if they dared to formulate charges which they had made, these charges would be investigated and probed to the bottom, either by a committee of this House or by judges, the highest in the land. The offences charged in these cases were not great in their nature, but were of a trifling character, and yet the Prime Minister in this case has permitted and allowed, since last December, charges to be made against three members of his cabinet, against the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair)—charges that have astounded the people of Canada—and yet after this House has been nearly a month in session there has come from him no intimation——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What members of the government?

Mr. BENNETT. I will come to that in a moment. The country was startled early in December by certain charges that were made in connection with the elections just passed. What was the nature of these charges? I am going to take newspapers favourable to the hon. gentlemen opposite and ministers of the Crown for the statements that were made in that connection. No hon. gentleman on that side of the House can deny that the Montreal 'Herald' is the leading Liberal newspaper in Montreal.

There is not a doubt about that. Further, that is the organ in which the Minister of Agriculture is largely interested financially ; it occurs to me that he has said that he is not interested in it, but we all know that the minister said in the House that while he had been a large stockholder in this newspaper he had transferred his stock to his brother when he became a minister. Be that as it may, no man will gainsay the fact that the Montreal 'Herald' is the leading Liberal English newspaper in Quebec, and that this government is anxious to enjoy all the good effects it can obtain from that newspaper's influence. Coming to the issue of the Montreal 'Herald' of December 5, what is stated ? After referring to this whole scandal—and it certainly was a scandal—it says :

> Nevertheless there is much to indicate that it deserves to take rank in Canadian history with the Pacific scandal of 1873, which also cost the Conservative party dear.

What was the scandal, as stated in the newspapers, as stated in the Montreal 'Herald' of December 5 ? Mr. Emmerson being interviewed as to some rumours then current—and it is strange to note that the interview given by him is telegraphed far and wide in this country and published, not only in the papers of Ontario and Quebec, but also in those of Manitoba—what was the whole scandal as related by Mr. Emmerson, and enlarged on by the papers ? It was that a gentleman who has been associated with hon. gentlemen in the past, the well-known lawyer, Mr. Greenshields, who was the most important figure in what is known as the Drummond County deal, a well-known friend of the government, who has on more than one occasion been a candidate in Quebec for hon. gentlemen opposite—this gentleman, Mr. Greenshields, associated with David Russell and other gentlemen had gone to certain members of the government, and these members of the government were specifically named. First and foremost was the Minister of Justice, the Minister of the Interior——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not desire to allow that statement to go unchallenged for one-half second. I say it is absolutely untrue, and I defy the hon. gentleman to prove it, and it is not in the newspaper that he refers to.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. minister will calm himself——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No man can remain calm in the presence of such a statement as that.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the hon. minister allow the statement to go first ? He challenged me to name the paper in which he was referred to. The hon. gentleman was referred to, and the Minister of Marine——

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have to make the same statement as has been made by the Minister of Justice.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And he dare not make the charge.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Make your charge.

Mr. BENNETT. On December 5 this appeared from Montreal in the Toronto 'World'——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may smile.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, I do.

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps he will correct the statement when I have read——

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not care.

Mr. BENNETT. The despatch reads :

> Hon. Raymond Préfontaine said to-night that the reflections on himself, Mr. Fitzpatrick and Mr. Sifton, as published to-day in the 'Toronto World,' were not founded on fact. The whole article as far as it referred to the ministers was a fabrication of misstatements. As there was no definite charge, however, Mr. Préfontaine declined to discuss the matter in detail.

The minister did take some cognizance of it, and did rush into print. I do not blame him after the manner in which he was referred to. It was stated in the public print that there was a plan on hand by which these gentlemen were to retire. What was the plan ? The Minister of Justice was to resign from the government, the Minister of the Interior was to resign, each was to be paid $100,000, but, for some reason or other, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) was placed on the bargain counter at $75,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And men of gentlemanly instincts can laugh at such stuff as that.

Mr. BENNETT. I will take the Montreal 'Herald' for the statements. It goes on to state—and Mr. Emmerson makes similar statements, which are all in the Montreal 'Herald, and if they are not true the Minister of Justice and these gentlemen should have had an investigation long ago and called upon the Montreal 'Herald' to do one of two things, either to retract the statements they have made or to make these statements good. Now, what are the statements made in the Montreal 'Herald' on these different occasions ? The statements are these : That a certain syndicate with a capital of $4,000,000 was formed. That this syndicate was going, as its members expected, to take over the work of constructing the government end of the projected Grand Trunk Pacific Railway ; that that proposition was laid before the premier himself,

and that that written proposition lay in the premier's hands for some days.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The statement was never made by the 'Herald.'

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman is a member of parliament, and does he undertake to make statements of that kind? Does he re-echo those statements, or does he not? What is his object? Does he re-echo those statements?

Mr. BENNETT. I simply say this, that the Montreal 'Herald,' a Liberal newspaper, has made these statements?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And, moreover, if the hon gentleman has any charges to make, let him make them like a man. Let him not go upon mere gossip. If he has charges to make, let him make them. There is not a word of truth in them.

Mr. BENNETT. The premier charges me with going upon mere gossip. Let me recall to his recollection a certain occasion when he did not do what I am doing—make a charge when the allegation and the denial could go out together. The right hon. gentleman, as leader of the Liberal party, in 1896 made the charge at Pembroke that Senator Drummond, now Sir George Drummond, had been instrumental in corrupting with a large sum of money the electors of this province, and that, as president of the Sugar Refiners' Association, he was in receipt of a large salary. The right hon. gentleman made that charge, not when Senator Drummond could be present to meet him face to face; and what was the answer of the Premier when afterwards he was challenged as to the truth or falsity of the statement? Not that it was true or that it should be investigated, but that other people had made the statement, and therefore he felt quite justified in going before the public and repeating it. Senator Drummond was not there to give a denial to the allegation; but the government are here to answer the charges of these newspapers if they please, and I am simply quoting what is in these newspapers, and what has been current in the country during the last few months.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, are we not entitled to have the quotation made from the newspaper, with the date when it was made? Let us have some opportunity of ascertaining the truth or falsity of these statements.

Mr. BENNETT. I am reading from the Montreal 'Herald' of the 5th of December:

> Now, the statement is made that efforts were made, by threats and by the offer of money, to have three ministers resign. The prospective resignation of one of them, Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick, was even announced by Conservative papers. But it seems the three ministers refused the offers of $100,000, or whatever sum may have been offered to them, and moreover declined to be frightened.

I am going to read something now that I hope will not shock the House. Everybody who knows the Minister of Justice will recognize this as a libel upon him, because it says that he penned this now almost historic telegram:

> Do your damnedest——

—which sounds so unlike the Minister of Justice to those who know him well that it seems improbable——

> ——was the telegram with which Mr. Fitzpatrick is said to have closed the incident when Montreal Conservative financiers undertook to secure his resignation, as they had announced.

Now, I am not making these statements of my own knowledge. I know nothing whatever of them. I do not know whether the Minister of Justice telegraphed that or not. I will sit down and let him deny it if he will.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I never sent any such telegram. There is not one word of truth in it; and I wish to say, moreover, that because I do not stop and kick every cur that barks at my heels, it does not follow that I admit the veracity of it.

Mr. BENNETT. Where there is a little smoke there is always a little fire, and those who know the Minister of Justice know that he is pretty badly piqued when he acts as he does to-night. It is always the galled jade that winces.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I think, in view of the categorical denial of the two ministers referred to, that the hon. gentleman should not persist in continuing the discussion along the line that he does.

Some hon. MEMBERS. He has a perfect right.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, I have been challenged to name a single newspaper that has made any of these charges or allegations. There is the charge as it appears in the Montreal 'Herald' of December 5.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No. What is the charge?

Mr. BENNETT. I have just read it. Surely the hon. gentleman has not been listening.

Mr. SPEAKER. I again call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that if a charge has been referred to, it has been categorically denied by the hon. gentlemen concerned, and their word should be accepted.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, if you rule that anything in a public newspaper cannot be read if a member denies the statement, I bow to your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not the rule I am making at all. I understood the hon. gentleman again to refer to the charge as having been made, after the hon. members concerned had denied it. Under these circumstances, I think the hon. gentleman should accept their denial, and not persist in repeating the charge.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, Mr. Speaker, I bow to your decision. Now, let me state what is appearing in the public press as to the way in which the Department of Railways and Canals has been conducted under hon. gentlemen opposite and Mr. Blair. Surely that is a matter for inquiry by hon. gentlemen opposite. There is a paper in this city called 'Events,' in which on November 26 there appeared most startling statements which are worthy of inquiry by this House or by a Royal Commission. What are these charges :

In passing we might explain how Mr. Russell stole the St. John 'Telegraph.' After a certain political transaction, carried out under the Department of Railways and Canals, $25,000 was put into the St. John 'Telegraph' stock. A certain contractor put up another $25,000 and a small amount of stock stood in the name of A. G. Blair, $5,000 we believe. The total capital stock of the company was $75,000 and only $69,000 of this had been issued. Mr. Dave Russell bought $9,000 of it, and as the contributors of the $50,000 did not wish their names to be known in connection with the subscriptions their stock was given to Mr. Dave Russell to hold in trust, it being, of course the control of the paper which the owners of the $50,000 worth of stock desired to retain. Mr. Russell then proceeded to treat the paper as his own, and when the directors protested he turned them out. He then offered the paper for sale to the Liberals for $125,000. The reason he was enabled to achieve this daring theft of an important daily newspaper was the desire of the two men who had placed their stock in trust with Mr. Russell not to be publicly connected with the affair.

Is this the state of political morality in this Dominion to-day—that associated with the Minister of Railways and Canals is this gentleman, Mr. David Russell, of whom I have nothing good or bad to say, because I am not in a position to say it ; that he stands as an intermediary, a toll-taker, between contractors and the department, that from a certain contractor $25,000 was filched and was used to purchase stock in a newspaper, that the deal was put through by Mr. Russell, and that by it he cleared no less than $125,000. The ministers cannot ignore these charges which are going through the country, nor turn a deaf ear to them when they hear them in this House. The public will expect, after the charges are stated in this House, that the same shall be fully investigated. This paper goes on to say :

Why was Mr. Russell so anxious to have the nominating of Mr. Blair's successor in the Department of Railways and Canals ? The answer to this question is Abbey's Salts. Mr. Russell formed a partnership of some sort with Mr. Blair on the salts business. During the past three or four years Mr. Blair made about $80,000 out of it. Mr. Russell no doubt made much more, for Mr. Russell is clever. How ? For some years no dividend has been declared on the stock. Promises have been given but nothing more. Mr. Russell is an adept at promises. In the meantime every contractor under the Department of Railways and Canals was expected to take a few thousands of stock in Abbey's Salts.

An hon. MEMBER. What paper is that in ?

Mr. BENNETT. The 'Events' of November 26. It cannot be pretended that the government are not aware of that charge made by a Liberal journal in this city. Is it not then high time that they should announce that there will be an investigation into everything done in that department while Mr. Blair was at its head. But if you rule, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot go into these other matters by giving quotations from public newspapers connecting the names of ministers in connection with attempts made to bribe them by contractors, I must of course bow to your ruling. But the question discussed in this newspaper is surely worthy the consideration of the first minister. Surely he is not going to do what Mr. Ross did in the Ontario House when the Sullivan, Stratton, Gamey, investigation was up. What happened then ? For three hours Mr. Stratton was accused of all kinds of crimes, and after these three hours of accusation, Mr. Ross stood up in his place and said that the next day Mr. Stratton would reply. That was certainly not an evidence of innocence, and I hope that the right hon. the first minister will go further than Mr. Stratton did and announce that there will be a full investigation into the conduct of the Department of Railways and Canals as regards this very matter. Let us go a little further. It was stated in the papers—and I suppose no one will rise to take Mr. Blair's part, because evidently there is none so poor as to do him reverence—that Mr. Blair was to take the stump. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman will explain why he did not. That is a matter concerning which the House and the country desire an explanation and which is worthy of investigation. But the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) made this afternoon a very savage attack against Mr. R. L. Borden, and I think, in Mr. Borden's absence, it is only fair that I should place on 'Hansard' the statement he made on the subject in connection with which the hon. gentleman made the charge he did.

Mr. LOGAN. I would beg to inform the hon. gentleman again that I never mentioned Mr. Borden's name or referred to him in any way this afternoon, and I shall leave to the unrevised 'Hansard' the proof of my statement.

Mr. BENNETT. Who then did the hon. gentleman give as his authority for the statement that Mr. Blair was to be taken into the cabinet to be formed by Mr. Borden ?

Mr. LOGAN. I do not propose to give my authority just now. The hon. gentleman will know it soon enough. We are not going to show our hand just now.

Mr. BENNETT. Then I presume the hon. gentleman is speaking on behalf of the government and there is after all going to be an investigation. If the right hon. the First Minister will say that there will be an inquiry, that will put an end to my remarks. But the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) had something to say with regard to this matter in an interview which he gave the Montreal 'Herald;' and in that interview he certainly placed Mr. Borden in rather an unenviable light. On December 5, he gave the Montreal 'Herald' this statement with reference to Mr. R. L. Borden :

I have no hesitation in telling you all I know about it,' said Mr. Emmerson. I was in New York on the 18th of September, and a gentleman approached me at the hotel I was staying at and asked me if there was no chance of getting a contract for the construction of the transcontinental railway. The elections, he said, were coming off, and if a contract was obtained there would be lots of money to swell the campaign fund. I told him that the work would have to be done by Canadian contractors, and refused to have anything to do with him.

He told me that they were working through Montreal people and I knew afterwards that Montreal parties acted very suddenly and peculiarly during the campaign. At the hotel was J. N. Greenshields, of Montreal. The Montreal people were said to be friends of David Russell. During the elections David Russell, J. N. Greenshields, two Americans, Dr. Kennedy and a Mr. Green, said to be an Englishman, who resided in the States for some years, visited my province.

They were riding in a magnificent private car and at Fredericton Junction on October 22, met Mr. R. L. Borden, apparently by appointment. Mr. Borden went on board, having been met at the station by Mr. Dowling, private secretary of Mr. David Russell. During the run to St. John, Mr. Borden, Mr. Greenshields and others were closeted together.

In the province of Quebec 'La Presse' was captured. But this was only preliminary work. There was, so I am told, to be on nomination day some twenty-five Liberal members who would retire. In this way twenty-five Conservatives would be elected in that province by acclamation, and this would secure the return of the Conservatives, when R. L. Borden would have charge of the construction of the transcontinental line and the giving out of the contracts. In connection with the resignation of Mr. Blair it may be mentioned that four days afterwards there appeared in a New York financial paper that he was to be the head of a syndicate for which the capital had been secured to control the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific. But something went wrong, and the plan of campaign fell through. 'That, said Mr. Emmerson, 'is what I know and what I have heard about it'.

If that is a correct report of Mr. Emmerson's statement—and I am not aware that he has contradicted it—he cast a reflection on twenty-five gentlemen who presumably have seats in this House from the province of Quebec ; and every hon. member from that province, in justice to himself, should demand from the government a full investigation and have the doubt cleared up whether or not they were parties to the infamous scheme by which they were to destroy this government, if at all possible, and had agreed to do this for a monetary consideration. I shall be very much surprised indeed if some hon. gentlemen from the province of Quebec do not demand a full and thorough investigation. But we have a further statement from another gentleman rather friendly to the government. I refer to the Speaker of the Senate. He said :

I heard on nomination day that the bombshell of the Tories was to develop as follows : 'The Tories, having secured the 'Presse,' were to keep the fact of having done so carefully from the public knowledge, and on nomination day Mr. Blair was to make extraordinary revelations. On the same day two or three ministers of the Crown were to be arrested for malfeasance in office. The next day the 'Presse' was to denounce the government and ask all honest men to turn out the Laurier government because of the revelations made by Mr. Blair. A certain number—as many as they could secure —of the Liberal candidates were to resign in disgust and allow as many Conservatives to be returned by acclamation.

Naturally Mr. Speaker Dandurand did not wish to make a wholesale accusation against the Liberal members from Quebec, and consequently did not state the number. Here then we have a statement made by a minister of the Crown and another made by the Speaker of the Senate, both published in a Liberal newspaper, and surely these are worthy of investigation. Then it is asked why did not the scheme succeed, and one newspaper thus answered that question:

The generally accepted theory is that the premier secured information which Mr. Blair was unwilling to have made public, and obtained it from Mr. Lambert Payne, formerly private secretary to Mr. Blair, and now to Mr. Emmerson.

What does that mean ? It is a statement in effect that Mr. Payne whilst secretary to Mr. Blair, became aware of certain actions in the department and had communicated these to Mr. Emmerson, and that the threat on the part of the first minister to expose Mr. Blair's conduct was sufficient to prevent his going on the public platform and making the expected denunciation.

Now, I desire to be perfectly fair and will add that I have seen in the public press an explicit denial by Mr. Payne, who is personnally known to many hon. members, especially to the older members,—and every one who knows him will accept his explanation that he in no way was a party to an exposure of Mr. Blair. There is the

matter as it is to-day before the public, set forth in the newspapers in the most positive and public manner, set forth in newspapers favourable to hon. gentlemen opposite and referred to in statements made by ministers of the Crown who were associated with the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson). The stories have been rife for a year or two that the Minister of Railways and Canals was the object of a plot to effect his downfall. And it may be that the Minister of Railways and Canals has set broadcast these statements relative to other ministers with the hope of defeating or at least of injuring them. I do hope that some hon. gentleman on that side, clothed with authority and knowledge—and that would mean that it must be none other than the Prime Minister himself—will rise in his place and state positively that there shall be and will be a thorough, a complete, a searching investigation of the whole matter. Let that investigation be by any authority that is competent, whether by a commission, as hon. gentlemen opposite seem to prefer, or by a committee of this House. In that connection, perhaps the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) knows whereof he speaks, because I notice that he is chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. But, in view of the hon. gentleman's action in presenting himself as a would-be voter in the city of Ottawa, where he must have known that he was not entitled to vote—and I have heard no denial from him of this statement which has been repeated here—it is about time for the Prime Minister to ask him to withdraw from the chairmanship of that committee. In reference to the part played by Mr. R. L. Borden in this matter, I think it only fair in his absence to place on 'Hansard' the statement made by him, under date of Dec. 6th he gave this interview in Montreal :

> With reference to certain press statements respecting Mr. Blair's resignation as chairman of the Railway Commission, I wish to say that that resignation came as a great surprise to me. I did not directly or indirectly suggest to him or ask him to resign. I held out no inducement to him to resign. I had no interview with him upon the subject, nor did any one on my behalf approach him upon the subject. In short I had nothing whatever to do with his resignation, and I was thoroughly surprised when I heard of it.
>
> I had no connection with and I knew nothing of any negotiations respecting the alleged change of ownership of 'La Presse,' and I had nothing to do with such change, if it took place. I never had any interview or communication with any English or American capitalists, or with any other person, with respect to any proposed contracts for the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific. I never even heard of the alleged construction syndicate. No one approached me with any proposal respecting the construction of that railway. Any statement or suggestion to the contrary is utterly without foundation.
>
> I never received any contribution for any purpose from Mr. Russell or Mr. Greenshields or any gentleman connected with them, or from any English or American capitalists, nor did the Conservative party, so far as I am aware. Until the article in the 'Toronto World' appeared I had never even heard of any attempt by Conservatives to induce the withdrawal of Liberal candidates in the province of Quebec. It would astonish me beyond measure to learn that any such attempt was made or proposed.

Now, this question is before the House, and to-morrow's newspapers will place it before the country. And, while the government are strong in this House, while it is clear from the applause that greets every statement of the ministerial benches whether creditable or discreditable, it is evident that this government cannot be defeated in this House. Judging by that applause I cannot conceive that it would be possible to force the greater part of these who sit behind the ministers to vote against this government, no matter how odious or nefarious any act of theirs may be.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) should retract that statement.

Mr. BENNETT. Oh, very well : I withdraw it. As I cannot repeat that statement here I can only repeat it in other places, and I expect to do so on many occasions.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. BENNETT. I have gone through the province of Ontario, or parts of it within the last month, and have addressed many public audiences. And, I care not what public opinion in other provinces may be, I can tell the Prime Minister here to-night, that, unless an inquiry is made into the matter we have been discussing, public opinion in the great province of Ontario will be stronger against him even than it was on the 3rd of November last. I do not wish to harrow up the feelings of hon. gentlemen who had a trial of strength in the province of Ontario lately, and they know the result. The whole corps of officials and all the power and influence of this government were joined to those of the provincial government, and what was the result ? I need not harrow up the feeling of hon. gentlemen opposite by referring to the matter at length. They know that, against all the power of this government and of the local government, and against all the power of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which carried free not only hundreds but thousands of voters who were expected to vote for the Liberals, this government received, in the great province of Ontario a rebuke that did not well please the Prime Minister and that to-day saddens him to recall. And another thing that he recalls with pain is that the old Liberal county of Huntingdon, for the first time in its history, went Conservative under the rule of the present Prime Minister of this Dominion.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). At the risk of prolonging this discussion which, perhaps, has already been prolonged too much, I desire to offer a few observations. Those observations will not be lengthy so far as they concern the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) who has just taken his seat. He has played again the role with which he has made us familiar in past sessions in this House when he bandies about the names of ministers and prominent members on this side. I say to him and to those on his side of the House, that if he has any charge to make against any of the ministers whom he has been pleased to name, there is a proper way for him to present that charge. I will challenge him, I will dare him, to stand in his place and make a single charge against any hon. gentleman on this side, and I will give him the floor if he desires to speak. He has mentioned the name of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine). Is he prepared to make a charge against that gentleman ? He has mentioned the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Is he prepared to make a charge against the Minister of Justice ? No, he is not. He is doing what we have seen him do in this House many a time before, using the names of men occupying prominent and responsible positions in this country, but not daring to make a charge against them. There is a proper course and an improper course in these matters, and the hon. gentleman has seen fit to take the improper course.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. Johnston) wish me to answer ?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I do.

Mr. BENNETT. I can tell the hon. gentleman that I have been elected to this House for four parliaments. My last majority was 383 and my smallest was 32. And, if the reputation of this government in Ontario goes as it has been going, my majority next time will be six hundred.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. There, Mr. Speaker, is the same old story. I have been good enough to give the hon. gentleman an opportunity to justify the statements he has made. I am still prepared to give way to him if he is ready to make a charge against any member of this House. Let me repeat that he has seen fit on this occasion, as on former occasions, to adopt the improper course when he chooses to address the members of this House of Commons. All I have to say on this occasion is that the coward and the slanderer is abroad in this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I do not mean to say that the hon. gentleman is one.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. I ask the ruling of the Speaker whether such language is permissible, because it evidently refers to the hon. gentleman ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The term would have been objectionable if persisted in, but the hon. gentleman at once stated that he did not propose to apply it to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett). Otherwise the term would have been out of order.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Understand me, well, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to make that observation apply to any member occupying a seat in this House ; but I do say again that the coward and the slanderer is abroad in this country, and the sooner he is picked out and his picture held up to the people of this country, the better it will be for the country. Sir, I hope, and I am sure hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will share that hope, that when hon. members venture to make insinuations of a very unsavory character with respect to members occupying seats in this House, if they have any charge to make, the proper thing for them to do is to make it. I will not pursue this subject any further. Now, why did Mr. Blair resign the chairmanship of the Railway Commission ? That is the question.

Mr. BENNETT. Hear, hear.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. The hon. gentleman says, Hear, hear. I have no doubt that if he applied to hon. gentlemen occupying prominent positions in his own party he would be told very quickly the reasons why Mr. Blair resigned from the chairmanship of the Railway Commission. I propose, before I sit down, to call witnesses in this House on that matter, witnesses whom the hon. gentleman will be compelled to admit occupy prominent positions in the councils of the party of which he is a member. I propose to call as witness the 'Mail and Empire,' and I propose to call a greater witness still, the Montreal 'Star,' which conducted the campaign on behalf of the Conservative party which ended on the 3rd of November last. It was the leading organ of the Conservative party. I wonder why my hon. friend, who is anxious to know why Mr. Blair resigned, does not ask Mr. Hugh Graham, proprietor of the Montreal 'Star,' why Mr. Blair resigned. I am quite sure he would be told why. Is it not notorious all over this land that Mr. Graham was the one person perhaps in this country who was possessed of the information before it was announced to the public, that Mr. Blair was about to resign his position as chairman of the Railway Commission ? True it is that Mr. David Russell, who was one of the stalwarts of the Conservative party during the last campaign, has told us over and over again that he induced Mr. Blair to resign. He tells us so himself. Mr. Hugh Graham also tells the people of this country that he knew Mr. Blair was going to resign. Now, I have selected a few extracts at random from Conservative papers of about

the date of the resignation ; as nearly as I can find out, it occurred on the 18th or 19th of October last. I have mentioned the Montreal 'Star' as the leading organ of the Conservative party in the Dominion of Canada. Some people may take exception to that, but I think any hon. gentleman in this House who followed the history of the Conservative party during the past three or four years can reach no other conclusion than that the Montreal 'Star' was, during that time, the organ which was more intimately associated with the Conservative party than any other newspaper in this country. Now, we find a despatch from St. John, New Brunswick, in the Montreal 'Star' of October 19, and what does it say ?

To-day there is no other topic on the street. Conservatives are jubilant, Liberals dumbfounded.

My hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean), at an early stage of this debate, said that he was ashamed of the conduct of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, Mr. Blair, in resigning his position on the Railway Commission. He was ashamed of it ; but the Conservatives in the city of St. John were jubilant because of it, and the Conservatives in every other city in the Dominion of Canada were jubilant. My hon. friend from South York was alone among the Conservatives who was ashamed, as nearly as we can find out, of the action of the ex-Minister of Railways in resigning his seat on that board. The St. John 'Telegraph,' of which we heard so much, and which was quoted at great length in the campaign in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick—the St. John 'Telegraph' said :

The resignation of Mr. Blair at this time, and the announcement which accompanies it will lend new force and depth to the swelling tide of popular feeling which animates this great country to-day, and which the government is ignoring to its peril and to its undoing.

The government was ignorant according to this paper. Then the St. John 'Sun,' which is a leading organ of the Conservative party in the province of New Brunswick, has this to say :

It is useless to suggest that Mr. Blair's resignation has no political significance. Its chief public significance is political. Mr. Blair is too old and experienced a politician not to understand the effect of his resignation at this stage of the campaign. If he were retiring for purely private or professional reasons——

The St. John 'Sun,' the leading organ of the Conservative party in New Brunswick, knew at that time that Mr. Blair was not resigning for purely private or professional reasons. What then was he resigning for ? The leading organ of the Conservative party in New Brunswick evidently knew why he resigned. Why don't they tell us ? Why don't they take hon. gentlemen opposite into their confidence, if they are so anxious to ascertain why it was that he resigned ? The evidence is clear and distinct that they were aware of the reasons.

If he were retiring for purely private or professional reasons he would wait longer, as the premier must strongly desire him to do. But if Mr. Blair desires to strike one more blow at the project which he has declared to be full of peril to the nation, he knows that this is his great chance—his last one.

That is what they say. Then the St. John 'Star,' another leading organ of the Conservative party in New Brunswick and the Dominion of Canada, said :

The weight of his fighting ability and his influence thrown with the Conservative campaign against that policy——

That is against the policy of the government.

——against that policy at this time renders even more certain than it seemed yesterday the triumph of the policy of the people.

That is, the policy of the Conservative party, so-called. My hon. friend from South York is ashamed of the conduct of the ex-chairman of the Railway Commission ; the leading organs of the party of which he is a member are heartily proud of the conduct of Mr. Blair. Then there is the 'Citizen,' the leading organ of the Conservative party in the city of Ottawa. It says :

The people believe that these personal sacrifices have been prompted by patriotic motives, and that belief has stimulated the expectation that a man of Mr. Blair's acknowledged political power and weight in national life will not remain satisfied with a mere personal protest ; that his sense of obligation to the people will force him to come forward and make the consummation of this ruinous deal an impossibility.

That is the opinion of the Ottawa 'Citizen,' and yet my hon. friend from South York is ashamed of the conduct of Mr. Blair. Then there is the 'Mail and Empire.' Surely it will not be denied that this paper occupies a prominent position in the councils of the Conservative party ? What does it say ?

The incident is highly dramatic.

Highly dramatic, of course.

Here is a public man commanding the highest position in the gift of the government. In this office he might have remained for the remainder of his natural life. But a great issue is before us—an issue in respect of which he is well informed—and he lays aside his appointment and his emoluments in order that Canada may again be warned of the danger that lurks in the proposition we are now asked to endorse.

Hon. gentlemen opposite are anxious to ascertain why it was that Mr. Blair resigned. Why do they not read the 'Mail and Empire' in order to be perfectly informed as to his reasons for resigning. Now there are several other statements that might be called in evidence to give this country an idea as to the reasons for Mr. Blair's resignation. We might appeal to the evidence of those hon.

gentlemen of the Conservative party who pressed Mr. Blair with invitations to speak for them all over the country. Who are the gentlemen, who, according to the Montreal 'Star,' pressed him to speak in the city of Toronto? Did any hon. gentlemen from the city of Toronto do so? They pressed him to speak at Kingston, London, Brockville, Peterboro, Hamilton, Windsor, Chatham, St. Thomas, Niagara, St. Catharines, Quebec, Montreal, Three Rivers, St. John, Halifax, Moncton, Sussex, Fredericton, Amherst, Truro, Pictou and my own city of Sydney.

Mr. STOCKTON. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. Johnston) means to say that the Conservative party in the city or county of St. John asked Mr. Blair to speak during the election he is entirely mistaken.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I am simply, Mr. Speaker, giving the House the benefit of the information given the country and the public and which has been generally supplied to them by the leading organ of the Conservative party, the Montreal 'Star.'

Mr. STOCKTON. I am giving a denial of that statement, Mr. Speaker, and according to the ruling you made in respect to the hon. gentleman in front of me, that denial should be accepted. The statement is absolutely untrue.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I accept without any reservation whatever the denial made by my hon. friend (Mr. Stockton), but I want to point out to him that it is not a denial of any statement made by me. It is a denial of a statement made by the leading organ of the party of which he is a member.

Mr. BARKER. Mr. Speaker, I desire, as one of the representatives of the city of Hamilton, to give an equally explicit denial of the statement in regard to that city. There was no request whatever to Mr. Blair to deliver any speech at Hamilton.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I accept with equal cordiality the statement made by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) and it is another evidence of the unreliability of the statements that were handed out to the people of this country by this great organ of public opinion.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, I desire on behalf of my own constituency of St. John to make a denial similar to the one already made by my hon. colleague from the county (Mr. Stockton). The Conservative party in St. John made no attempt whatever to obtain the services of Mr. Blair or to induce him to deliver an address in the city of St. John.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I accept again, as I have accepted in the case of the hon. gentlemen who have preceded him, the denial of my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel). I followed the addresses delivered in the city of St. John somewhat closely during the campaign, I followed the addresses made by my hon. friend in his own campaign, and I did not notice during the progress of that campaign that he or his colleagues took any exception to the very many remarkable things that were said by members of the Conservative party, of Mr. Blair. I think he fully concurred in everything which was said about him owing to the benefits that were going to accrue to the Conservative party as a result of his conduct, and I think he was prepared to accept the full benefit that he expected would accrue to the Conservative party. A great many people in the hon. gentleman's own party will not hesitate to say that were it not for the position assumed by Mr. Blair in this country neither himself nor his colleague would have been elected.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire you to read the resolution before the House. I fail to see the connection between the hon. gentleman's remarks and the resolution.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. HENDERSON. I think I am quite within my right in asking you, Mr. Speaker, to read the resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is quite within his right in asking to have the resolution read at any stage of the debate.

Mr. BRODEUR. Not during a speech.

Mr. HENDERSON. At any time. I understand it is my right.

Mr. BRODEUR. You cannot interrupt an hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER. My recollection of the rule is that a request may be made at any time to read the resolution before the House. If the hon. gentleman desires to have the resolution read. I will read it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have no desire to impose upon you, Mr. Speaker, the reading of this resolution, but I do not want to sit here and be imposed upon by a gentleman discussing a question which is not before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. If it was not the desire of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) to have the resolution read, I do not think he should have asked to have it read.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would ask you to read it unless the hon. gentleman is called to order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think there has been a good deal of latitude allowed in this debate on both sides. The hon. gentleman's remarks are perhaps somewhat irrelevant to the question, but there has been a good deal of latitude and I do not propose to call him any more strictly to account just at present.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I will be delighted to conform myself, Mr. Speaker, to any ruling you may make. My only apology for participating in this discussion is that I am simply following the lead of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I think that the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) is perhaps more than anybody else responsible for the turn which this debate has taken.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. In what way? You had better shelter yourself under some one else on the other side. I do not care to take the responsibility.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. It is interesting, however, to have from hon. gentlemen opposite, even at this late date, a contradiction of the reports which were sent out by this great organ of the public, the Montreal 'Star.' I think, however, Mr. Speaker, it would have been a little better if these hon. gentlemen had risen in their places previously to November 3, last, and repudiated the utterances of this journal. They are willing to do it to-day, but they were not so ready to do it previously to November 3 last. However, I am quite prepared to accept their statements. My hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan), when addressing the House before six o'clock, made reference to the rumour set abroad in this country that Mr. Blair, in the event of the Conservative party coming into power was going to be a member of the next Conservative cabinet. Whether or not there was anything in the rumour, I do not know. I am not going to say I attached very much importance to that rumour, but I am here to assert with my hon. friend from Cumberland that there was such a rumour abroad and I am going to give the House a little bit of evidence just to point out that there was some reason for the faith that was in some people in this country. The Montreal 'Star' of October 25, had the following:

> It is now stated that after the election a splendid banquet will be given Hon. Mr. Blair in Windsor hotel in recognition of his great public services and his efforts to save the country from the disastrous effects of the government's Grand Trunk Pacific policy. The banquet which will be held on or about November 26th will be, it is stated, the most magnificent function of the kind ever held in Canada.

At the time that this announcement was made on the authority of the Montreal 'Star,' a great many Conservatives in this country said that the Conservative party were going to win on November 3, that Mr. Borden will be forming his cabinet about November 20, he will be taking into his cabinet Mr. Blair, as Minister of Railways and Canals and this magnificent banquet announced by the Montreal 'Star' will take place at that time to celebrate the entrance into the Conservative party and government of Mr. Blair. Of course, the Montreal 'Star' may be wrong again. Now it is highly probable, in view of the repudiation of hon. gentlemen opposite to-night, that the Montreal 'Star' was wrong again, and therefore it is that I am quite satisfied to allow the matter to drop. My hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) is ashamed of the conduct of the ex-chairman of the Railway Commision. What does his leader, the leader of the Conservative party say with regard to this matter? Speaking at Sherbrooke in the province of Quebec, the night following the announcement of Mr. Blair's retirement, Mr. Borden said:

> I at one time like many of you here thought Mr. Blair mercenary, but now I admire him because he has been able to rise to the occasion to say 'although I have the salary, it is my country first.' He had exposed the Laurier government. He has shown the inner workings of their policy.

That does not compare with the opinion which the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has of Mr. Blair.

Why did Mr. Blair resign? That is a question which has been asked us frequently from the other side of the House this afternoon. The Montreal 'Star' of October 21 reports a speech delivered by Mr. Borden, at Woodstock, in the province of New Brunswick. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has assured this House that Mr. Borden knew nothing whatever about the movements of Mr. Blair. I accept the statement of the hon. member for Simcoe that Mr. Borden did not know, but if you read the report of his speech at Woodstock, as it appears in the 'Star', you will find this paragraph:

> Some one in the audience interrupted at this stage by saying: 'Emmerson will talk about Mr. Blair tomorrow night.'
>
> Like a flash Mr. Borden replied: 'I think the amusing part will be when Mr. Blair comes to talk about Mr. Emmerson.'

Evidently Mr. Borden expected that Mr. Blair was going to take a part in the campaign. Of course we are assured by hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House that he knew nothing about it, and I for my part am prepared to accept that explanation—it is another repudiation by hon. gentlemen opposite of the Montreal 'Star.' I have to apologize to the House for having perhaps transgressed the rules, but I have given my reasons for this transgression. It is somewhat comforting to us on this side that hon. gentlemen have nothing whatever to offer in opposition to the resolution now before the House. The government have proposed to the people of this country the appointment of a certain gentleman as chairman of the Railway Commission. Hon. gentlemen opposite have risen one after another vying with each other as to which would say the kindest things of the gentleman the government propose to appoint. It is naturally comforting to those of us who sit on the back

benches supporting the government, to know that the appointment they propose making to an important position is one that commends itself to the best judgment of gentlemen who sit not alone on this side of the House but on the opposite side as well.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey). Mr. Speaker, it was said by one of the Conservative members the other day that criticism is the life of parliament. I should think it is equally true that too much criticism causes sessions of parliament to live unnecessarily long and I should think that a great deal of the criticism of to-night has been wide of the mark. I sympathize with some of the remarks made to-night by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) especially when he stated that he did not think it likely that the reform government would be defeated by the votes of members of this House. I think he is perhaps in that regard deserving of some sympathy. I have wondered if this is where the shoe pinches and if this is at the bottom of the whole trouble. I also learned that the hon. member for East Simcoe marvelled that 25 Reform candidates refused to be bribed, refused to be bought and to play the traitor for the thousands of dollars that had been raised in the effort to bribe them to defeat the Laurier government. That is what I would have expected of 25 Reform candidates in the Dominion of Canada. I would expect they would refuse as they did, to be bought and bribed, preferring to preserve their good consciences and honour. I trust that had the same offer of a bribe been made to Conservative candidates, they would have resisted and refused in the same manner.

There is a vacancy in the chairmanship of the Railway Commission, and I believe the desire of the government is to fill that vacancy with a man well qualified to discharge the duties. I believe that is the desire of the people of this country. I hope that is the desire of the Conservative members of this House. I am glad to hear every one on either side who has spoken, express the highest opinion of the hon. Mr. Justice Killam. Every one seems to admit that he is a man of integrity and ability and the proper man to fill the position. The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has said that there has been bargaining and he regrets that there has been bargaining. Sir, it is oftentimes necessary to bargain to obtain the services of a good man. It is never necessary to bargain to obtain the services of an indifferent, poor or incapable man. The acting leader of the opposition (Mr. Foster) has said that the services of Mr. Killam have been obtained upon the lowest terms. If that be true, that a man who is thoroughly capable, a man of the greatest integrity, has been arranged with, and that a bargain has been made whereby his services have been procured for the people, for the payment of the lowest price, then I should think the interest of the people of this country have been well and truly looked after and I believe the people will be thoroughly satisfied with the arrangement that has been made.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). These resolutions are to affect one particular case, they have covered one case which is probably an exception. No objection has been made, I do not think any objection could be made to the gentleman who has been named and who is being provided for in this resolution. Where I think the mistake has been made and where I think the government will be wise in changing this resolution is that they are providing not for this case alone but are making a general Act covering possibilities. Now if the gentleman who is named is appointed, we all hope that he will hold that position for very many years. Ten years or a longer time we hope will elapse before the necessity again arises of appointing a chairman of the Railway Commission. When that period arrives, it is in my judgment very unlikely that a judge of one of the superior courts will be again called upon to fill the position. But if that should happen ten years hence, it would be a very easy thing to provide for it by a special Act, as is being done in this case, and I think that would do away with all the objection there is to these resolutions. You are putting on the statute-book a law which will naturally be looked to by the judges of the court as containing one of the prizes that will possibly fall to them. I do not think that is necessary or wise ; it is not the proper position in which to place the judges. Let us deal with the one case before us that requires to be dealt with, and confine the resolutions to this particular case, and I believe every one will agree to them.

Mr. LOGAN. Before you put the question, Mr. Speaker, will you allow me to make a personal explanation ? On two or three occasions this evening reference has been made to my having offered to vote at the recent provincial election in the city of Ottawa, and, if you will allow me, I will state the facts. I happened to be a householder in this city, and as such my name was placed upon the assessment roll, and for that reason, I believe, was also placed upon the voter's list. I knew nothing about it, however, until a day or two before the provincial election, when I received a notice to the effect that my name was on the provincial voters' list, and asking me to vote at a certain poll. In the province of Nova Scotia, from which I come, if a man's name is on the list, having got there from the assessment roll, it matters not in a provincial election whether he lives in Nova Scotia or British Columbia, he has a vote. I am

now informed that the same is the case in Manitoba and Quebec. I did not give the matter any consideration; but knowing that that was the law in Nova Scotia, it never occurred to me that I had not a right to vote in the province of Ontario. Therefore I went to the poll to exercise my franchise, as I thought I had the right to do; and I am informed to-day by an eminent Ontario lawyer in this House that I had a right to vote. Whether I had or not, I thought I had, as I would have had under the law of Nova Scotia. But having been asked at the poll if I had been a resident of the province of Ontario for a certain length of time, I said I had not; and when it was pointed out to me that there was a residence qualification in this province, I withdrew. I make this explanation to show that there was no wrong intention on my part in this matter.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee.

On resolution 1,

1. Resolved, That if a judge of any Superior Court in Canada is appointed chief commissioner of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada he shall not be removed at any time by the Governor in Council except upon address of the Senate and House of Commons.

Mr. STOCKTON. I have not taken any part in this debate, and I do not intend to occupy the attention of the committee at any length now. This is somewhat special legislation. I am not objecting to the provision of the statute that the appointee shall be removable only upon an address of the two houses of parliament; but I do object to a distinction being made between an appointee who is not a judge and one who is a judge. I think for fair legislation that it is worthy of the consideration of the Minister of Justice to make the law applicable equally to all appointees.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The suggestion which my hon. friend has just made is one that would naturally commend itself at first sight to any intelligent observer of what is going on. But let me point out to my hon. friend the conditions under which this legislation is introduced. It is found necessary to choose the man who above all men we deem to be the best qualified for this particular position. I think my hon. friend, with the knowledge he has of the profession, will come to the conclusion that the gentleman we have in our mind for this position is eminently well qualified to fill it.

Mr. STOCKTON. I think that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That opinion, I think, is concurred in by all those who have spoken in this debate. It has been suggested by the present leader of the opposition that something in the nature of a bargain was made between the government and this judge, and in the way he put it such a bargain would be in the last degree objectionable. I for my part heartily concur in all that has been said here to-day with respect to the necessity of keeping our judges free from all political entanglements. I am a firm believer in the doctrine of once a puisne always a puisne, although, as my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) observed to-day, that doctrine has been more honoured in breach than the observance. My hon. friend knows that it has been set at defiance not only in this country, but quite recently in England, in the appointment of the present Lord Chief Justice, Lord Alverstone, who was previously Master of the Rolls. It was also set at defiance in the appointment of Lord Russell as Lord Chief Justice of England, he having been Justice of Appeal when appointed. And my hon. friend will remember the discussion which took place in the House of Commons in England in 1872, with respect to the appointment of Sir Robert Collier to the Judicial Committee.

Mr. BARKER. But I think that was universally condemned.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend will remember that marvellous letter of Lord Coleridge to the Lord Chancellor, in which he castigated the Lord Chancellor to such an extent that he had shortly afterwards to resign. What was the principle he contended for? It was the principle, practically consecrated by vote of the Commons of England when, on a motion of censure, Mr. Gladstone was almost defeated as a result of the appointment. What was the principle? It was that a judge should not be appointed to the highest court of appeal until he had some experience in a lower court. The principle then of once a puisne judge always a puisne judge was formally condemned. I have expressed my opinion—and it may be considered presumptious in me to have an opinion after what I have quoted—but I would, if I could, have inscribed over the entry to the judicial bench these words: 'Those who enter here leave all hopes of preferment behind.' That is my own view, but that is not the view which has been adopted. But, after all, one swallow does not make a summer, and it is not because I hold that view against the opinion of the people at large that my opinion should prevail. But let me answer something that fell from my hon. friend the leader of the opposition some few minutes ago. When he noticed how thin was the ice on which the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) was skating, he found it necessary to depart from the principle that his hon. friend was contending for, and he said, with that capacity for refining and making nice distinctions which is so characteristic of his analytical mind: I admit that in principle, preferment in order of promotion on the bench is all right, but when you come to take a man from the bench and

appoint him to a position elsewhere, that is what I object to.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. But here again we have a number of precedents. Let me remind my hon. friend of the case quoted by the First Minister, the case of Sir John Thompson, who was taken from the bench and made Minister of Justice in the government of Sir John Macdonald. Let me remind him also of the case of Mr. Angers, who was taken from the judicial bench in my own province and made Lieutenant Governor, and also a case in my own family, which occurred in 1873, when a gentleman was taken from the bench in the province of Quebec and made Lieutenant Governor. These are all cases in which was followed the rule adopted in the present instance. But let me get down to the case in hand. Let me point out to the committee the conditions under which this appointment was made. The government was casting about for a man to replace Mr. Blair.

Mr. STOCKTON. I am not objecting to the appointment.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am not speaking to my hon. friend, but at the committee. When we were casting about for a proper person for this position, the man upon whom we fixed our mind was Mr. Justice Killam. He was approached and asked if he would accept. His answer was: Here I am now on the bench. I have served on the bench for twenty years. Ten years hence I shall have the right to retire with my full salary. I am now fifty-five years of age, and in addition to that I occupy a position from which I cannot be removed except upon an address from both Houses of parliament. Why should I give up that fixity of tenure in the office I hold and the advantages which will come to me as the result of my occupation of that office with respect to my retiring allowance, to take this position that you offer me?

Mr. SPROULE. For the $30,000 extra he will get.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Allow me. That was his argument. He said: I have an acquired right to my position and the emoluments which will come to me at the time of my retirement. And we thought that was perfectly reasonable, and that we should not in any way interfere with the fixity of his tenure of office or his right to his retiring allowance at the expiration of his period of office. And this legislation is intended for nothing else than to enable us to give him that position under these conditions. There was no other bargain; and if that can be considered an ill-advised bargain, of course we are responsible for it, and perhaps I am responsible in a larger manner than any one else. But that is the extent of the bargain, and it does seem to me there is nothing extraordinary in it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman is evading the whole question. This resolution says:

> That if a judge of any Superior Court in Canada is appointed chief commissioner of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada he shall not be removed at any time by the Governor in Council except upon address of the Senate and House of Commons.

The people were given a solemn pledge that the chairman of the Railway Commission would be removable by the Governor in Council and that his conduct could be discussed and criticised in this House. Now, however, the whole scheme is changed, and an effort is made to put an irresponsible man in that position—irresponsible as compared with the chairman under the present law. The whole argument of Mr. Blair, who introduced the Bill, and who was then a colleague of the hon. Minister of Justice, and who was sustained during the whole of the debate by his colleague, was that the chairman and every other member of the commission should be subject to removal by the Governor in Council. In that way he was to be responsible to the government and this House, and could be removed if he failed to do his duty. Now that position is reversed, and nobody is given any authority to compel him to perform his duties. What are his powers? The hon. gentleman read this afternoon what the powers of that commission are. They are very extensive, and a great obligation is put, not only upon the chairman, but on the other two commissioners. The point I make has not been answered in this debate, and I intend that it shall be before this measure goes through. What I contend is that the government have changed their policy. This afternoon the Prime Minister claimed credit for what he is doing to-day. But what he is doing to-day is reversing the policy for which he claimed credit and which he presented to the people not long ago for their endorsation. We were to have a tribunal competent to deal with all these disputes between railway companies and the people, and that tribunal was to be responsible to government and to parliament. Now, however, that the elections are over, and when the public expect the government to carry out its pledges, we are told that the chairman of this commission is to be irresponsible. Until the point I make is answered, this legislation shall not go through. It may be six months before this session is over, or before the consent of the Governor General can be had to this legislation, and as far as I can gather the gentleman named may not be prepared to take the position until this measure becomes law. Is this commission to remain for months unmanned, and those questions left unsettled with which it was appointed to deal?

Now, my charge is not that made by the hon. member for St. John city and county (Mr. Stockton) that this thing is wrong because it does not apply to all cases. My charge is that this is a reversal of policy. I protest against that reversal and against making the chairman of the commission an officer not responsible to the Governor in Council, so that we may criticise the government for his acts, as we criticise any other acts of the ministers. Instead of having a commission simple in its methods, quick in its action, and one that can sit in any part of the country, we are to have a court whose presiding officer is not responsible to the administration. That is the charge that I want answered. I do not raise the smaller issues raised by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Stockton) —if he will pardon me for so speaking. It is the complete reversal of policy, the setting at naught of the promises that were made two years ago, when this commission was established, when Hon. Mr. Blair, as shown by the record, declared that it would not do to have the chairman of the commission removable only by the cumbersome method of a joint address of both Houses of parliament. It is impossible, practically, to enforce such a means of responsibility. Suppose that a general election were being held which turned upon the administration of the law by this Railway Commission. It would be pleaded that the government was not responsible. And, if attempt were made to act through parliament, this doctrine of vested rights would be pleaded against any change in the policy of the commission. This is not the policy that was adopted when this commission was provided for by statute. The policy of that time is completely reversed. I do not care so much, for my part, for an explanation of these petty matters as to one man being treated differently from another, because he has been a judge ; it is the reversal of policy that I want explained. Still, as was pointed out by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Foster) there is an invidious distinction—a rule is made to apply to the chairman of the commission that does not apply to his colleagues. If the chairman is to be removed only upon joint address of the House of Commons and the Senate, why should not the same rule apply to the other members of the commission ? The argument used is that this is a special case. But what I object is that the government are using this special case to make a bad general rule. Under the law as it is, if the chairman of the Railway Commission is not doing his duty, that can be pointed out in this House, and an explanation demanded of the government. The law provides that the chairman may do this and shall do that ; but there is no clause of the law compelling the fulfilment of his duty, and it is left for this House, by holding the administration responsible to cause them to compel him to do his duty. And that is the great trouble with the laws we make. We see it cropping up every day. No penalties are imposed and obligations are not fulfilled. The only course is this cumbrous and ineffective course of removal upon address of both Houses of parliament. I ask the government to explain the reason for its reversal of policy and the destruction of the usefulness of this great commission.

Mr. STOCKTON. I was not here when the policy was laid down. I hope it is not going to take three months to go through with what we are doing in the matter. I certainly shall not be one to prolong the discussion. The case of Sir Robert Collier has been brought before the House by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick). That case does not apply. The law there was that a man could not be appointed to the judicial committee of the Privy Council unless he held high judical office. To comply with the letter of the law, they made him a judge, and two days afterwards appointed him to the judical committee. It was practically a device to permit an evasion of the law.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What about the chief justice ?

Mr. STOCKTON. Lord Alverstone was master of the rolls. I am not talking about that case, and probably would not go as far as the Minister of Justice has stated with regard to it. Now, the chairman of the Railway Commission is essentially a judge, and we must recognize that fact. It may be a small matter, as my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) suggests, but I can see no objection to making him as independent of the government of the day as is the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Canada. But, suppose the first minister were to recommend the Minister of Justice as chairman of the Railway Commission. Under section 8, the Minister of Justice, after being so appointed, could be dismissed from his office by order of the Governor in Council, because he holds no high judicial office. Why put a judge in a better position than the Minister of Justice would be if he were appointed ? It is an invidious distinction, and therefore, I say, it is special legislation. I hope the Minister of Justice will make it general, if it is the policy of the government, and make it apply to the chairman of the commission no matter what his office before appointment.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend (Mr. Stockton), of course, sees at once the difference between my appointment—which, of course, is impossible—

Mr. STOCKTON. It was only an illustration.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course, but even taking it as a matter of illustration—I have no acquired right to a retired allowance or to the position I occupy. But if you go to a judge and ask him to accept this position he is well entitled to say : Why should you make my position more precarious under

the new appointment than it is at the present time ?

Mr. STOCKTON. You can provide in the law that, if he is removed, he is to have a retiring allowance. You can make it a general law. I state to the Minister of Justice and to the members of this House that, as far as possible, all laws should be of general application.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This is of general application with respect to a class of persons.

Mr. STOCKTON. It is a general law made to suit a particular case.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend (Mr. Stockton), I am sure will be willing to take a reasonable view of my difficulties, and will appreciate them, when he considers what fell from the lips of my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) and what fell from the lips of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr Foster). In the one case I was asked to make a special law for this particular individual ; on the other hand I am told not to do any thing of the sort in any direction or in any case.

Mr. STOCKTON. Well, I think it would be better legislation to make a special law for this particular case, which will just fit Judge Killam, if he is to be the man ; and then after that, have the law general.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I object absolutely to that. I want what was promised to the people of this country, and I will insist on it, I want the chairman of that commission to be a responsible officer, under the doctrine of responsible government.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will my hon. friend define what he means by responsibility ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I will answer in the terms of his colleague, the hon. gentleman who put this Bill through the House. Mr. Blair said this : We are not going to make these men judges, this is not a court; it may have some of the functions of a court of law, but it is to be a business man's tribunal, not a court. He told us that business methods were to be adopted in it, there was to be a speedy settlement of cases, it was a kind of board of arbitration, which is much different. It is a board of arbitration such as they have in the United States. They are not courts there, they have certain functions of courts, but they are chiefly boards of arbitration and settlement. I still insist on what the public were promised. What the public expected was a responsible officer in the way that a Lieutenant Governor is responsible—to use the example of their own side when they brought down the Bill. They printed the Bill twice with the provision in it that these men were to be judges. But Mr. Blair pointed out that this was not a court of law so much as a commission to do certain things. But that idea was abandoned, and he apologized to the House that he had placed these men on the basis of judges, and he said : We want to have them on the basis of lieutenant governors who can be removed by Order in Council. I say that is what the people were promised, and by that I mean a chairman responsible to the people, responsible to parliament in a speedy way, and responsible to the Governor General in Council. But there is a reversion of policy. I want what the public were promised, I want to see a chairman there on the lines that the hon. gentlemen mentioned when they introduced the Bill. What reason have they for this change, the only legislation they are entitled to bring into this House to-day after the recent change of the law ? They told the member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) the other day : We do not want any amendment to this law, we want to try it, let us work it out and introduce no changes. Now, one year after they have put it into motion, they introduce this radical change to meet a special case. As I said before, they are abandoning their own policy, they are abandoning the things which were in the public interest. I protest against it, I will protest unceasingly against a judge being made chief of this commission. It is not a court, it was never intended to be a court, and I emphasize that point and will continue to emphasize it. This is not a court, it is a commission.

Hon. N. A. BELCOURT. How does my hon. friend wish the commissioner to be responsible ? What does he mean by saying the commissioner is not going to be responsible ? Does he mean that he is not responsible to parliament or to the government ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. He is not responsible—using the words of hon. gentlemen opposite to the Governor in Council.

Mr. BELCOURT. Do I understand him to wish that the resolution shall make the commissioner responsible to the Governor in Council ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I wish the law to remain as it is.

Mr. BELCOURT. But what is the law ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman must read it for himself, he is a lawyer.

Mr. BELCOURT. I am putting the question in all fairness, I am asking what is it he wishes.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I wish the law to remain as it is.

Mr. BELCOURT. That the commissioner shall be responsible to the Governor General ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. As the Lieutenant Governor is, to use the words of those who introduced this Bill.

Mr. BELCOURT. I want to know what the hon. gentleman means ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I have told you very plainly. Again I say that the amendment changes the law. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) not remember that we on this side of the House have all been warned off : Don't touch this legislation ? They now propose to reverse the policy, and why ? Something has gone wrong, they have had a bad experience with their first appointee, and that chairman has done something that he should not have done. He left the whole court in a mess—if I may use the term. The legislation that should have been introduced here to-day was legislation which would prevent the recurrence of such a thing, and there ought to be some kind of provision in the law that the man who accepts the high position as chairman of that commission cannot leave it as this chairman has done. The chances are that we are to have no railway commission for three months, until this legislation can get through, and possibly it will be three months before the government's consent can be had. In the meantime the country will be tied up, and in the meantime the great expenses of this commission, $50,000 to $100,000 will continue, and the car which the commission procured because they could not wait to have one built in Canada, is lying sidetracked now, I suppose. There is no administration of that law, and there is a complete change in the policy. Again I ask the right hon. gentleman why this reversion of policy.

Mr. STOCKTON. Section 8 of the Act says it is a court of record.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It also says it is a railway commission.

Mr. BELCOURT. It is amusing to hear the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), who is in his own estimation the champion of the people, taking the position he does to-night. As I understand it, the resolution will have the effect of making the chairman of the Railway Commission responsible to the two Houses of parliament. What my hon. friend wants now is to make him responsible to the Governor in Council only. Now, if that is consistent with the course which the hon. gentleman ever advocates in this House, and in his paper, he, the great champion of the people, I cannot understand his position. It is not consistent with his past, it is not consistent with the ideas which he constantly advocates.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The inconsistency is over there.

Mr. BELCOURT.

Mr. BELCOURT. What does the hon. gentleman mean by saying that the chairman of the commission is not going to be responsible ? It means that according to him he won't be responsible to the Governor General. But by this resolution you are going to make the chairman responsible to the whole country.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I want him responsible to the people directly.

Mr. BELCOURT. You are going to make the chairman responsible to the advisers of His Majesty, they all being responsible directly to the people of Canada, of whom the hon. gentleman constitutes himself the champion. You are going to the highest court in the land, the parliament of Canada. Surely the hon. gentleman will see how absurd and how inconsistent his position is.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If the hon. gentleman will lecture those on his own side he will be consistent.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope the Minister of Justice will take the suggestion that has been made by my hon. friend from the county of St. John (Mr. Stockton). Perhaps the Minister of Justice will give me his view as to consistency in this respect. Did the minister make this first clause with this purpose in view, that as the chairman of the Railway Commission was a judicial officer, occupying the place of a judge quoad his jurisdiction in the matters that came before him, he thought he ought to be placed as a judge in the matter of dismissal ? Now if there is any principle underlying this Bill at all so far as the first section is concerned, that is the principle, there can be no other.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, that is not the principle.

Mr. FOSTER. Then there is no principle in the Bill. It is simply a piece of special legislation made to fit the case of the present selection for appointment. So far as this Bill goes, it asserts that the chairman of the commission being a judge, occupying the position of judge, it is best that he should have the protection of a judge, that is, he should not be liable to be dismissed by Governor in Council, but he should have the same security as a judge in that respect, and could only be displaced by parliament acting together. That is declared a good thing to have for the sake of the commission itself, as applied to the chairman. To be consistent you are bound to apply the same to every person who, from time to time, may be the chairman acting as a judge on that commission. Now then if that be the principle of your legislation, and if that is not the principle there does not seem to be any principle at all, why do you confine it simply to the

gentleman who is to be appointed in this case ? Why do you not have the same general safety and security of tenure of office for every chairman of the commission who must be from the duties imposed upon him, acting as a judge ? If you do not take that ground, what ground will you take ? You may take the position, as I stated at first, that you are not making legislation on principle, that you have a special case on hand, that you want a special man and that you cannot get him unless you put this legislation on the statute-book. If you come to that, then make it special entirely, and have it for this gentleman alone, but, leaving aside the difference of opinion that there may be as to whether the Governor in Council should have the power of dismissal or whether it should be parliament—we will not discuss that—if the government is of opinion that parliament should have this authority for the reasons which the hon. gentleman has given, then make it general so that it will apply to every chairman of the Railway Commission.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The position which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has taken, as I understand it is this : The chairman of the commission, is by reason of the duties assigned to him under the Railway Act, a judge to all intents and purposes. Therefore, if he be a judge why not give to that gentleman who performs the duties of a judge the same fixity of tenure in office that a judge ought to have. There is a great deal to be said in favour of that, but that is not the view that is entertained by the government and that is not the object we have in view in proposing this resolution. If we had that object in view our resolution would fall absolutely short of our object. Our view is that we should open the door and extend the field of selection, that instead of being limited practically to a choice from laymen, as distinguishing them from judges, we should have the right to go to the judicial bench if we think it necessary in order to get a man for this office and we say that in order to get a man from the judicial bench we must take into account the conditions under which he fills his present office, and that if we wish to remove him from his present sphere to that other position we want to be in a position to tell him that as a result of the transfer from one place to another his present fixity of tenure shall not be interfered with.

Mr. STOCKTON. What is there to prevent you from doing that with a chairman who is not a judge ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We do not think it necessary because the chairman who is not a judge accepts the conditions as they exist. He accepts or he refuses. If he accepts he is not in any way interfered with in any right which he possesses at the time, because he has no office, but the other man has been placed in a more difficult position. He would be asked to accept conditions which entail forfeiture of a right which he already possesses and it is to prevent that that we want this legislation. It may be that we are not at one on this. We undoubtedly do not agree. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Stockton) takes the position that this ought to be made general legislation. We take the position that it should be made legislation not applicable to the individual, but applicable to a class of individuals.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I have not yet had an answer to the question which I asked.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I did not try to give an answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean). I was speaking in answer to the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Foster).

Mr. MACLEAN. This legislation, it is clear to me, is an attempt to destroy the usefulness of this commission. We were promised a responsible chairman of the commission, we are now to get an irresponsible chairman and once started the series will be continued. There will never hereafter be a chairman of the commission who is responsible to the Governor in Council and whose conduct can with effect be discussed on the floor of this House. I am going to sit here and urge that the policy originally adopted should not be abandoned but that the chairman should be responsible to parliament directly through the Governor in Council, and that his conduct should be discussed in this House.

On resolution 2 :

Resolved, That if any chief commissioner of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, having been at the time of his appointment as such chief commissioner a judge of any Superior Court in Canada, or having resigned his office as such judge for the purpose of accepting appointment as such chief commissioner, has continued in office as judge of one or more Superior Courts in Canada and in the said office of chief commissioner for periods amounting together to fifteen years or upwards, or has become afflicted with a permanent infirmity disabling him from the due execution of his office, and if such chief commissioner resigns his office, or if his term of office, or any renewed term of office, has expired, His Majesty may, by letters patent under the Great Seal, reciting such periods of office or such permanent infirmity, grant to such chief commissioner an annuity equal to two-thirds of the salary of the judicial office which he held at the time of his appointment as such chief commissioner, or which he resigned for the purpose of accepting such appointment, to commence immediately after his so ceasing to hold office as such chief commissioner, to continue thenceforth during his natural life, and to be payable by monthly instalments and pro rata for any period less than a year during such continuance.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That resolution merely makes applicable to the chairman of the Railway Commission that which is now

applicable to a judge; that is to say that at the expiration of fifteen years he shall retire if he chooses on two-thirds of his allowance.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not examined that resolution with any care nor do I suppose I am capable of examining it without a good deal of trouble, but I would ask the hon. Minister of Justice if this section simply secures to the judges the retiring allowance which he should have if he remained a judge.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is it:

On resolution 3,

Resolved, That if any such chief commissioner of the Board of Railway Commissioners resigns his office or completes his term of service, original or renewed, therein, having, in either such case,

(a.) attained the age of seventy-five years, and continued in office as such judge and in the said office of chief commissioner for periods amounting together to twenty years or upwards, or

(b.) attained the age of seventy years, and continued in office as such judge and in the said office of chief commissioner for periods amounting together to twenty-five years or upwards, or

(c.) continued in office as such judge and in the said office of chief commissioner for periods amounting together to thirty years or upwards,

His Majesty may, by letters patent under the Great Seal, reciting such period of service, and, in cases (a) and (b), such chief commissioner's age, grant to him an annuity, payable as aforesaid, equal to the salary of the judicial office which he held at the time of his appointment as such chief commissioner, or which he resigned for the purpose of accepting such appointment, to commence immediately after his resignation as chief commissioner and to continue thenceforth during his natural life.

Mr. FOSTER. What does this do?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This resolution is intended to cover the case that was provided for by the statute of two years ago; that is to say that a judge who has been thirty years on the bench, whatever may be his age, has the right to retire with full salary. If he is 75 years of age and has served 20 years he has also the right to retire with full salary, and if he is 70 years of age and has served 25 years on the bench he has also the right to retire with full salary.

Mr. LENNOX. All these are conditions that apply to judges as enacted a couple of years ago?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, except resolution No. 4.

Mr. STOCKTON. If there is an increase in the salary he gets the benefit of it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Exactly, that is No. 4. We have not read that yet.

On resolution No. 4,

Resolved, That if between the date of the appointment of any such chief commissioner or of his resignation of his office as such judge and the date of his resignation of, or retirement from, the office of chief commissioner, the salary attached to the judicial office which he held at the time of his appointment, or which he resigned for the purpose of accepting appointment as such chief commissioner, has been increased, the annuity to be granted to him hereunder may be increased in the same proportion.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is to provide that in the event of an increase in salary being given to the judges between the appointment to the chairmanship of the Railway Commission and the time of retirement therefrom, the judge who happens to be the chairman of the Railway Commission gets the benefit of the increase with respect to retiring allowance.

Mr. U. WILSON. Do you not think it is good enough now?

Mr. LENNOX. I am always disposed to be good enough to the judges, but having regard to the fact that the judge or chief justice who takes the position steps from a salary of $7,000 to $10,000, or some such figures, I think that this clause is unnecessary.

Mr. FOSTER. You are drawing it pretty fine there. I think the government capitulated.

Mr. U. WILSON. I think we are now doing more than we should for the judges by giving them their full allowance when superannuated, and I think it is going too far to do this. A man getting $7,000 a year and stepping into a position at $10,000 a year, if he holds that position for ten years has an increase of $30,000, and I think he might be well satisfied with that. I am against superannuation when it comes out of the pockets of the working people—the taxpayers of this country. There does not seem to be any inclination on the part of the government to take into account the people who pay the taxes. They seem to be anxious to heap more honours and pay on the officials. I am willing to have the officials well paid, but after you pay them for the services they render the country, I do not think you should provide for them in their old age. All people in the ordinary walks of life have to provide for their own old age, and I do not see why they should in addition have to make provision for the old age of other people. I would ask to have clause 4 struck out.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The intention of the legislation is that the judge, after he leaves his present position and goes on the Railway Commission, should continue to enjoy all the advantages which will attach to his present office if he continued in it, and this would be one of the benefits.

Mr. U. WILSON. You must remember that you are giving him $3,000 a year more for the actual time spent in the service of his country. If he gets a superannuation

allowance of $7,000, is not that enough without adding any increase that may take place in the judges' salaries ? I might say that personally I think the judges are sufficiently paid now. I believe that the same kind of men would get the judgeships if you were to pay $10,000 as now get them, because it appears that no matter which party is in power the men who have the pull get the positions, and if a man is a kicker he is more apt to get a position whether he is fitted for it or not. As I stated last year, we had a vacancy in my own county, and any lawyer would have taken it at the present salary, but there is a continual desire on the part of the lawyers in this House to advocate an increased salary for the judges. A session or two ago we authorized the superannuation of judges on full pay. To my mind the whole thing was wrong, and it seems to me that if the people understood it fully, those members who voted for it would not again be elected. I may say that I think it helped me in my election. I had a majority three or four times what I had before, because I tried to explain the wrong-doings of this government.

Mr. LENNOX. I am sorry to hear my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) speak as he has done about lawyers. I have noticed on many occasions that lawyers are made the butts of remarks that are not deserved.

Mr. FOSTER. They get revenge when it comes to fees.

Mr. LENNOX. I must say that, although there may be some justice in what the hon. gentleman says in some instances, it was not the prevailing rule when this was discussed before, that lawyers advocated large salaries for judges. They took occasion to point out that certain improvements were required in the judiciary, in the actions of some of the judges, &c., and perhaps these remarks were well founded. I also noticed that some gentlemen remarked this afternoon that the lawyers get the best of everything. I do not think they do in this world, although I think they will hereafter.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is not the popular belief, unfortunately.

Mr. LENNOX. Probably not. However, I do not think I succeeded in making myself understood a few moments ago. By the resolutions down to No. 4 we provide for what I think we might, in a general way, speak of as vested rights. We have made specific provision for the judges, and I think it is perfectly fair that a judge taking this position should not be deprived of any of the conditions existing at the present time for which we make provision, and in applying that rule to the circumstances with which we are dealing, I think that if a judge accepts the position of chairman of this commission he will be bettering himself by the addition of $3,000 a year to his salary during such time as he occupies the position, let us say, in round numbers, ten years. He is accepting a certainty, and is getting more than that ; he is getting also the contingencies in connection with the appointment to the new position, that is, if it should be found—and I do not think that this is beyond the range of possibility—that the position of chairman of the Railway Commission is a particularly onerous one, involving hard work—and I believe it will involve hard work—it may happen that we will raise the salary to even a higher point than it is to-day. He has that possibility in connection with the new position that he takes, and I submit that it is not fair to the people of this country, whom we represent, to give him the double possibility of an increase in his present salary and also of an increased retiring allowance due to the fact that the judges' salaries are raised because they are working hard in the services of their country. I do not see any justice in this. He is taking a new position with a definite increase of $3,000 a year, and he has the possibility of an increase in salary, and I do not see any fair-play in saying that he should also have the possibility of benefiting from an increase in the judges' salaries.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If he retains his present office and an increase takes place in the judges' salaries——

Mr. FOSTER. How much ? Let us suppose a case.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Say $2,000 to $9,000. If he retains his present position there are advantages connected with it which he would not enjoy as chairman of the Railway Commission. A judge of the Supreme Court would occupy an entirely different position with respect to judicial functions than the chairman of the Railway Commission ; he would not be obliged to go all over the country, as the chairman of the Railway Commission will in the exercise of his duty.

Mr. LENNOX. In a palace car.

Mr. FOSTER. With everything furnished, coloured porter, and all.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We are getting down to details now. If he remained on the bench, he would be entitled to the increase if any increase comes. If no increase comes, nobody suffers ; but if an increase comes, why should he not get the benefit of it ?

Mr. U. WILSON. Because he gets a better office.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not a better office. the position of a judge of the Supreme Court is a very fine office.

Mr. U. WILSON. It is a very fine office, but why should he get the benefit of an increase of salary that may be given to the judges of the Supreme Court after he has left the

bench and has got another position in which he gets $3,000 a year more salary. While on my feet I may say that I am opposed altogether to the way the commission is constituted. I would like to see it composed, as was originally intended of one railway expert, one lawyer, and I should hope the whole three men of common sense. Then, I think questions of law should not be left to the chairman alone, but should be argued before the whole three as before a jury, and let the three men decide. It seems to me that the three men are more likely to do justice. What we want above all is to have men of common sense and business men on the commission. I am opposed to this gentleman getting the benefit of any increase to the salaries of the judges after he has left the bench.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose the salary were raised from $7,000 to $9,000, he would then get the superannuation on the additional $2,000 ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He would get a superannuation on the basis of $9,000.

Mr. FOSTER. It is apparent, of course, to all of us that from the time he takes this office he gets $3,000 per year more than he is getting now ; he gets far and away more than he could lose by any stoppage of an increased superannuation allowance which would result from a problematical or actual rise of $2,000 in salary. The government capitulated on all other points ; I do not think there was any need of their capitulating on this point ; and when you come down to the hard facts of the case, and face the men who have to pay the money, however much these officials are paid, it is pretty hard to justify before them that you should give this man $30,000 extra during the subsistence of his office, and that he then should insist, and the government should go so far as to comply, that he should have the extra advantage, whatever it amounts to, of whatever rise of judges' salary there might be afterwards. All the contingencies that might be against him are provided for ; and if the country comes to believe, in the course of five years that $10,000 is not sufficient salary, he is not debarred from getting the larger salary which the country may think he shall get as chairman of the commission. $30,000 may be a slight matter for the minister but for myself, and to the taxpayers it is a very large amount, and I am opposed to that resolution 4, and I shall vote dead against it.

Resolution 4 agreed to.

Resolution 5 dropped.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to ask the Minister of Justice a question which I think is important. As I understand from an answer of the Prime Minister to a question the other day, it so happens that when the chairman of the commission is not able to sit with his brother commissioners and decide cases which have been heard previously by them, for any reason, such as death or sudden vacation of office, all these cases fall to the ground, and have to be gone over again. Is that so ? If it is, it is a great hardship.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think my hon. friend has stated the case in too general terms.

Mr. FOSTER. If certain contingencies would make all the evidence which has been taken practically useless, the trouble is not so much the cost of taking the evidence over again as the fact that there is delay in remedying grievances, and life and property in the meantime are at stake. Does the government intend to make any provision for that ? You have a man leaving an office of trust, as was said to-day, in the twinkling of an eye, saying, as it were, 'I do not care how many lives may be risked at dangerous crossings or how much property may be endangered, my own interest is involved now, and I will let the people's interest go.' If a man can leave the commission so quickly and on so slight grounds, or if death intervenes and he is taken away suddenly, there should be a saving clause somewhere to provide that the result of the previous evidence shall be saved and that the grievance shall be quickly remedied.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As my hon. friend is aware, any two commissioners constitute a quorum. The difficulty arises from the fact that in some cases the evidence was taken before two commissioners one of whom disappeared. The other, who had not heard the evidence, could not act with the commissioner who had for the purpose of deciding the case. That difficulty occurs in courts of law every day.

Mr. BARKER. Could not that be remedied by having the evidence taken down by a shorthand writer, so that the incoming commissioner could read it ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am willing to consider that.

Mr. LENNOX. You could not have that without legislation.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It would require that. The difficulty was that two commissioners went away and took evidence in the cases that came before them, and after they came back one of them resigned. The question was put before the Department of Justice whether the commissioner who had not sat and heard the evidence could under the statute take up the cases and deicde them. Of course, there was nothing for us under the statute except to say that the commissioner who had not heard the evidence was not competent to decide the

case. The question is whether it is not possible to put something in the statute to meet that difficulty. That is a question that may fairly be considered. There are some cases that will require to be re-heard, all of which happened in the Northwest Territories. The evidence is all typewritten, but the difficulty is that one of the commissioners has not seen the witnesses or visited the localities.

Mr. LENNOX. That could be overcome by statute. There is another question I would like to ask the minister. That statute provides that as regards questions of fact all the commissioners are judges, but that there is only one judge on questions of law, and that judge was the commissioner who resigned. In other words the legal gentleman is to be sole judge on questions of law. But as regards cases which turn upon a point of law—

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not thought of that difficulty.

Mr. LENNOX. There is no way probably of getting over that difficulty because the sole judge of that particular point of the case has gone.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the resolutions are reported, will not the Minister of Justice give the committee the reasons assigned by the chairman for his hasty flight from that office.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I now say, in the presence of the Prime Minister and with his authority, that not one member of the government had any knowledge of the intention of the commissioner to resign, and that the only information we had is that contained in his telegram to the First Minister, in which he said that he had resigned the office. It was naturally expected that in the interval, because some days elapsed before his resignation was accepted, he would do something towards disposing of the arrears. The telegram was sent the 18th October, 1904, and his resignation was accepted the 31st October, 1904.

Mr. FOSTER. Have you the telegram ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, I have not got it here.

Mr. FOSTER. There was no explanation by him why he resigned ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Absolutely none. So far as the members of the government are concerned, his resignation came like a bolt from the blue, absolutely without any notice.

Mr. FOSTER. That is an answer certainly and the House was entitled to that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I ought to have given it at the beginning and I had it in my notes to give it. My right hon. friend, the Prime Minister, is prepared to bring down the telegram and lay it on the table.

Resolutions reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I beg leave to introduce Bill (No. 36) to amend the Railway Act, 1903, based on these resolutions. I would ask leave to strike out clause 5 which has reference to the Local Judges in Admiralty, and I propose, when the Bill reaches the committee, to introduce an amendment to reach the difficulty which has been suggested this evening.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 6, 1905.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. McISAAC moved :

That the Public Accounts of Canada for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1904, and the report of the Auditor General, partial reports Nos. 1 and 2 for the same year, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS—AMENDMENT.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Inland Revenue)—for the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries—moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 37) to amend the Act relating to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, 1899. He said : The object of the Bill is to extend the jurisdiction of the harbour commissioners of Quebec from St. Barnabé to Father Point in regard to pilots. To-day steamers have to stop at Father Point to take on the mails but the pilots go to St. Barnabé and Isle au Bic to go on the steamer. Under these circumstances the steamer has to stop twice. By extending the port of Quebec to Father Point we get rid of the double stoppage.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the distance ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Fifteen or twenty miles.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SEAMEN'S ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Inland Revenue)—for the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries—moved for leave to intro-

duce Bill (No. 38) to amend the Seamen's Act. He said : The object of the Bill is to declare that section 18 of the Act shall not apply to British Columbia. I understand that it is very hard to find seamen there, and that sometimes they have to go to the United States to get them. I understand also that one of the reasons why they experience so much difficulty is the low fees paid to the shipping master. The fees are very low and it is expected that by providing that in British Columbia he may charge higher rates than are elsewhere permitted they may have a chance to get seamen without going to the United States.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the clerk of the House has received from the clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election of R. L. Borden, Esq., for the electoral district of the county of Carleton in the province of Ontario.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 24) respecting the Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 25) respecting the Walkerton and Lucknow Railway Company.—Mr. P. H. McKenzie.

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Sovereign Fire Assurance Company of Canada.—Mr. E. F. Clarke.

Bill (No. 27) respecting certain patents of the Facer Solid Steel Car Wheel Company, of Perth, Limited.—Mr. Caldwell.

Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the Northwest Telephone Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 29) respecting the Canada Southern Bridge Company.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 30) respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 31) respecting the Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Company.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the London and Saint Clair Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 33) respecting certain patents of Jean Effront.—Mr. L. P. Demers.

Bill (No. 34) respecting the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Georgian Bay and Seaboard Railway Company.—Mr. Grant.

QUESTIONS.

LENGTH OF LOBSTERS.

Mr. GANONG asked :

1. What is the present legal limit of length for lobsters that may be caught in the waters of the Bay of Fundy, between Point Lepreaux and the United States boundary ?

2. What was the legal limit of length for lobsters on October 1st, 1904, in these waters ?

3. If any change in the limit has been made, on what date was the change made, and on what date were the local fishery officers in that district notified of said change ?

4. On whose recommendation was the change made ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Inland Revenue) :

1. 9 inches.
2. 10½ inches.
3. October 14, 1904.
4. On that of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

LOBSTER CANNERIES.

Mr. GANONG asked :

1. How many licenses to can lobsters in district No. 1, New Brunswick, were issued in the year 1904 ; and to whom were they issued ?

2. How many applications have been received for licenses to can lobsters in district No. 1, New Brunswick, for the year 1905 ; and what are the names of the applicants ?

3. How many of said applicants have been granted licenses, and what are the names of persons to whom licenses have been granted for 1905 ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Inland Revenue):

1. None were issued in 1904.
2. Nine. J. Ingersoll, E. A. Holmes, Connors Brothers, Burnham & Morrell, J. W. Wooster, Frank McDonald, P. P. Russell, L. C. Guptill, D. S. Gaskill.
3. J. Ingersoll, E. A. Holmes, Connors Brothers, Burnham & Morrell.

NEW BRUNSWICK SOUTHERN RAILWAY.

Mr. GANONG asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to acquire the New Brunswick Southern Railway, and make it a part of the government system ?

2. Has the present Minister of Railways, or any other person or persons in the interest of the government, had any negotiations, verbally or in writing, with any representative of the New Brunswick Southern Railway, with a view to acquiring that railway, and making it a part of the government railway system ?

3. If so, who were the parties so negotiating in the interest of the government, and with whom did they negotiate, representing the New Brunswick Southern Railway ; and what was the date of the last negotiations ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Petitions have been received asking that the road be purchased, but there is no present intention to acquire the railway.

2. No, beyond the fact that petitions were received from many people in Charlotte county, asking the government to purchase the said road.

3. Answered by number one.

CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. SPROULE—by Mr. Henderson—asked:

1. How many permanent appointments, male and female, respectively, have been made to the Civil Service (inside division) in Ottawa since July 1st, 1896 ?
2. What is the present strength of the Civil Service in Ottawa (inside division), permanent staff, specifying whether male or female ?
3. How many temporary employees (specifying whether male or female) are on the pay-list for the inside division of the Civil Service at Ottawa for January, 1905 ?
4. How many of these have been appointed since July 1st, 1896 ?
5. In addition to the permanent and temporary clerks at present employed in the public service in Ottawa, how many artisans, labourers or other workmen employed at Ottawa were on the January pay-roll, specifying under which department these men were employed ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I have to inform my hon. friend that a motion will have to be made in order to get this information.

HALIBUT FISHERIES.

Mr. SLOAN asked :

1. Has the government any information as to whether American companies engaged in the halibut industry are encroaching in the waters under the jurisdiction of this government on the Pacific coast ?
2. Has the government taken any steps to secure control of Hecate Straits ?
3. If so, when, and with what results ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Inland Revenue):

1. Reports to such effect have reached the department, and every effort has been made to protect Canadian inshore fisheries on the Pacific, especially since the commissioning of the fisheries protection cruiser 'Kestrel.'

2. The question of a claim to territorial jurisdiction in Hecate strait is one which has formed the subject of some diplomatic correspondence and at present is in an unsettled state.

3. Answered by No. 2.

FENCING WIRE.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Henderson—asked :

1. In view of the fact that much hardship and loss arises yearly to the farmers of Canada from the purchase of fraudulent and inferior wire for fencing, is it the intention of the government to institute such inspection of fence wire, whether made at home or abroad, as will safeguard the farmers from losses so arising ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I shall ask this question to stand because if my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) were here I would have to observe to him that it is out of order as it contains a statement of fact. I shall allow it to stand in the meantime ; I simply call attention to it.

FISHERMEN FROM IRELAND.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. A. Martin—asked :

1. Has any action been taken by the government looking to the immigration of fishermen from Ireland and Scotland to Prince Edward Island to prosecute the cod fisheries off Cascumpec and other points, asked for last year by the Board of Trade of Alberton and West Prince, and promised by the minister ?
2. If so, what action has been taken ; and if none, why not ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Inland Revenue) :

1. No.

2. I promised to take the matter into consideration ; but have not yet succeeded in devising a practical scheme with a view to encouraging long-line fishermen to emigrate. In any arrangement reached, joint action with the Department of the Interior would be necessary.

YONGE STREET BRIDGE, TORONTO.

Mr. KEMP—by Mr. Alcorn—asked :

1. Did the Railway Committee of the Privy Council issue an order respecting the construction of a high-level bridge over the Esplanade at Yonge street in the city of Toronto ?
2. If so, what was the date of such order ?
3. What is the cause of the delay in proceeding with the work of constructing the bridge ?
4. Did the government, on or about October 8th, 1904, authorize a telegram to be sent to his worship the mayor of the city of Toronto, respecting said bridge, containing the words 'All right.' ?
5. If so, what was the nature of the communication to which this telegram was a reply ?
6. What action, if any, is the government taking to expedite the work?
7. When is it expected the work will commence ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

1, 2 and 3. The Railway Committee of the Privy Council passed an order in the month of December, 1903, to authorize the construction of a high level bridge over the Esplanade at Yonge street in the city of Toronto.

The powers of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council came to an end before that order had been ratified by the committee of the Privy Council, and therefore the committee had no power after this to pass an order confirming the order of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. A Bill was introduced during last session to give authority to the Privy Council to pass an order to ratify the order of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. When the session was over I was approached by Mr. Urquhart, Mayor of Toronto, to have this order taken into consideration, and I promised the mayor of Toronto that as soon as convenient the matter would be taken into consideration by the Privy Council, and that if the order was ratified I would in-

form him by telegram that it was all right. The order was passed on October 7.

4 and 5. The order was passed October 7, and the following day I telegraphed the Mayor of Toronto.

6. I have only to say that the government has absolutely nothing to do with that.

7. This is a matter between the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway and the corporation of the city of Toronto.

STANLEY BRIDGE.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. What was the total expense of the survey of the Stanley Bridge Branch Line of Railway in Prince Edward Island ?

2. Have bills been presented to the government for damages sustained by persons on account of the cutting of timber and trampling of farmers' crops, which the government did not pay ? If so, what was the amount claimed by each person, and what is the name of each person ?

3. Have bills for damages of this nature been paid ? If so, what are the names of persons to whom paid, and what was the amount paid to each ?

4. Are there any bills of this nature which the government intends yet to pay ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Total expenditure up to November 30, 1904, was $844.47.

2. Two claims for damages have been presented, which the government has not yet paid, viz.: John Mayne for $20, and the other, Austin J. McNeil for $120.

3. No.

4. Not aware of any that they intend to pay.

CHATHAM ARMOURY.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

1. Has the contract for the Chatham armoury been let ?

2. If so, to whom, and at what price ?

3. When does the government intend starting the erection of the same ?

4. What date does the contract call for the completion of the same ?

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. Yes.

2. To John Pigott & Sons, $50,905.

3. Immediately.

4. August 30, 1906.

PRINTING OF VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. Pringle—by Mr. Haggart—asked :

In what printing establishments were the ballots used in the last Dominion elections in Prescott, Russell, Carleton, Ottawa City, Glengarry and Stormont, printed ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

Prescott—Vankleek Hill 'Review.'

Russell—Russell 'Leader.'

Carleton—Rolla L. Crain Co., Ottawa.

Ottawa city—Ottawa 'Free Press.'

Glengarry—Alexandria 'News.'

Stormont—Cornwall 'Freeholder.'

THE CENSUS.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Sam. Hughes—asked :

1. Has the work in connection with the taking of the Census for 1901 been completed ?

2. If so, have the services of the staff engaged thereat been dispensed with ?

3. If not, how many are still retained, and in the service of the government ?

4. What has been the total expenditure in connection with the taking of the Census of 1901 up to 1st January, 1905 ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1. The work in connection with the taking of the census for 1901 has been completed.

2. Yes, in so far as the taking of the census and the compilation are concerned ; but there are a certain number of the staff still in the service of the government working on tabular statements drawn from the compilation of the census. These are paid out of the General Statistics vote.

3. There are in all six persons so engaged.

4. $1,192,296.19.

INSPECTORS OF FRUIT.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Sam. Hughes—asked :

1. How many inspectors or other persons have been appointed or employed to attend to the enforcement of the Fruit Marks Act of 1901 ?

2. What amount has been paid for the services of said inspectors or other persons up to the 1st January, 1905 ?

3. What amount has been paid for travelling expenses for said inspectors or other persons up to 1st of January, 1905 ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I shall have to ask the hon. gentleman to move for a return, as the information is too voluminous to be given in an answer to a question.

CORNWALL BASIN DREDGING CONTRACT.

Mr. PRINGLE—by Mr. Bergeron—asked :

1. To whom was the contract for the dredging in the Cornwall basin given ?

2. Were tenders called for ?

3. How many tendered for the work ?

4. What was the amount per yard ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. To W. J. Poupore.

2. Yes, by poster.

3. Two.

4 Earth excavation, 50 cents per cubic yard; boulders, ¼ cubic yard and over, $2 per cubic yard.

THE WELLAND CANAL.

Mr. PRINGLE— by Mr. Bergeron—asked:

1. How much money has been spent in the past four years on the deepening of the Welland Canal ?

2. Who did the work ?
3. Were tenders called for ?
4. Was the work given to the lowest tenderer ?
5. Are tenders to be called for the work to be done this year ?
6. What price per yard has been paid to the contractors ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. $486,510 up to January 31, 1905.
2. Messrs. McGann & Finn, Hogan & McDonell, and Weddell, Battle & Manley.
3. Yes.
4. Yes.
5. No, the present contract covers it.
6. McGann & Finn, 38½ cents per cubic yard. Hogan & McDonell, rock, $2.75 per cubic yard. Weddell, Battle & Manley, $2.90 cubic yard.

PORT BURWELL WORK.

Mr. PRINGLE—by Mr. Sam. Hughes—asked:

1. To whom was the Port Burwell work let ?
2. Were tenders called for ?
3. If not, why not ?
4. What were the prices paid ?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works):

1. The work was done by day labour.
2. No.
3. As the initial work to be done consisted entirely of the renewal of existing structures, it was not found possible to produce a definite specification so complete as to prevent the possibility of claims for extras.
4. For this a return should be moved.

SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL DREDGING.

Mr. PRINGLE—by Mr. Sam. Hughes—asked:

1. In what month in 1903 was the contract for dredging Sault Ste. Marie Canal given ?
2. If given in the fall, why was it given at a season when Canadian contractors were unable to take the work ?
3. Did United States contractors get the work?
4. What was the price ?
5. Was there such a rush to have the work done that Canadian contractors were excluded from doing the work ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. In November.
2. It was given in the autumn because parliamentary appropriations were not available until then, parliament having prorogued on October 24, 1903.
3. Yes.
4. Eighty cents per cubic yard.
5. It was necessary to let the work as early after the House prorogued to avail of the appropriation.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. A. Martin—asked:

1. Has any survey been made for the proposed branch line of railway from some point on the main line of the Prince Edward Island Railway to some point on the coast at or near West Cape, and for which purpose an amount of $1,500 was placed in the estimates last year ?
2. If no survey has been made, why not ?
3. Is it the intention to make said survey ? If so, when ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. No.
2. Because the engineering staff was otherwise fully engaged.
3. The matter has not been recently considered.

THE AUDITOR GENERAL.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. Have any definite arrangements been made or steps taken to retain Mr. McDougall in the service of the country as Auditor General ?
2. What is the position of the matter, as regards the resignation of the Auditor General, or otherwise ?
3. Does the government propose at the present session to introduce legislation with a view to secure the harmonious and more efficient and satisfactory working of the Audit Office and the Treasury Board ?

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

1. No arangement, definite or indefinite, had to be made or steps taken to retain Mr. McDougall in the service of the country as Auditor General. Mr. McDougall occupies the same position now that he has done since his appointment.
2. The Auditor General has withdrawn his resignation.
3. The government do not propose to consider this question until the Minister of Finance has returned from Europe.

FISH HATCHERIES IN NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. WILMOT asked :

1. What number of parent fish were placed in the salmon pond at Carleton, St. John, N.B., and at what cost for each year since 1902 to date, inclusive ?
2. About what number of ova were produced, and what was the location of the hatcheries in which they were placed ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1.

Year	Number.	Cost.
1903.	1,289	$3,825
1904.	1,022	3,334

2. Sixteen and a half millions of eggs. Gaspé, Quebec; Margaree, Nova Scotia; Bedford, Nova Scotia; Grand Falls, New Brunswick; Restigouche, New Brunswick.

RIVER THAMES IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

1. Have the surveys for the River Thames from Lake St. Clair to the city of Chatham been completed for a fifteen-foot channel, as proposed by the government ?

2. If so, what has been the cost up to date for the completion of said plans, specifications and all other work in connection with the same ?

3. Is it the intention of the government to complete the work as per plans and specifications submitted, and when will the work commence ?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works):

1. Yes.

2. The survey was made by the regular staff of the department, and there has been no other expenditure.

3. This question is under consideration.

STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN asked :

1. Is any subsidy at present paid by the government to any line of steamers between any port in Prince Edward Island and the West Indies ?

2. What amount is paid in subsidies by the government for steamers running between other ports in the maritime provinces and the West Indies ?

3. Have any representations been made to the government or any member thereof in reference to the establishment of direct communication between the West Indies and Prince Edward Island ?

4. If so, what were they, and what does the government intend to do in the premises in order to stimulate trade and place the province on an equal basis in this respect with its neighbouring provinces ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Trade and Commerce):

1. No.

2. $65,700 per annum on the St. John, Halifax, West Indies and Demerara service. $1,150 per round trip on the St. John, Halifax and Jamaica service.

3. Indirectly.

4. Matter under consideration.

CAPTAIN ST. LOUIS.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Daniel—asked:

Has the Minister of Marine and Fisheries reinstated Captain Louis St. Louis, who was deprived of his certificate by the judgment of Wreck Commisioner Salmon in the 'Canada-Cape Breton' affair ? And if so, what were the reasons for the reinstatement of this officer ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries). There was no necessity to reinstate Captain St. Louis because he was never legally deprived of his certificate.

PROTECTION OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Daniel—asked:

Did the Montreal Society for the Protection of Women and Children present a petition to the Minister of Justice in May of 1903, asking for certain amendments to the Criminal Code, in effect that persistent wife beaters may be sentenced to be whipped, and that constables may enter without a warrant into a house where a woman is being assaulted ? If so, has the government taken this request into consideration, and do they intend taking action in accordance with the expressed views of the petitioners ?

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). In answer to my hon. friend, I beg to say that an amendment to the Criminal Code was suggested last year by Mr. Bickerdike. I did not think I ought to accept it, because it went very much too far; but when the amendments to the Criminal Code are being introduced this session, if the suggestion is moved in committee, I will take occasion to consider it then.

ST. IGNACE CHANNEL DAM.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Did the government, at the written request of Messrs. François Arthur Marcotte, Edmond Angers and Gilles Godin, promise to have certain works done on the dam in the St. Ignace channel, in the Parish of Ste. Anne de la Pérade ?

2. Has a plan of the said works been prepared by J. L. Michaud, government engineer ?

3. If not, by whom was that plan prepared ?

4. Did Captain Edmond Angers, by letter dated the 7th March, 1904, and addressed to the department at Ottawa, demand the carrying on of the works in question ?

5. Was the money necessary for the execution of the said works voted by parliament ?

6. Were the said works executed ?

7. Why have the said works not been completed ?

8. When will the said works be done ?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works):

1. Representations were made by the parties named to have certain works performed in the St. Ignace channel, in the parish of Ste. Anne de la Pérade, and upon a favourable report by the chief engineer.

2 and 3. A plan was prepared by Mr. J. L. Michaud, an engineer of the Department of Public Works.

4. The letter in question is not on record.

5. Yes.

6, 7 and 8. Yes. Before the execution of the works the plan prepared by Mr. J. L. Michaud was submitted to all riparian owners who signed an agreement to the effect that they would make no claim for any damages arising out of the performance of those works.

THE ENGLISH IMMIGRATION OFFICE.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What is the total cost per year, for the past three fiscal years, of the office in England of Immigration Commissioner Preston ?

2. How many assistants are employed by the said Preston under pay by the Dominion government ?

3. What are the names and remuneration of each such assistant, respectively ?

4. What is the date of Mr. Preston's last report, and when will it be ready for distribution ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of the Interior):

1. For 1901-1902, $10,582.13 ; for 1902-1903, $31,688.98; for 1903-1904, $31,021.48.

2. There are fourteen assistants under pay by the Dominion government.

3.

C. F. Just, clerk, per month	$154 16
C. A. Allen, clerk, per month	83 32
W. G. Fincham, clerk, per month	52 72
Miss F. E. Gardner, clerk and accountant	52 72
Miss E. Godden, stenographer, per month	37 92
Miss B. Lock, stenographer, per month	34 26
Miss B. Ferrar, typist, per week	7 30
Miss K. Hales, typist, per week	7 30
Miss D. Fleetwood, typist, per week	7 30
Miss C. Priske, typist, per week	4 87
E. G. Everett, clerk, per week	10 67
E. Peddle, messenger	3 65
A. G. Hannell, clerk, per week	9 92
W. Webb, caretaker	6 08

4. June 30, 1904, and published in the report of the Department of the Interior.

RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What have been the expenses incurred by the government in connection with providing official cars for the new Railway Commission, from the 1st February, 1904, to the 1st February, 1905 ?

2. What amount has the government expended for legal services to the said new Railway Commission during the above mentioned period, and to whom has the said amount been paid ?

3. What is the total amount expended in connection with the said new Railway Commission during the year ending 1st February, 1905 ?

4. How many final decisions has the Commission rendered during the same year ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. $21,701.99.

2. $1,030 to A. George Blair, jr., $212.50 to Macdonald, Shepley, Middleton & Donald.

3. $79,600.50.

4. In contested matters 72 decisions have been rendered, and in non-contested matters 289 orders have been issued, making a total of 361 orders issued by the board for the year.

SURVEYS IN COUNTY OF JACQUES CARTIER.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Did any engineers or officers of the government make any surveys in the county of Jacques Cartier, and especially in the parishes of Point Claire and St. Ann, during the months of October and November last ?

2. What was the cost of said surveys ?

3. With what object were such surveys made?

4. What report, if any, was made by the parties who made such surveys ?

5. How many were employed to make such surveys ?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. Party No. 9 of the Georgian Bay Ship Canal Survey, worked at St. Anne and along the north shore of Lake St. Louis towards Point Claire, during October and November. This section No. 9 extends from St. Anne to Montreal, and most of the work to be done is located in Jacques Cartier county.

2. Survey still in progress. Cost in October and November of party No. 9, including 4 days in September : $3,828.59.

3. The survey work done is in connection with the proposed Georgian Bay Ship Canal Navigation project from Lake Huron to Montreal, by way of the French river, Lake Nipissing, the Mattawa and the Ottawa rivers.

4. Survey not yet completed. Only the usual reports of the progress of the work received.

5. Party No. 9 was composed of 22 men in October and 21 men in November.

VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. BOYCE asked :

1. Were all the voters' lists for the unorganized portions of East and West Algoma, East and West Nipissing, and Thunder Bay and Rainy River, used at the last parliamentary election, prepared and revised under the same statute law as the Ontario Voters' Lists Act, part 3, and by the same officers ?

2. If not, what lists were otherwise prepared and revised ?

3. Under what authority were such lists prepared ?

4. At what date ?

5. By whom were such lists prepared and revised ?

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

1. All the voters' lists for the unorganized portions of East Algoma, West Algoma, the electoral district of Nipissing and the electoral district of Thunder Bay and Rainy river at the last parliamentary election were prepared and revised on the basis of the Ontario Voters' Lists Act, but not in all cases by the same officers therein defined.

2. Answered.

3. By an Order in Council under the authority of section 9 of the Franchise Act as amended in the session of 1901.

4. Date of the Order in Council, August 25, 1904.

5. In East Algoma the lists were prepared by Sheriff Jackson for Manitoulin Island, Collins Inlet, Killarney and White River Mouth, and by William Thompson of Blind river for the remaining parts of the unorganized districts which are on the mainland.

For West Algoma Jacob Stevenson was appointed to prepare the lists—the sheriff declining to act.

For Nipissing Sheriff Varin and his deputy Peter Groulx. For Thunder Bay and Rainy river Sheriff Thompson of the Thunder Bay district, and Sheriff Humble of the

Rainy River district; all with authority to appoint enumerators under them. The following were appointed to hear appeals: Judge McCallum for East Algoma; Judge O'Connor and Police Magistrate Quibell for West Algoma. Judge Valin and Leask, the senior and junior judge of Nipissing, and John Loughrin, stipendiary magistrate were appointed to hear appeals in the district of Nipissing. Judge Fitzgerald, Port Arthur, was appointed to hear appeals for Thunder Bay, and Judge Chappler of Rat Portage was appointed to hear appeals for the Rainy River district.

MUNICIPAL TELEPHONE SERVICE.

Mr. BOYCE asked:

1. What is the present status of the application now before the Board of Railway Commissioners of the town of Port Arthur and Fort William, to get access for their municipal telephone system into the Canadian Pacific Railway stations in the two towns?

2. Did the Board of Railway Commissioners decide that the Canadian Pacific Railway must allow the municipal telephone system in Port Arthur and Fort William to be connected with the railway stations on the payment of compensation? If so, has has the order been carried out?

3. Has the extent of the compensation to be paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway been determined? If so, by whom, and what is the amount? If not, who will determine it?

4. Is the government aware that the municipalities throughout Canada are anxiously awaiting the final settlement of this question, other applications being dependent upon the result?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). I must ask my hon. friend to make a motion.

SHELBURNE POSTMASTER.

Mr. JOHN BARR (Dufferin) moved:

For copies of all correspondence between the government or any minister, and any party or parties, concerning the dismissal of the postmaster at Shelburne, Ontario, on or about the 7th of March, 1903.

He said: My object is to ascertain why the postmaster was dismissed. In order that the House may understand the position, I need only refer to the history of the case. In 1867 Mr. Berwick was appointed postmaster at the village of Shelburne, Ont., and during 37 years, up to the year 1903, he filled that position with credit to himself and to the entire satisfaction of the community. He continued to occupy that position, not only during the time of the Conservative government, but also under the Mackenzie government, and there never was any complaint made against him. It is true that Mr. Berwick is a partner in a mercantile firm at Shelburne—one of these partners—and probably did employ some of his time in looking after the interests of his business. But during the distribution of mail matter he was almost always at his post and at all times he had an efficient assistant, quite competent to attend to the business should Mr. Berwick ever happen to be away. The best proof of the manner in which he conducted the post office is to be found in the fact that during all those years no complaint was made against him, until the year 1903 when, I understand, the charge was made that he had other business outside to attend to, and that there were good reformers who had not any business to look after, and who consequently should be looked after by the government. That I believe was the real cause of Mr. Berwick's dismissal. It may no doubt be charged that he was not always in the post office, but we must remember that Shelburne is but a village, and there are few village postmasters who are in their office the whole time. If they have an efficient assistant, that is considered quite sufficient, and I venture to say that the postmaster who is now at Shelburne is not more often in his place than was the late postmaster and probably has not as efficient an assistant.

But, early in 1903, an agitation was got up by a few—probably not more than a baker's dozen—every one of whom was an applicant for the office—to have a change made. And when the change was made and the new appointment settled, I venture to say the dozen agitators who had failed were just as much dissatisfied with the change as were any others in that village. So I do not think the government will gain any friends by the change. The agitation was carried on beneath the surface. No petition, so far as we knew, was circulated. The majority of the people using the office neither made nor heard of any complaint. But those who were anxious to obtain the office, gained the assistance of a senator, and probably of a member of the House, although both are outside of the riding and have no interest in the matter whatever except in promoting the welfare of their friends in the reform party; now could they have had any object in removing the postmaster who had grown gray in that service? And they succeeded in bringing about the change without the member then representing the county, without 99 out of a hundred of the people really interested knowing anything about it. Mr. Berwick had held the office for thirty-seven years was replaced without any reason given, so far as I know. No just cause was assigned—there was none to assign. These agitators succeeded in putting one of their party friends in the place that Mr. Berwick had occupied so long. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we are to have the American system adopted in Canada, the course taken by hon. gentlemen opposite in this matter is the one that is most likely to bring it about. It is well known that in all the various departments, this government are weeding out the Conservatives, so that in the very near future

not a Conservative will be left in the public service of the Dominion. But I wish to remind hon. gentlemen opposite of the signs of the times. They cannot shut their eyes to the fact that one province after another is going Conservative by overwhelming majorities—the latest by a perfect landslide. If the incoming government in Ontario were to follow the example of the hon. gentlemen opposite there would be a weeding out of officers that have not attended to their duties; and if they were to follow it completely, even men who had attended to their duties, as Mr. Edward Berwick did, would be dismissed on some excuse to make way for friends of the party in power. We have only to follow the example set by this government to have the spoils system established in this province. In my opinion, it was an evil day for this Dominion when that system was inaugurated ; but the government cannot blame Conservatives if the Liberals in Ontario are given a dose of their own medicine in the near future. We have no desire to follow that course ; we should regret to be driven to it ; but we cannot be blamed for following it, if it affords the only means by which we can protect our own friends. I know that the cry may be raised that Mr. Berwick had an interest in a store in Shelburne. But it cannot be shown that he in any way neglected the duties of the post office. As I have stated he was in his place day by day when the mail was delivered, and there was nothing in what he did to afford just ground for complaint. When the papers come down, I hope we shall learn who was the power behind the throne in causing the removal of Mr. Berwick without the member for the county or the great body of the people interested having any knowledge of what was going on.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK—(Postmaster General)—There can be no objection to the order going. I think that when it is obeyed and the papers are brought down, it will appear that the change of postmaster to which my hon. friend (Mr. Barr) refers was not brought about by any political considerations. I think the hon. gentleman himself has given the explanation. I should infer, from his own admission that the reason for the change was that the postmastership at Shelburne had attained such importance as to entitle it to the undivided services of the person holding it. I speak now without any recollection of the facts. Perhaps I ought to apologize for not having informed myself ; but I failed to notice the motion on the paper in time. I have sent for the papers in the case, and had hoped that they would arrive before I needed to make my remarks. However, the hon gentleman from Dufferin (Mr. Barr) himself has stated that the village of Shelburne has grown a place of considerable importance. I presume that there are many merchants there competitors in business of the gentleman who held the postmastership. If such are the facts, I think it will be made clear by the papers in this case, when they are produced, that the change has been made in pursuance of the policy of the department that the postmastership of a place shall not be held by a person engaged in other business if the office itself furnishes sufficient emoluments to give the officer a living about on a par with the average earnings of the people there. You can well understand, Mr. Speaker, how a village postmaster who is carrying on the business of a general store has, by reason of his office, special advantages over his rivals. As long as the revenue is not sufficient to furnish a good living for the postmaster, that condition of affairs is not disturbed. But when the place grows in importance, and exception is taken to it by competitors, some attention must be paid to those objections. I think my hon. friend will find such to be the conditions in this case. I do not dwell upon his other statement, nor would I regard it as a sufficient reason for a change that this gentleman had held the office for thirty-seven years. A man who has held an office for thirty-seven years has been fairly successful. If it was only in 1903 that he was disturbed by this government, I think there was no undue haste to disturb him. After he had been for thirty-seven years in the enjoyment of that office, I have no doubt any action that was taken was for the reason that I have assigned, not on account of any political considerations.

Mr. BARR. If I may be allowed to reply —I regret the Postmaster General did not see fit to ask me to allow the motion to stand so that he might get information that would throw more light upon it. The very fact, as the hon. gentleman says, that a man had been thirty-seven years in the position, was sufficient to remove him——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I did not make that statement.

Mr. BARR. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that might be sufficient. I find they have old men in the Senate, and in other offices, who are so old that they are not able to fill their positions properly. But as long as they are friends of hon. gentlemen opposite they are allowed to remain. I think the trouble was because that gentleman went to the polls and voted according to the dictates of his conscience, because I have heard that it was often intimated to him that if he did not change his way of voting, although he took no part in politics whatever, he would be removed. As to the size of the town, Shelburne is not larger today, indeed I think it is not as large as it was when hon. gentlemen came into office. It is only a village, and has not grown to great importance, and I never heard from that village any complaint from rival business men, nor is the hon. gentle-

man able to tell us that any petition came in against this postmaster. There may have been, but if so, the petitions were sent in without the knowledge of the free and independent electors there, and had they known it a contrary petition would have been sent in signed by a great many Reformers as well as Conservatives. I think I have given the true solution, namely, that he was engaged in business and had a partner in the store. Well, Mr. Speaker, you know that in small places like that postmasters often have other business, the post office business is so small that it does not occupy much of their time, and it frequently happens that they employ competent men to assist them. I say again, I regret that the hon. gentleman, finding himself unable to give the information, did not allow the motion to stand, because I would have been able to enlighten him on many points. His friends probably misled him. I think possibly he would not have made the change had he been cognizant of all the facts.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think my hon. friend would have done well to reserve his judgment. When he receives the papers I think he will have occasion to change his views. A large number of his own friends asked for it.

Motion agreed to.

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jaques Cartier) moved for :

Copies of all correspondence between the government of Canada, or any member thereof, and the government of the Northwest Territories, or any of its members, in reference to the granting of provincial autonomy to the said Territories, since the date of the last prorogation of parliament.

He said : The object of this motion is to obtain the correspondence in regard to the autonomy of the Northwest Territories that took place since the last prorogation of parliament. We had two returns during the last parliament, bringing down only a part of the correspondence. The object of the motion is to complete it.

Motion agreed to.

POSTAL BUSINESS IN THE DISTRICT OF ALBERTA.

Mr. WM. J. ROCHE (Marquette) moved for :

A return showing in detail the business done during each of the past ten years, and also in the aggregate during the same period, in connection with the transmission of mail matter ; and with the issue and payment of money orders and postal notes at each post office in the provisional district of Alberta.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). Perhaps my hon. friend would explain what he means by the statement 'Showing in detail the business done during each of the past ten years, and also in the aggregate during the same period, in connection with the transmission of mail matter.'

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I want to get at the amount of business done in that provincial district in each post office for each year.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Does the hon. gentleman mean the number of letters and the number of the various kinds of mail matter ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Yes.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I would point out to him that to give in detail what he asks for would be impossible, because there is no account kept of each piece of mail matter that passes through the post office. Every six months an enumeration is made of the business of an office for a period of about two weeks, and from these enumerations an estimate is formed of the amount of the mail matter of different kinds mailed at a particular office. Therefore this could only be an estimate.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. It is the general business done that I desire to get at.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The secretary of the department tells me that they would have to correspond with every postmaster in Alberta to get this information, and to get it as fast as the hon. gentleman wants it. Therefore there would be considerable delay involved in gathering the information.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I am anxious to get an idea of the business done so that it may be discussed when the question of autonomy comes up.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Very well, I will give all information we can now. But if we have to correspond to get anything, it might be better to have a partial return made now, and give the rest later. I would suggest that we strike out the words 'in detail' and substitute the words 'an estimate of.'

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

INLAND AND CUSTOMS REVENUES, N.W.T.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE moved :

For a return showing the amount of revenue collected, (1) by the Department of Inland Revenue ; (2) by the Department of Customs, during each of the past ten years ; and also in the aggregate during the same period, at the following points in the Northwest Territories, viz.: Edmonton, Strathcona, Red Deer, Calgary, Medicine Hat, Maple Creek, Lethbridge, Coutts, Cardston and Macleod.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). When the hon. gentleman says 'in the aggregate' does he mean to have the

Inland Revenue returns and Customs returns put together ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. No, separately, the aggregate for ten years.

Mr. PATERSON. That is year by year, and then total them up.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Yes.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Return showing the acreage in each township in the provisional district of Alberta, and in those parts of the provisional districts of Saskatchewan and Assiniboia lying west of range 13, west of the third meridian, in the Dominion Lands system of survey, that has been disposed of in each of the following ways : (a) acreage patented, either as homesteads or on sales ; (b) acreage not patented, but held under homestead entry or by purchase; and (c) acreage patented or reserved for railway land grants. Also the number of homestead entries made to date in the following land agencies : Edmonton, Red Deer, Calgary, Lethbridge, and so much of Battleford and Regina as lies west of range 13, west of the third meridian.—Mr. Wm. J. Roche.

Return of all lists of voters, as prepared by the enumerators, for the several polling subdivisions of the respective electoral districts in the Northwest Territories, and used in the recent general election for the House of Commons.—Mr. M. S. McCarthy.

Return showing the total number of acres of public lands undisposed of in the several and respective provisional districts of the Northwest Territories of Canada. Mr. M. S. McCarthy.

Statement showing the amounts expended from the 30th of June, 1902, up to the 1st of February, 1905, upon the two wharfs and approaches at Ste. Genevieve and Isle Bizard, in the county of Jacques Cartier ; also letters adddressed to the Minister of Public Works during the year 1904 in reference to the said expenditure, with estimates and statements connected therewith.—Mr. Monk.

Copy of the letter of resignation of the Honourable A. G. Blair, as chairman of the Board of Railway Commission and of all correspondence in reference to the said resignation.—Mr, Monk.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 10), respecting Labour Union Labels.—Mr. Ralph Smith.

Bill (No. 21), to amend the Act respecting the Safety of Ships.—Mr. Sinclair.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will take up Public Works.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the minister's report down yet ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, and the report of the Auditor General also.

Mr. MONK. When was the report of the Minister of Public Works brought down ?

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works). I expect to be able to lay the report on the table on Friday.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I was not correctly informed. I thought the report had been brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think we can go on with this until that report is down. Hon. members ought to have a chance to scan the report.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think there is a good deal in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. FOSTER. That is true, but the report of the minister needs to be studied somewhat by the members. We have acceded to the request of hon. gentlemen to proceed in some cases because we did not want to delay business entirely, but I do not think we can go on with the estimates of the Department of Public Works without that report.

Mr. HYMAN. Possibly I may be able to go on with the capital expenditures.

Mr. FOSTER. Those are just about as important as the others and I think a little more so. The Department of Public Works is a very important one, and hon. members have had no opportunity of seeing the report.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We might start and if hon. gentlemen opposite want to reserve any item we can reserve it for discussion later on.

Mr. FOSTER. We approach it without any knowledge ; we might be wasting time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, there is nothing left but to adjourn the House then.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) ready with his ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The report is not down either.

Mr. FOSTER. What have we besides ? When will we have the railway report ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not received the report from the Printing Bureau. It was promised for to-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To-morrow we will take up the Census Bill and the resolution in regard to apples. We will have enough for the day with those.

Mr. FOSTER. You are not ready with these to-day ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, we did not expect to take them up. Many members of the House would like to be present during the discussion of these questions and we set them for to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. To piece out the afternoon we might go on with these estimates, dis-

cuss the items and then allow a few to stand as we did with those of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, so that we can come back to any one of them.

Public Works—chargeable to capital—public buildings, Ottawa—Dominion Archives building, $45,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Explain.

Mr. HYMAN. This building is to provide a safe keeping place for the archives and public documents. It is to be erected just back of the Printing Bureau, on the extension of Mackenzie Avenue, on land owned by the government. The contract has been let to William McGillivray, of Ottawa, for $49,847.

Mr. FOSTER. How much has been spent on that work so far ?

Mr. HYMAN. There has been practically no expenditure ; the contract was let on September 29.

Mr. BERGERON. When will it be finished ?

Mr. HYMAN. September 30.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there to be another building erected where the National Gallery will be housed ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, another item in the estimates deals with that.

Mr. FOSTER. How much does the minister expect will be spent on this building by July 1 ?

Mr. HYMAN. About $35,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be the total sum for building and equipment ?

Mr. HYMAN. For the building, $49,857. Then there are estimates for an elevator $6,000, heating $5,000, electric wires and fittings $2,500, fittings and furniture about $10,000, levelling of grounds, sidewalks and fences $2,000, and the usual percentage for contingencies, bringing the estimate of cost of the building to about $80,000.

Mr. FOSTER. $80,000 complete ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, it is to be a fireproof building.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the size of the building and how many stories will it have?

Mr. HYMAN. It will have three stories and a basement. The length will be 100 feet and the breadth 50 feet.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there much land belonging to the government in that part of Ottawa ?

Mr. HYMAN. There are a number of feet of land in that district. I think all of that land is practically vested in the Militia Department.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. BERGERON. My object was to ascertain whether this building could be utilized for some of the departmental offices that are now scattered all over Ottawa. I understand we are paying a large sum of money for rent, and if these offices could all be in the same building it would be a saving, and at the same time it would be more convenient because now when you want to visit different departments you have to travel all over Ottawa.

Mr. HYMAN. I do not think it will be possible in connection with this building. I may say that I have been asked by the librarian for permission to use one, and possibly two floors for the storage of a certain number of papers that are burdensome to the library, and it is proposed to use part of the building in this way, but I do not think the building could be used for any other purposes. It is to be a fireproof building and is to be used simply for storage.

Mr. FOSTER. The question arises as to the capacity of the library. We have not a very large library. It is a very complete one so far as it goes, but its storage capacity is, I believe, more than exhausted. In the erection of a building of this kind when you have your foundation it should be easy to run it up a couple of stories more and it might at least be a point to be considered whether there could not be provided in this building additional space for at least a portion of the books and papers now in the library that are seldom used, but that must be preserved. I do not think it would be well to have general offices in the museum because these are too different from the purposes of a musuem, but something must be done sooner or later to provide additional accommodation for the library. Has the minister considered that question ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have given it whatever consideration is possible, and I have no doubt that one and possibly two stories, one certainly, will be available for that purpose. I may say in this connection that I have also been asked by the librarian to take into consideration the raising of the roof of the portion of this building which is at present being used as a reading room. I have asked the chief architect to figure on this and draw a plan, in order that we may see if we could not in this way without injuring the architecture of the main building provide certain accommodation for library purposes. While I have not a full report from the chief architect I may say that he is of the opinion that it could be accomplished.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be rather for the extension of the book room.

Mr. HYMAN. For the extension of the book room for those books that might possibly be wanted. Then I am sure that we

will be able to arrange in the building that we are now discussing for the storage of those books which are not often called for. Thus, with the raising of the roof of the present reading room, and the accommodation provided in this new building I hope to overcome the crowded condition of the library which certainly makes everything very inconvenient.

Mr. FOSTER. What material is to be used in this building.

Mr. HYMAN. The walls of the basement are to be of stone and the remaining portions brick, with stone facings.

Mr. BERGERON. Have you the plans ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have not the plans here.

Mr. FOSTER. For the purpose suggested we want a building which will be permanent, and I should think it ought to be erected in the very best style so as to be architecturally an ornament to the city and a credit to the government. What kind of stone is the minister going to use ?

Mr. HYMAN. The foundation and trimmings will be of limestone and the roof of iron ; it is supposed to be an entirely fireproof building.

Mr. WHITE. Is it intended to use cement in the floors of this building ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, it is intended to use concrete.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like the minister to inform us where all these public documents for which provision is now being made, have been stored during the last 20 or 30 years ? Will these public documents that are now stored be removed to the new building so as to have them all under the one roof ?

Mr. HYMAN. A portion of the Langevin block is used at the present time for the storage of a large number of papers ; but it is intended to remove from the different departments to this building, as far as possible, all the documents which ought to be safely kept.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that in the basement of this building there are vaults in which a large number of old records are stored. Am I correctly informed as to that ? If so, there ought to be considerable available space left for other purposes if these documents are removed.

Mr. HYMAN. I am not informed as to that. I have no doubt that when this building is completed and a search is made for documents, we shall find them stored in a good many unexpected places.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are the Dominion archives kept now ?

Mr. HYMAN. In the Langevin block.

Mr. FOSTER. In what way does the minister provide against their destruction by fire ? Has he simply a fireproof building, or has he vaults as well ?—because some of these documents are very precious and important?

Mr. HYMAN. There is to be a very large vault in the building for particularly valuable documents. But the building itself is practically one vault, divided into sections by fireproof partitions.

Mr. FOSTER. How much more would a stone building cost than brick ?

Mr. HYMAN. I am informed by the chief architect that that would depend very largely upon the style of architecture. A plain stone building would cost about 25 per cent more.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not an architect, but it struck me that for the Dominion archives we ought to have a really fine building, and one of stone instead of brick, which has a rather common look for a building of that kind, in which the richest treasures of learning and knowledge and history with reference to the country are placed.

Mr. HYMAN. I may say that the question of the archives building and the question of the museum building came before the department. The latter, being a building that would be visited by a great many more people than the former, we considered should be a stone building, and a first-class building in every way. The archives building is intended to be more of a store house, and in regard to it the question of safety was chiefly considered.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Are the walls to be hollow ?

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Ottawa—Royal Mint, $200,000.

Mr. BERGERON. How far has that building gone ?

Mr. HYMAN. The contract was signed on the 5th of January, 1905. The date for the completion of the contract is the 5th of January, 1907. It has been let to Messrs. Sullivan & Langdon, of Kingston. The amount of the contract is $263,194. It was let after public tenders were advertised for, they being the lowest tenderers.

Mr. BERGERON. I suppose there is no use now of talking about the use of that building ?

Mr. HYMAN. The matter has been before the House for a considerable time.

Mr. BERGERON. As we are going to coin money in Canada, I may say that an immense amount of American money is circulating through this country, and some people are trying to devise a means of getting rid of it. I was told the other day

that over $9,000,000 of American coin was circulating through Canada. I know how difficult it is to prevent this, but it seems to me that we might arrange with the banks when it reaches them not to put it back into circulation. There are also a great many American bills in the country. Every one who has travelled through the States knows that our dollar bills, which are worth their face value in gold, are not accepted there. If we are going to spend such a large sum of money in building a mint, it seems to me that it would be logical to find a means of preventing American money circulating in Canada and taking the place of our own Canadian coin.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend will agree with me that that is a vast question which had better be postponed until the Minister of Finance is in his seat. I have reason to believe that before very long he will be with us. I understand that there are two sides to this question of the circulation of American money in Canada; but the question is one that deserves consideration, and if my hon. friend will bring it up at a later period, when the Minister of Finance is here, I have no doubt that it will receive some consideration.

Mr. BERGERON. I may tell the right hon. First Minister that I have been thinking of proposing an amendment to the Banking Act on that subject.

Mr. BARKER. What is expected to be the total expenditure on this building ? The amount of the contract is in excess of the sum here voted, therefore it is quite clear that further expenditure is contemplated.

Mr. HYMAN. There is, in the first place, the contract that has been let, amounting to $263,194 ; the estimate for heating is $15,000 ; for electric wiring and fittings, $6,000; for fittings and furnishings, $10,000; for vault doors and fitting, $15,000. The suggestion would naturally arise that a building of that character, in which would be stored large quantities of coin and gold dust, would require to be well fenced ; and no doubt a very expensive fence will have to be erected for the purpose of protecting that building. It is estimated that such a fence will cost about $25,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Why not take the fence around Major Hill's Park, which is of no use there ?

Mr. HYMAN. I shall take that into consideration. Adding contingencies, &c., $13,000, the total probable cost estimated by the department is $350,000. In addition to that there is the land which costs $21,250. It is a square piece of land on the corner of Sussex and Cathcart Streets and was purchased from the Canadian Pacific Railway. In addition the department are negotiating for the purchase of the property immediately adjoining—a small property—on which there is a house. We have not been able to come

to terms yet and do not want to take proceedings to dispossess the owner of the house until we find it absolutely necessary. The house no doubt will cost between $5,000 and $6,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is the hon. minister taking any steps to prevent any other building being in close proximity to the mint. In the United States no building of any description is allowed within a certain distance of any government public building.

Mr. HYMAN. The lot on which this building is being erected is practically a square. It is bounded on one side by the river and on two other sides by wide streets.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is it ?

Mr. HYMAN. On the corner of Sussex and Cathcart Streets. It is on the river bank, almost directly opposite Nepean hill and the large convent on Sussex Street. It is in order to complete the square that the department want to buy this other piece of property, which will cost between $5,000 and $6,000. That piece of property will not be needed for building operations, but it is thought better not to allow any building too close to the mint.

Mr. FOSTER. How much land are you getting for that $21,000?

Mr. HYMAN. A little over 300 feet square.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any building on it ?

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Mr. BLAIN. When were the plans first prepared ?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not know when the plans were commenced, but it must be at least two years since they were begun, and a considerable amount of work has been done on them.

Mr. BLAIN. When the question of erecting a mint was brought up by the right hon. the first minister some few years ago, he said that the total cost would be $200,000. My hon. friend now estimates in the neighbourhood of $375,000. Is that due to any changes in the plan ?

Mr. HYMAN. A great deal of care has been taken in the preparation of these plans and I do not think the matter is one in which the public would desire anything being done before every preparation was taken to have all the latest improvements. The architect of the department visited the United States and English mints and consulted with the best authorities in both countries. Every possible precaution is being taken to ensure the building being made sufficient for its purposes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I understand that in the archives building the walls are solid. I do not care how thick a solid wall may be,

it will not prevent dampness. A wall should always be hollow.

Mr. HYMAN. Altogether the wall itself is not hollow, there is a casing inside of it of steel or iron and there is a space between that and the brick work.

Mr. BERGERON. Do I understand that the land purchased is 300 feet square and costs $21,250 ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, this land belonged to the Canadian Pacific Railway, who were not inclined to sell at all. The department then had the land valued by two or three valuators and the value placed upon it was in the neighbourhood of $19,000. The department asked the Canadian Pacific Railway to name a price. The company wanted $43,000. That seemed beyond the ideas of the department and we made them an offer of $19,000. On their refusal we took proceedings in expropriation. Shortly afterwards they approached the department and said they would accept $21,250.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. When was the purchase completed ?

Mr. HYMAN. Negotiations went on during four or five months and the deal was only closed last month. The department felt it was better, considering the cost of expropriation, to give the extra amount.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. When this matter was up a year or so ago, there was a proposition that this mint should be located at Vancouver. The hon. member for Vancouver used to demand that it should be there. That was one of the battle cries in his campaign. I do not see him in his seat, but possibly he is conveniently out of the House.

Mr. MACPHERSON. No, he is right here.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If I remember right that was one of the war cries in his campaign.

Mr. MACPHERSON. You need not shed any tears over his campaign.

Mr. BERGERON. Who were the arbitrators ?

Mr. HYMAN. Messrs. Taggart, Douglas and Wallace of Ottawa.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why was it not located in Vancouver ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is the first time I have heard of any suggestion of that kind.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many tenders were submitted ?

Mr. HYMAN. There were four. $263,194 was the lowest ; $275,700 was the next, and $277,500 was the third lowest. The two last were by W. H. Davis and Holbrooke, Son & Wallace.

Mr. BLAIN. We understand that this is the contract for the building alone that has been awarded. Have tenders been received for the lighting and heating? I notice that there is a large amount for iron doors for the building. Is it the intention to ask for tenders for these items?

Mr. HYMAN. These questions have not been considered by the department as yet. It will be at least a year before that work will be done. In all cases when the sum involved is sufficiently large, or when, for any reason, it is in the public interest, tenders are called for. The usual course will be followed in this case.

Mr. BLAIN. What information can the hon. minister give us at this time about the course to be followed in regard to the vault doors and fittings, which the minister says, will cost about $15,000.

Mr. HYMAN. There can be no question as to that, in such a case, tenders will be called for.

Mr. BLAIN. Some years ago the Minister of Public Works stated to the House that he intended to have a general review of the construction of public buildings in Ottawa. I think he went so far as to secure an option or prices on some land adjoining the site of existing buildings, and indicated that a general report would be prepared as to the construction of new buildings that are necessary for the keeping of public documents and the efficient carrying on of the public service. May I ask if the minister has such a report ready or has it under consideration ? No year passes but we have an item in the estimates for the construction of some new building or the addition of a story to some building now in existence. It seems to me that this is rather an expensive plan. I think the House would be better informed and the country better served if a general policy were proposed for the construction of buildings in the capital. Of course, I understand that the building that we are now discussing is a building designed for a special purpose.

Mr. HYMAN. I am not sure that I understand exactly what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) means. It would be almost impossible to make plans according to which buildings for the future should be constructed. The special needs and the site have to be considered in every case. So far as the construction of post offices and custom houses in various parts of the country is concerned, we are trying to follow the best plan and to have them all as uniform as possible.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hyman) has misapprehended my question. I refer to the statement made by the Minister of Public Works that he had learned the price of a property on Wellington street in front of these buildings and proposed at an early day to bring down a report showing

what properties were available and at what prices, and setting forth the policy of the government as to the purchase of property and the construction of buildings to meet the requirements of the public service.

Mr. HYMAN. I may say that I expected the discussion of that subject to come up on the item of rents of public buildings. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) has no objection I would be glad to have the matter discussed, and fully discussed, on that item. The sum paid as rent for buildings in Ottawa used for government purposes has grown to such proportions that it would be decidedly in the public interest to take action to provide a public building suitable for the requirements of the government service. I have had the matter under consideration to a certain extent. It is a very large question and involves a good deal of work. The officers of the department are now engaged in figuring out the floor space necessary for the departments in Ottawa at the present moment. Of course, we must also, as well as we can, provide for the future. I hope that it will be possible, before the supplementary estimates are brought down, to consider this matter more fully and to have a good deal of information to lay before the House. I hope also to receive suggestions from members of the House, so that we may reach a conclusion that will be satisfactory to the representatives of the people.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the material to be used in building the mint?

Mr. HYMAN. It will be a stone building, a rectangular parallelogram measuring 220 feet from north to south by 164 feet from east to west.

Mr. BLAIN. What kind of stone will be used?

Mr. HYMAN. Nepean stone, which comes from the neighbourhood. It is practically the same stone that was used in the construction of the parliament buildings.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand that this building, when completed will cost about $375,000. I suppose it is too late now to talk about whether the money should be voted or not, because the policy has already been decided upon and accepted by parliament. But I would be very glad if any of those who favoured the establishment of a mint at this time would explain the reasons by which that policy was supported. This is a very large amount of money to spend for a work that seems to me clearly unnecessary.

Mr. HYMAN. I was not a member of the government when the decision to construct a mint was arrived at. I have always understood that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the government gave very careful consideration to the whole question. The matter has been discussed in the House more than once, and I think that hon members on both sides have taken very strong grounds in favour of the erection of this building. I understand that there was no question about the necessity for it. From a departmental standpoint, the Department of Public Works is only asked to bring in plans and specifications.

Mr. BERGERON. Would some one who has had to do with this decision, tell us why they have taken that decision ? I was not here to hear their reasons. This institution is to cost in the neighbourhood of $375,000. Although the decision to construct has been taken, might I be allowed to ask the reason, since we are now voting the money ? This is a very large amount of money, and I have not heard at any time reasons given why we should have a mint in Canada. Without saying that the money is spent altogether uselessly, I may suggest that it is spent sooner than necessary.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I may say that parliament did not agree with the view just presented by my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) when the matter was up some years ago. In fact, I believe it was first brought up when my hon. friend occupied the seat he now occupies, and it has been discussed during the interval that he has been away from the House. I think he will remember that this matter was brought before parliament in 1899 or 1900, and more than once. At all events, whether my hon. friend was absent or present, this matter has been discussed in parliament more than once, and the idea taken by the government was that a mint had become necessary in view of the discovery of gold in the Yukon ; we thought the time had come when parliament should have power to coin our own money. From 1898 or 1899 the Yukon has produced gold ore to the extent of at least $10,000,000 a year. During all this time, that gold has gone to be coined in the United States, and we thought it good policy to have an institution where we could coin our own gold and put it into circulation in this country. My hon. friend is right perhaps in saying that the currency would be too limited to justify us in coining gold for Canada alone. But we have obtained from the Imperial authorities permission to coin for them also, and to issue coin for the United Kingdom. Therefore we are to coin not only for ourselves but we are to coin for the United Kingdom. This question has been discussed more than once in parliament, on these lines, and I never heard any objection taken to it. I have given to my hon. friend the chief reason that induced us to take the action we did, and that was the discovery of gold in the Yukon, which we thought ought to be minted in this country.

Mr. FOSTER. In what way would the minting of our gold here add to the production of gold in the Yukon ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know that it would add a single cent. But I suppose that my hon. friend is a National Policy man, that he wants to have Canada for the Canadians, and Canadian gold for a Canadian mint instead of Canadian gold for an American mint, as is the case at the present time. I should suppose that such a reason would appeal to my hon. friend.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without answering the suggestion of the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), that Canada does not require a mint. He says he does not see any particular reason why we require a mint. Let me give him a few facts that I am sure will apeal to him as a good Canadian. Let me tell him and this committee that the cities of Seattle, Tacoma and Spokane Falls have been built up as a result of the shipment of Canadian gold mined in Canada, which has gone to swell the coffers of merchants in the United States. I can tell him further that we are producing nearly $20,000,000 worth of gold every year, and with the exception of $1,500,000 that is produced west of the foot hills of the Rocky Mountains, that gold has gone into the United States to be minted. When a miner wants to sell his gold he goes where the people will buy it and mint it. There is no city in Canada outside of Vancouver where he can dispose of his gold, and if he did, he would probably be obliged to sell it for $1 an ounce less than he could get on the American side.

Mr. BERGERON. Will he bring it to Ottawa ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. I take it for granted that whatever government is in power will see to it that the gold produced in Canada will find its way to our own mint. Moreover, I suppose, they will arrange some scheme with the banks for the collection of the gold. People who live in the east can hardly conceive of the immense harm that has been done to Canada and Canadian institutions by the prevalence of just such a view as the hon. gentleman has expressed, that we have no real use for a mint. Of course I believe he expresses this view in good faith, not being conversant with the facts. If we had had a mint in Canada, or any place where gold could have been bought at its value, the city of Vancouver, instead of being a city of 40,000 inhabitants, would have been much more populous, because it would have received the benefit of the shipments of gold from the Yukon, and would have been a greater city than Seattle to-day. Seattle was built up, I can tell my hon. friend, from a city of 20,000 people, as it was when I first saw it, to a city of 120,000. Most of the prosperity which Seattle has enjoyed the last eight years has resulted from Canadian mined gold. Now, Sir, I think that every man in this country should be alive to the fact that we are a gold producing country. We have other things in this country besides wheat, and fowl, and barnyard hogs. Last year we produced in British Columbia alone $6,000,000 worth of gold, and the whole output in Canada was nearly $21,000,000. Let me tell my hon. friend that that $21,000,000 went over to the American side and is credited to the United States production of gold, making that country the second largest in the world, whereas if Canada was to receive her right proportion and mint her own gold, she would stand fourth as a gold producing country. I have given some of the reasons, there are others of a patriotic nature. I think it is high time that this country of 6,000,000 people should mint their own gold and silver. We can produce every known mineral I think on the earth, we produce gold in a great amount, and silver in almost unlimited quantities, and I believe the time has come when this gold should be coined in our own country, and bear a Canadian imprint. We have plenty of silver, and we shall see silver 50 cent pieces and $1 pieces of our own coining. When my hon. friend sees a gold piece with a beaver on one side and the name Canada on the other, I know his Canadian heart will swell with pride.

Mr. BERGERON. I desire first to thank my right hon. friend for the explanation he gave me. While the right hon. gentleman was speaking, I recalled to mind that this subject did come up in 1899 or 1900, and if I am not mistaken, politics did enter into the discussion of that question. Some of our friends from British Columbia were talking strongly on the lines the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macpherson, of Vancouver) has just suggested. The right hon. gentleman shows there was no politics in his scheme when he says that it was important to keep our own gold in Canada, to be minted here instead of letting it go over to the United States. Why is it that the government have waited four or five years to come to this decision and to build this institution, while our gold has been allowed to go over to the other side ?

My hon. friend from Vancouver says that instead of building up cities in the United States, Canadian cities will be built up by the construction of this mint. Surely my hon. friend is not serious. He knows very well that most Americans who come into our country in search of gold, on finding it take it home with them, and I do not think my hon. friend will find any means of preventing them from doing so. The Canadian mint here will be idle. There will be two or three superintendents and five or six clerks employed, we will spend a great deal of money and I intend to ask before I get through how much it will cost for oper-

ating. We will require to have a number of specialists. Having visited the mint in Philadelphia, I know the number of people who are employed there. I do not believe that we will coin very much money The establishment of this mint will not prevent money being coined on the American side. The hon. Postmaster General came to the rescue and spoke about the banks being called upon to help in the distribution of the gold. We know what has happened. The Bank of Commerce has a monopoly in the Yukon but that fact does not prevent Canadian gold from going to the United States. When the demand for a mint was first made in the House of Commons there was a population in Dawson City of 40,000. What is the population of Dawson City to-day? There are not 10,000 people in that city. Where is your immense production of gold? I cannot see the usefulness of such a building. It will involve the expenditure of a large amount of money uselessly. It will cost a great deal of money to keep up that institution every year and there is no reason for it. The political reason has disappeared. If the building were to be erected in Vancouver or even in Dawson City there might be some reason for it, but being located here in Ottawa it will serve no useful purpose because it will be a great deal shorter for a man coming out from Dawson City to go to the United States than to come here. My hon. friend talks about patriotism being stimulated by the establishment of this institution. If there were more patriotism there would not be nine million dollars of American coin in circulation in Canada to-day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I hope we will be able to get rid of the American coin in Canada, of which my hon. friend speaks.

Mr. BERGERON. That will not do it. The banks are filled with American coin.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not find fault with that. If my hon. friend looks at the statutes he will know that the banks have been allowed to use American coin for their reserves of gold. That was necessary when we were a small nation, but we are growing. Does my hon. friend believe that we must for ever remain without our own mint and our own coin? There is in the highest sense a political reason for the establishment of a mint. Canada, to-day, with a population of six millions of souls, a larger population than that of Belgium, Sweden and Norway and many other nations and with a large production of gold, should have a mint of her own. As a commercial transaction I do not think there is any money in it. We will do well if we come out even, but whatever it may be as a commercial transaction, put it upon the ground stated by my hon. friend a moment ago—the political ground and I hope that he and his hon. friends will agree with the government that the mint will serve a useful purpose. It will assert that Canada is coming to the front. It will be an advertisement for Canada not only on this continent but everywhere. You will see our gold coins in Washington and New York and wherever you go in the United States or in Europe you will find Canada advertised as it is not advertised to-day. Our bank bills may be refused in the money markets of Europe and the United States, but when you have gold coin in your pocket it will be accepted everywhere and it will advertise Canada. In the Yukon we produce about $10,000,000 every year. That is the standard production of the Yukon now. In British Columbia, as I understand from the statement made a moment ago by my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson), we produce $6,000,000—that makes $16,000,000—and in other parts of Canada we produce $4,000,000 making a total production of $20 000,000 of gold. I do put it to my hon. friend on the ground of his own political faith, on the ground that he has been preaching more than once recently: Does he not believe it is good policy that we should coin that gold ourselves in Canada? Where does it go to-day? It does not go to Europe. I do not think that any part of our gold goes to Europe, but I believe it all goes to the United States. Every ounce of that $20,000,000 of Canadian gold which is taken from the bowels of the earth goes to the United States. Let us have a mint here in Ottawa, that Washington of the North, and then we shall have something which is worthy of a nation. In the United States they have not one mint but several, one in Washington, one in Philadelphia, which is the oldest, one at San Francisco and one, I think, also at Denver. We will commence with one and as time goes on, we, like our neighbours, shall have more than one also.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I understand that some years ago the estimated cost of this mint was $200,000; to-day it is $375,000. Why is there such a vast difference?

Mr. HYMAN. Of course, I presume, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) refers to the question that another hon. gentleman spoke of a moment ago when something was said about the hon. Finance Minister having made a statement that it would cost $200,000. I have never seen such a statement. I presume the hon. gentleman has seen a statement of that character. I presume he spoke from memory. If such a statement was made by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance it must have been made without any calculation, because the plans of the department were not prepared in any careful way at that time. He was under a misapprehension if he made that statement. Great care has been exercised in preparing a plan which will provide a building that can be operated in the most economical way.

Mr. BERGERON. How much would it cost to heat the mint ? How many men will be employed ? How much will it cost for operating ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have not come to that yet. That is a fair question for the hon. Minister of Finance, but not for the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Minister of Finance ought to be here when we are discussing this item.

Mr. BERGERON. How can we go back to the question when the hon. Minister of Finance is here ? This item will be passed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think we will find some way of satisfying the curiosity of my hon. friend, and I think he will find some way himself.

Mr. BERGERON. I will take the advice of my right hon. friend and wait until the hon. Minister of Finance is here.

Mr. BLAIN. On the question as to whether we were speaking from memory or not, I draw the attention of the hon. acting Minister of Public Works to page 5673 of the 'Hansard' of 1901. The hon. Finance Minister said that 'the building would cost $200,000.' Now, my hon. friend the acting Minister of Public Works comes forward and says it will cost $370,000.

Mr. HYMAN. No, I am sure my hon. friend does not want to misrepresent what I said. The contract for the building is $263,000.

Mr. BLAIN. That is in addition to the doors which will cost $15,000 ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, those are fittings.

Mr. BLAIN. The doors are fittings ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, the vault doors are fittings.

Mr. BLAIN. Are the windows fittings as well ?

Mr. HYMAN. No, they are under contract.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would state what the total cost of the building will be. I do not mean the fittings I mean the cost of the building without the fittings. I understand the contract price is $260,000. That is $60,000 more than the hon. Finance Minister said it would cost. Then there is a considerable amount in addition as mentioned this afternoon by the hon. acting minister.

Mr. HYMAN. I have no doubt in the world that this very building which now costs by contract, $263,000, could have been built for about the sum that the Minister of Finance mentioned. Everyone knows that there has been a large increase in the price of building in the last three or four years, probably 25 to 30 per cent ; that I am sure will be accepted by the House as an explanation. Considering that the Minister of Finance made his statement without having all the details, and the plans before him. I thin he was wonderfully close in the estimate he gave, taking into consideration the difference in the cost of building. The hon. gentleman laughs. I am perfectly serious, and I am speaking of my own knowledge. In the last two years I have let contracts for buildings that cost 20 per cent more than they would have cost the year before. I do think that any member in the House with experience in building knows that the cost of building is not less than 20 per cent higher than in 1902.

Mr. BARR. I might ask if the banking interests in this Dominion have been consulted ? Probably they could give some light on this subject. It is certainly a large undertaking involving large expenditures and it seems doubtful whether due consideration has been given to the undertaking. The banking interests are probably best able to inform the House on questions of this kind and I would like to know if they have been consulted.

Mr. HYMAN. Does the hon. gentleman mean in regard to the principle of building the mint ?

Mr. BARR. Yes, the principle.

Mr. HYMAN. I understand the bankers have expressed themselves from time to time.

Mr. BERGERON. In favour of it ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There is a Bankers' Association, and on several occasions at their annual meeting according to newspaper reports which I have read, they discussed this question. I recollect now one prominent banker who was president of the Bankers' Association who expressed himself very strongly. I refer to Mr. D. R. Wilkie, manager of the Imperial bank. I think he was very strong in favour of it. Of course in all questions of this kind, as in all large questions, you will find differences of opinion, but the project is not without its advocates in the banking world.

Mr. BERGERON. It seems to me that I read a report which indicated that the vice-president of the Bank of Montreal, Mr Geo. Drummond, was certainly against the principle of establishing a mint in Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) is perfectly right. The bankers were not unanimous, some favoured it and some did not.

Mr. BARKER. This question was up before and it was then said that this was not to be a purely Canadian mint, but a branch of the Royal mint. Now, as it is costing so much money, perhaps it would be interest-

ing if the first minister could tell us just what the distinction is. The gentleman from British Columbia (Mr. Macpherson) seems to think it is to be a Canadian affair, something that is to be of immense good to Vancouver, and to buy all the gold that will be produced in this country. When we find it is costing us nearly $400,000 we might know what the difference is between a branch of the Royal Mint and a purely Canadian mint.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The explanation is this : The mint is to be a Canadian mint of course, to coin Canadian gold, Canadian five dollar pieces, which as my hon. freinds know are not now coined. At the present time as my hon. friends know Canadian silver, 25 cent pieces, 50 cent pieces, &c., are all coined in England.

Mr. BERGERON. But this is only silver.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If we have gold coined, we get it coined in England Now we are going to do the reverse. Up to the present time the Royal Mint has coined British coins and Canadian coins ; the Royal Mint in Canada will coin Canadian coins and also English coins, the English sovereign, &c. In order to do this, the mint has to be a branch of the Royal mint ; that is the way it has to be done. This is what the Minister of Finance says. The advantage is this : We may not require for ourselves all the gold that we produce in Canada and that gold will be coined in Canada into British sovereigns and sent over for circulation to Great Britain, and in order to have this done the Canadian mint will be made by Royal proclamation a branch of the Royal Mint.

Mr. BARR. And it is to coin silver as well as gold ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. I did not think that part of the object of this building was to coin British coins for use in Great Britain.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. Are we paying the money for that purpose ; is that our object ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that is expected—upon this point I speak under correction, as I am not perfectly sure, —that on the coin we make for the British public we make some profit. As to that, as I said, I speak under correction.

Mr. BERGERON. Of course I believe fully what my right hon. friend says, but I would ask if there is an arrangement with the British government to that effect ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is.

Mr. BERGERON. We have never had any Canadian gold coinage ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. BERGERON. Our money is different from the English money; we have no pound or sovereign here? Will the mint here make the $5 gold pieces as in the United States ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. And when they coin English coin it will be English pounds ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes. We shall coin here Canadian dollars, $5 pieces, $10 pieces and $20 pieces in gold and we shall coin also the British sovereign.

Mr. HAGGART. But no English shillings ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not expect that we will coin English silver, although we have the power to do so.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Is there not a branch of the Royal Mint in Australia ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot speak positively as to that.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes there is. If this mint coins English sovereigns, which the English government of course guarantee to be of a certain fineness and value, will they take that coinage simply from our own management here or will they insist on having supervision as well ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand they will insist on having supervision as well.

Mr. FOSTER. We have not yet got very clearly even after the speech from the hon. gentleman from British Columbia (Mr. Macpherson), and I wish we could get a little more clearly, information as to just what effect this mint is going to exert upon the production of gold into this country. The hon. member for British Columbia (Mr. Macpherson) seemed to have the idea that we are going to buy all the gold that comes from the earth. If we do that how are we going to dispose of it ? After all, gold in a sense is an article of merchandise, just the same as the barnyard hog of which my hon. friend thought so little. Will we have some coining arrangement to attach to the ear of the barnyard hog to give him currency ? A great deal of generalities are talked regarding this subject, but we cannot get any very explicit explanation. In the first place it is going to involve us in very large expense. When this first became a matter of real agitation in this country, if I understand rightly, the present Minister of Finance declared himself as opposed to it. Then the idea was advanced that it would be a good thing to have a Canadian coinage for patriotic reasons, and I think a good deal of weight should be attached to that sentiment.

The idea then was that it was to be an inexpensive operation. Well, we have the old difficulty again, that an idea is made operative by a statement of cost which is

reasonable, and afterwards it comes out that the cost runs away up above the original estimate. Here is an institution which, when built and manned, will cost at least $450,000. That is a good deal of money to pay; but that is not all, for there will be current expenditure as well. My right hon. friend knows that we make a round lot of money on our coinage by having it coined in the British mint. It is quite possible to have Canadian $10 or $5 pieces coined, with the Canadian maple leaf and beaver on them, instead of the head of the English King or the American eagle, if we desire it; and to have that circulated in Canada. and to require the banks to keep it. It would have been possible to have got all that and to have made an absolute profit on the transaction. But surely no one can argue that because you have a mint here, you are going to dispossess Seattle or any other United States coast town of the advantage which it has got largely from being the pioneer of that great movement towards the Yukon. The miner of the Yukon sells his gold as an article of merchandise; he can sell it in the United States or in Canada, and he will sell it in both countries, some in one and some in the other. But with an accumulation of gold production of $20,000,000, then $40,000,000, later $60,000,000, this mint cannot be a great receiving and buying centre which will absorb all that. Then what will you do with it? All the coinage we can use in the country is what the banks need. If we make it a condition that they shall take our own coinage, you can have some circulation of gold. But our people are very strongly predisposed to the circulation of bank bills, and they would put their gold very quickly into the banks and take out the bills for circulation. Then, my hon. friend knows that gold circulation is the most expensive circulation. It wears, and wears easily. In Great Britain, where gold goes into general circulation, the annual loss is enormous. Then, what are you going to do? The argument comes down to this, that we are going to pay pretty roundly for the sake of having a mint and coinage of our own. There may be something in that, and I am not going to controvert the views of my hon. friend on that point. The thing may have to come, and this may be the time for it. But we are greatly in want of many practical things in this country, and when we had to take half a million dollars from these pressing wants and put it into what is after all an ornament, with perhaps some slight advantage to Canada, I think it was a fair question whether we should have gone into this immense expenditure at the present time, or whether we could not have used our money to better advantage, at the same time having our gold coinage, which we could have got from London, just as London is going to take their gold coinage from us. Our coinage will go only so far as its reputation is established, and it will take time to make a Canadian stamped gold coin current in countries far distant from us. I imagine that supervision must come from Great Britain joined with our own, in order to impress widely the value of our coinage. But we might as well get rid of a great many of these floating notions that our mint is going to make our cities spring up like magic or provide a buying place for all the gold we produce.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no fault to find with the way in which my hon. friend has discussed this question. I think I would agree with him on almost everything he has said. But there is another aspect of the question. Nobody expects that the establishment of the mint will take all our output of gold. But the fact that we have a mint in Canada is bound to help the trade of Canada and to bring to Canada a trade which to-day goes to the United States. The miner in the Yukon or in British Columbia produces from the bowels of the earth many ounces of gold, and he has to find a market for it. He cannot find a market in Canada. At the present time every ounce of the $20,000,000 which is produced by Canadian miners from the soil has to go to Seattle. It cannot find a market anywhere else.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand that the Canadian Bank of Commerce is the authorized bank of the government there, and why should not this bank take the gold dust from the miners and as a matter of patriotism send it to England to have it coined into Canadian gold pieces and English gold pieces?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. For this reason, that the Canadian Bank of Commerce, which has an establishment in Dawson city, takes the gold for commerce, and will sell it at the greatest profit; and the Bank of Commerce and all the other banks on the Pacific coast find it to their advantage to send the gold to their nearest market, which is Seattle or San Francisco, where it is bought and turned into coin. The gold must find its way to some mint.

Mr. BERGERON. Will they send it here?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly they will. But at present they send it to Seattle. The consequence is that most of the purchases for the Yukon are made at Seattle. That is the place of exchange; the gold has to be exchanged for everything a miner requires. We get a large share of the trade, for certain reasons; but there is at Seattle, Tacoma and at other Pacific coast cities of the United States a large trade with the Yukon which we would get if the gold were to come here. With a mint at Vancouver, a great deal of the trade would go there. So that the establishment

of a mint will give a great impetus to our trade, and will give us a trade which we have not to-day. I think this reason should commend itself to the critical judgment of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition.

Mr. HAGGART. My idea of a mint is entirely different from that of the right hon. gentleman. If I am not mistaken, a mint in the United States or Great Britain coins gold free to the individual sending it. In the United States the gold is taken to the mint, not for the purpose of being sold, but for the purpose of being coined into money. The miner receives the full value of his gold in money. Then it goes, in the ordinary course of trade, to the country in whose favour is the balance of trade, for the purpose of paying that balance. And the making of mints will not cause a flow of gold in any particular direction. As soon as the mint coins the gold and hands it over to the individual, the gold will go in the end to where it is due and be used for the purpose of paying the balance of trade.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. How are these balances paid in any part of the world? In the Yukon some years ago when there was no bank there, the miner brought his bag of gold to the counter where he exchanged it for something else. The gold was weighed and its value in goods given to him. But he would not follow the same process in the city of London. He would there bring his gold to the mint and would use the coins which he got in exchange for the purchase of what he required. The gold which is produced in Canada has to go somewhere to be coined. To-day we have a bank in the Yukon, and the miner goes to the bank and receives bank notes in exchange for his gold dust. But the bank has to send that gold dust somewhere, and I venture to say that every ounce of it goes to the United States because there it can be coined. Of course, the surplus will find its way to Europe or anywhere else where it may be required. But when we have a mint in Ottawa, the gold produced in Canada will be sent there to be coined. I dare say there will not be any profit to the government in the transaction, but we will gain by the fact of keeping in Canada a large portion of the trade which now goes to the United States.

Mr. BERGERON. What guarantee have we that the miner will bring his gold to the Canadian mint to be coined instead of sending it to Seattle? If the mint were established at Vancouver, as Mr. Maxwell, the late member for Victoria, urged, no doubt the Canadian nuggets and gold dust would be brought there to be coined. But there is no way of forcing the miner or the bank in Dawson City to send the gold down to the mint at Ottawa.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is now nearly 6 o'clock and if you will pass the item, I will move that the committee rise.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. FOSTER. With the understanding that we may go back to the discussion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood the First Minister to say that we would mint silver coin as well. In that respect he seems to differ with the Minister of Finance.

In the session of 1901 this question was put to the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding):

Will the Branch mint in Canada make British silver coins as well as gold coins?

MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, there are reasons why we shall not undertake to make British silver coins. We make no profit in the production of gold coins, because gold is worth no more in the form of coin than in the form of bullion.

Then the Finance Minister went on to say:

If we could mint silver into British coins in unlimited quantity, we could make a great deal of money; but it would be entirely unreasonable to expect the British authorities to allow us to engage in that enterprise.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is British silver, not Canadian silver.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 7, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

R. L. Borden, Esq., member for the electoral district of Carleton, Ontario, introduced by the Hon. Geo. E. Foster and Mr. F. D. Monk.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, I beg to move:

That the name of Mr. R. L. Borden, member for Carleton, Ontario, be added to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, and the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

I may inform my hon. friend (Mr. Borden), whom I welcome back to this House, that in anticipation of his early presence in the House we reserved for him places upon the Committees on Privileges and Elections and Banking and Commerce. These are the only two committees on which he served last year, and I hope they will be satisfactory to him again.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). They will be entirely satisfactory to me, Mr. Speaker, and I am very much obliged to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for his welcome. I arrived a little later than I

intended, but I believe I am entitled to the sympathy of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), because I think he had once an experience of the same kind.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, yes.

Motion agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I beg to move:

That the name of Mr. Fisher be added to the Committee on Private Bills.

I make this motion after consultation with my hon. friends on the other side.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 39) respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 40) respecting the Niagara-Welland Power Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Regina and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 42) respecting the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 43) respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.—Mr. Gervais.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Annual Report of the Geographical Board of Canada to June 30, 1904.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

CENSUS AND STATISTICS.

Bill (No. 5) respecting the Census and Statistics—Mr. Fisher—read the second time, and House went into Committee thereon.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps before we proceed to the consideration of this by sections, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) would give us what is usually given on the motion for the second reading—some explanation of the purport and scope of the Bill, and what evils it is intended to remedy.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). At the request of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden)—and I would also like to add a word of welcome to the House—I shall be very glad to give an outline of the intention of this Bill. It is a Bill practically to consolidate three actual laws—the Census law, the law of General Statistics and the law of Criminal Statistics. These three laws deal with the same subject. They, however, contain different provisions, and to a certain extent overlap each other; in some instances, to a slight extent, they conflict with each other in some details.

Mr. FOSTER. These two Acts form all the existing legislation?

Mr. FISHER. I know of no other, except one Act in connection with the formation of the province of Manitoba, the Act respecting the subsidies of the province of Manitoba, which requires that a census should be taken of the province of Manitoba each five years, and which is in no way conflicted with by the provisions of the Bill which I now propose to present to parliament. Apart from this, I know of no legislation except the three Acts I have quoted—the Census Act, the General Statistics Act and the Criminal Statistics Act. The Bill which I propose combines and consolidates these three Acts. It also provides machinery for a permanent census office. This is the chief novelty in the Bill. I ask for that on the ground of public utility and the more efficient administration of the department, and for the purpose of securing a better census in the future.

Mr. FOSTER. How about the expense?

Mr. FISHER. I believe it will be more economical too. My reasons for that are these. One of the greatest difficulties always found in the taking of the census is the necessity of organizing a staff, almost on the spur of the moment, of inexperienced people who have never had much of this kind of work before. The difficulties consequent on this hasty manner of operation would be avoided if there were a permanent census office. But, in addition to that, what I consider to be quite as important is the necessity, in the present stage of our development, of obtaining accurate statistics during the ten years that intervene between the taking of the censuses. Hitherto we have had no accurate statistics whatever for the whole Dominion except those taken in the census years. The result is that when investigations are made by students or public men, or others, requiring general information with regard to the Dominion, they have either to go back to the census year or get their information from whatever sources they can. At present, these sources are in a certain way official. The trade and navigation returns give information about trade matters, and the other departments do give certain other information; but there is no compilation of the figures given in the various departmental reports in a form available to the public at large except in the Canadian Year Book. This work is a compilation made from the various departmental reports for the year, but it only deals with what appears in those reports. I think it is in the interest of our country that we should have a more frequent taking of information in regard to our industrial and agricultural interests; and for that purpose I think it is necessary to have a permanent office which, while it takes a census of the population, and obtains detailed information on all the different subjects which have been contained in our census once in ten years, should also have the duty

of taking information at first hand on a portion of those subjects every year. I do not propose that a whole census should be taken every year; that would be quite out of the question. I do not propose that on any one subject statistics should be taken every year; but I do think that between the two censuses, there should be a periodic taking of information along various lines, and including each year a portion of the census information. For instance, certain agricultural statistics might be taken every second year, and certain other agricultural statistics in the alternate years. Certain industrial statistics might also be taken in the same way. Certain mortuary or hygienic statistics might be taken at intervals, whether every second year, every third year, or otherwise, according to the decision of the department and the facilities of the work. In this way a comparatively small staff would be able to work one year on one set of statistics and in another year on another set of statistics, and would secure for us, between the decennial censuses, in the aggregate, a large mass of important information. I think this is one of the most important objects, if not the most important, in having a permanent office, and in providing by this Act for the appointment of a permanent staff, and for giving them the authority to do in other years what they now have authority to do in the census year, each time the authority is given them designating just what information they shall collect. I may say that a work similar to this is being carried on and has been carried on for some little time in the United States. The United States census office secures a very large amount of information which our census office never has been in the habit of securing. The work in regard to the census is continued from year to year practically until the work for the next census begins. Compilations and tables are prepared from the census work of 1891, the work on which continues practically until the census of 1901 is commenced.

Mr. HAGGART. Is it simply a compilation on which these officers are at work in the United States, or do they actually get the information from the people?

Mr. FISHER. They do get what I may call interim information. They do not get it with the same exactitude, or by the personal investigation of enumerators as is done in the taking of the census.

Mr. HAGGART. How do they get it, then?

Mr. FISHER. They get it largely by correspondence, largely by issuing forms for the people to fill up and return through the post office.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister says that certain kinds of agricultural information will be taken in one year and certain other kinds in the alternate years, and that this information can be made useful for the decennial census. That I do not understand.

Mr. FISHER. That is not my idea. It is not to be made use of for the decennial census at all, but for the use of the people between the censuses.

Mr. FOSTER. As to that year.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, but we would not make use of that information at all for the decennial census. The information taken in the interval between each decennial census will not interfere in any way with the complete taking of the decennial census. The establishment of a permanent census office will not in any way decrease the necessity or the work of the decennial census except that it will decrease the expenditure in this respect, that the office being in permanent existence, we will be able to prepare for the taking of the information during the census year, and thus do the work more easily and effectively. With regard to the question put me by my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart), the information taken between the census years would not be taken by enumeration, except in some instances. For instance, the census of Manitoba has to be taken once in five years. There was an Act requiring that on a certain day the census should be taken of the population in the Northwest Territories at the end of the five year period. That Act was for one definitely named year. That is only done once; and in view of the development of our new Territories in the west and of the fact that in Manitoba the census has to be taken every five years, it would be perhaps a good thing for Canada to take the census in the new provinces or in the Territories once in five years. That would have to be done by actual enumeration, but with regard to industrial information and even to a great deal of agricultural information, my idea is that that work should be done from the office here and done through the mails to a very large extent. Perhaps a little might have to be done otherwise, but I think nearly the whole of it could be done through the post office. Something of this kind might be done. A blank form might be sent to the various industrial establishments asking them to fill in the changes in their business since the census year. Those would be compiled and the results then placed at the command of the people.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman propose to send out at certain intervals a return to be filled in by business men throughout the country?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there to be any mode of compelling these people to give the information?

Mr. FISHER. I propose to give the same powers to the office as are given under the

Census Act. Anybody who receives such a form would have to fill it in subject to the same penalties as at present for non-compliance.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It would be useless without that.

Mr. FISHER. Quite so. That is one of the reasons we need a new Act. The present one only gives that authority for the census year. I am satisfied that a system can be worked out by which we can get a great deal of local information at absolutely no expense. A large number of our best informed and leading men would be only too glad to give free information of the condition in their own locality in return for a redistribution of that information to themselves. For the last two years my department has been securing information with regard to fruit growing in Canada, without any authority or powers of execution, and we have been able to procure a very large amount—not sufficient to enable us to compile and publish it, but sufficient to guide us in our dealings with matters in that branch. We have been able without any expense to secure from men competent to give that information, a very large amount of what I might almost call statistical information. Not being complete, it could not be compiled and given to the public, but it is still a mass of information which is quite accurate, and which, if it were complete from the whole country, would be worth being compiled and published. I am satisfied, from my own personal knowledge, we could get the latest agricultural information with regard to crop areas and promises of harvest with practically no expense. That information we could compile, and publish the results. The only expenditure would be the preparing and printing of the forms to be sent out, and the work of the office in receiving them and compiling the returns, so as to make tables which would be suitable for study by the ordinary individual.

Mr. MONK. Has the hon. minister made any calculation of the expense to be incurred in connection with this law ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. MONK. I wished also to suggest that, as the carrying out of this law would probably involve a considerable expense, the minister should have proceeded by resolution.

Mr. FISHER. As I understand it, the rules of the House do not require the introduction of this measure by resolution. The expenditure will be provided for by an item in the estimates.

Mr. MONK. I cannot but believe that the minister is mistaken and that the very opposite is the case.

Mr. FISHER. I am not prepared to set myself up as a judge of that point. But I consulted the Department of Justice, and understood that it was not necessary in this case to proceed by resolution.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. minister make provision for salaries in the Bill ?

Mr. FISHER. There is no provision for expenditure in the Bill. The Bill authorizes the department to incur certain expenses, but it does not indicate the amount. And, as I understand, it is only in that case that the question of proceeding by resolution arises.

Mr. MONK. I thought there was a clause in the Bill relating to the payment of money. I find that subsection 2 of section 42 provides :

> Such remuneration or allowances, and all expenses incurred in carrying this Act into effect, shall be paid out of such moneys as are provided by parliament for that purpose.

But, without any desire to retard the progress of this measure, the point I wish to make is that the minister has stated that officers would be employed to carry out the provisions of this Act. Of course, these officers will have to be paid. I think, therefore, it is only fair to raise the point of order, which I do. I think we had better adhere to the old rule and have the Bill founded upon resolutions previously adopted by the House. An hon. friend draws my attention to the fact that section 4 of the Bill provides that one or more enumerators are to be appointed for every census sub-district. This must involve expense. I think we cannot surround these enactments providing for the appointment of officials and the incurring of expense with too many precautions. The procedure I have suggested is according to the old traditions of the House.

Mr. FISHER. I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) that we cannot surround the expenditure of public money with too many safeguards. Had I supposed for a moment that this Bill required it I would have proceeded by resolution. I do not profess to be an authority on questions of procedure, but I would point out that the clauses to which my hon. friend refers are already in existence in the laws which are being consolidated by this Bill. I grant that under this Bill, there would be authority given for paying more than was paid under the old Acts. At the same time, the existing law does provide for the expenditure of money for the purpose of gathering statistics and carrying on a good deal of the work contemplated under this Bill. Therefore, if I may put it in that way, I think it is a mere question of degree and not a question of new expenditure. And I would point out that the expenditure under this Bill, of course, must be authorized by vote in the estimates when we reach that stage. I think my hon. friend's position is not tenable, but I must submit to the decision of the committee on that point.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand it the hon. minister proposes by this Bill, to repeal the Acts to which he has just referred. Of course, I do not know how it is proposed to pay these officers, but if it is proposed to make their salaries a charge on the public revenue, it seems to me clear that this measure ought to be proceeded with by resolution.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would appeal to the experience of my hon. friend from North Renfrew (Hon. Peter White), who has had a great deal of experience in these matters, that the rule is that when a Bill is proposed, the chief object of which is the expenditure of public money it must be introduced by resolution. But when a Bill is promoted the chief object of which is not the expenditure of public money, but in which the expenditure is an incident, it may be introduced directly, but the clauses which provide for the expenditure of public money must be introduced by resolution.

Mr. WHITE. Quite so.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My attention has been very forcibly drawn to this distinction in connection with the Bill which the government will have to introduce for the admission of certain provinces into the confederation. When Manitoba was admitted as a province in 1870, the measure was introduced by Sir John Macdonald in the form of a Bill. Of course, there are certain clauses of the Act which provide for heavy charges upon the public treasury—the subsidy to the province for instance. Concurrently with the introduction of the Bill or subsequently to it, resolutions will be introduced to provide for the financial part of the measure.

Mr. WHITE. When a Bill is introduced any clauses of which refer to a charge upon the public treasury, the practice is that these clauses shall be printed in italics or inclosed in brackets so that members of the House may be appraised of their nature, and these clauses should not be discussed until after the resolutions have been introduced providing for these expenditures.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear. Let me put this question to my hon. friend: Does not he think that the committee could deal with the Bill, and, when we come to any clause involving the expenditure of public money, it could be passed over and left for future discussion?

Mr. WHITE. I would not like to give an opinion upon that subject; but I think that the House should be apprised, by the sections being printed in italics or inclosed in brackets that resolutions must be introduced before those sections can be proceeded with.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think that the course suggested by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and supported by my hon. friend from North Renfrew (Mr. White) is the one that has always been followed. I remember a case arising three or four years ago though I cannot cite the name of the Bill at this moment. The Bill was introduced, but the discussion of the money clauses was postponed until resolutions had been passed in committee providing for the charge upon the public revenue.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think that, as the point raised is a most important one, I would beg leave to reserve my decision until to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. In the meantime what is to be done?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I suggest that a motion be made, and the Bill be reported to the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister might go on with the rest of the explanations.

Mr. FISHER. If the point is pressed, it might be advisable simply to reserve the sections.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is no objection to continuing the explanations.

Mr. OSLER. Could the minister state in general terms what is likely to be the annual cost of this project?

Mr. FISHER. That would depend largely on the amount of information obtained from year to year. I think myself that would grow. I am satisfied that as the public get the information they will ask for more and more of it, and I have no doubt that within a few years the cost will be considerably greater than what I now contemplate—I want to give fair warning of that. But my own intention is to commence on a comparatively small scale, as it is found desirable, taking at first those subjects concerning which information is most likely to be asked for by the public. I would not like at the moment to venture a figure of the probable cost. This current year, including what is paid out of civil government and two or three votes for general statistics and criminal statistics, the cost will amount to a little under $20,000 in the year. That is what is appropriated by parliament at the present time, and which would be included for the work we propose to carry on under the new law. But if general returns are made it would involve a considerable increase. I should think that, roughly speaking, next year I would have to ask nearly double, that is to say, it would add something like $15,000 a year to the present expenditure. The expenditure this year is a little over $18,500. I think we would have to provide for an expenditure the next fiscal year of fully $35,000. It might be a little over that, but I think I am safe in saying that $40,000 would cover the expenditure for a number of years to come.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister intend taking up any of the work in the statistical line which is now being carried out chiefly by the Department of Trade and Commerce. They are issuing statistical statements, and have a staff who are engaged upon that work. I do not know but that the Customs Department is doing something in the same line. Does he propose to amalgamate those with the statistical branch which he is creating?

Mr. FISHER. I have no intention of taking away from the other departments the work they are doing. If this work develops in the way I hope, I think all statistical work connected with the government service, so far as it deals with compilation, had better be done in one office. So far as the collection of information is concerned, some departments may have facilities for collecting certain classes of information which, if I were to undertake to do it in my department, would require the creation of new machinery, which would to a certain extent duplicate existing machinery. I would expect that the officers of the permanent census office would as far as possible get information from other branches of the service, making use of the information gathered by those other branches. But there is a good deal of census information which to-day is not procured by any department, and we would devote ourselves largely to obtaining that information.

Mr. OSLER. Clause 4 says there shall be appointed under the authority of the minster one or more enumerators. Now what would be the character of those men? Would they be permanent government officials?

Mr. FISHER. No. These enumerators would be appointed when a census was to be taken. As I explained a moment ago, most of the information taken between the regular censuses would not be obtained by correspondence. I also pointed out that such information as the taking of a census of the population in Manitoba, or in any other province where the law requires it, would have to be taken by enumerators. But the collecting of statistics in regard to production, in regard to industries, and that kind of thing, would not require to be done by enumerators—unless it was thought absolutely essential to get occasionally more definite information upon particular subjects. Then we would have authority, if it was thought wise and if we got the money to do it with, to appoint enumerators besides those of the census year. But that would be entirely dependent upon a vote of the House, because the money I am speaking of would not nearly meet the cost of appointing enumerators around the country to get information. My hon. friend will see that that clause deals with the appointment of enumerators for every census. The clause goes on to say :

> The minister may also employ from time to time such agents or persons as are necessary to collect for the office of statistics and information relating to such industries and affairs of the country as he deems useful and in the public interest, and the duties of such agents or persons shall be such as the minister determines.

That is the authority under which the information would be collected when it is necessary to collect it by agents. But in a general way, my idea is that that information should not be collected by agents, but should be collected by filling up forms through the post office.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the minister if he has considered that under the assessment law in the different provinces, the local governments collect all this information every year ? This could be obtained from the local governments without the expenditure of this large amount of money. For instance, in the province of Ontario every year assessors are appointed who take the number of children in a house, the number of horses, cattle and so on.

Mr. FISHER. If my hon. friend will turn to clause 16 of the Bill he will see that:

> Whenever in any province or territory any system is established or any plan exists for collecting agricultural, commercial, criminal, educational, manufacturing, vital or other statistics, the minister may, under authority of the Governor in Council, arrange with the Lieutenant Governor in Council of such province or territory, or with the organization possessed of such system or plan, for the collection and transmission of such information as is required by schedules prepared by the office under direction of the minister and approved by the Governor in Council for the procuring of such statistics.

That gives us the authority.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the hon. minister if it is his intention to adopt that for the province of Ontario ? The hon. gentleman is well aware that in Ontario the assessment is made every year. Therefore, may I ask the hon. minister if he intends to have enumerators in Ontario in addition to those who are now doing this work, or are we to understand that in Ontario there will be no new enumerators appointed ?

Mr. FISHER. Wherever the statistics can be obtained from an existing organization the intention is, under the powers of this Bill, to utilize that existing organization, and in no case, under such circumstances, to create a new organization to do the same work.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to ask the hon. minister what method he proposes to adopt to collect the vital statistics especially in the eastern provinces. In the province of Nova Scotia at present I believe they have no Registration Act, and I would like to know how he expects to collect the statistics there or in New Brunswick, or if

he intends really to have a system to collect the vital statistics of the whole Dominion, so that we can get them fully and correctly.

Mr. FISHER. Clause 15 of the Bill gives that power, and it would be my intention to utilize that power for that purpose.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it the intention of the hon. minister to take action in the direction of collecting the vital statistics of the Dominion ?

Mr. FISHER. I may say in general terms that while I have not formulated any plan of doing that at the moment, I think it is perhaps one of the earlier classes of information that we ought to attack. The vital statistics are at present pretty well collected in most of the provinces. Wherever they are we would utilize the provincial machinery for that purpose, and simply get the information from the authorities who have collected it. Wherever that was not done in a province or in any other way than provincial we would feel it necessary to obtain that information.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Does that mean that the hon. minister proposes to perform duties that the provinces are doing for themselves and impose upon the people of the Dominion an expense that is not justified ? The provinces have the power to collect these statistics and in my own province they are doing it. If it goes abroad that where a province fails to do that which it ought to do the Dominion is ready to pay the cost out of its own exchequer, there will be an abandonment of a great many matters which belong to the provinces and the whole load will be imposed upon the Dominion. I hope the hon. minister will consider that before he embarks upon a proposition of that kind.

Mr. MONK. In this connection perhaps my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture will allow me to remind him that in the province of Quebec, as the hon. minister knows, we collect many statistics and the scope of these statistics has been enlarged a little by perfecting our system of vital statistics. My hon. friend knows that under our municipal system, the secretary treasurer of each municipality is obliged to furnish to the government every year a very large quantity of information particularly concerning the agricultural districts. It does not cost anything, as my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) reminds me. My own feeling is, without having studied very carefully my hon. friend's Bill, that it would give us a great deal of relief if my hon. friend would allow that Bill to stand over, at any rate, for one year. It is surprising the amount of money we have spent in order to take the last census. My hon. friend is aware that we have spent, I think, $1,250,000, or somewhere near that sum—a great deal more than we ever spent before. It seems a very large sum to spend to find out the population of the country that scarcely amounts to six million souls, and from what I have seen, census taking costs more in Canada than it costs in any other country, having regard to population, except, perhaps, India, because in India there is a prejudice and fear on the part of the natives in regard to the enumerators and census officers, which certainly does not exist here. I would submit to my hon. friend that he might, instead of enacting this Bill this year, bestow some consideration on the system of census taking which is known as the de facto system and which is the system prevailing in England. I was astonished some time ago upon reading in a review how easily and how promptly the census was taken in England and at what a comparatively small cost as compared with what our census costs us here. Papers, formulas, or blanks are distributed, and the whole census in England is taken in the space, I think, of one or two days, at least the principal portions of it. Each citizen is obliged to make a return under severe penalties. This is the de facto system as opposed to our own system which is the de jure system. I have noticed that this last census has cost us a great deal more than any other census which has been taken. We take it every ten years and after the little word of explanation my hon. friend has given us of this Bill, it is reasonable to conclude that we are laying the foundation for an expenditure during the next ten years of from $35,000 to $45,000 a year. I think it is well for us to pause, because we have so much to do with the little money at our disposal, so many improvements that are absolutely necessary. Our constitution provides for a decennial census, and for my part I would like to spend a little more every ten years to get correct information than to make the census a permanent burden upon our resources.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has brought into the discussion two points which I will not elaborate upon just now. One is the cost of the last census and the other is the question of the de facto as compared with the de jure census. In regard to the former we have discussed that a good deal, we have threshed it out pretty well and I am not going to deal with it just now. In regard to the de facto and de jure census I may say that the de jure system was deliberately adopted in Canada at the commencement of our census taking, at the time of confederation, I think, in fact, before confederation, and it has been continued from that time to this. At the time at which I was charged with the duty of taking the last census, I discussed pretty thoroughly with a number of individuals whom I thought informed upon this question the advisability of proposing a change

from the de jure to the de facto system. While theoretically a little attracted myself personally to the de facto system I came to the conclusion that in this country and under the circumstances and conditions of our census taking it would be unfortunate, and that it would not be at all advisable to attempt to introduce the de facto system because the change necessarily would to a certain extent vitiate comparisons between the information gathered under one census taken de facto with the same information gathered in another census taken de jure. But, more than that and I think far more important was the fact that under the system which is pursued in England when the census returns are taken, as my hon. friend says, de facto, taken in one day, or one night, there is very little information got. There is simply the counting of heads, or noses, and some vital or mortuary statistics. There is nothing taken in regard to the industries of the country. There is no information gathered as to the productions of the country, as to houses, factories, as to plant, machinery or investments in these factories, as to the amount of the product that is turned out, or as to the agricultural productions of the country. The census taken in England is taken cheaply. It is taken in one night but it only gives the actual figures of population and some vital or mortuary statistics.

Our census is taken on an entirely different system.. The census in the United States is on a larger scale than ours, but it is on the same principle, and I venture to think that, especially in this a rapidly growing and progressive country, one of the most important parts of a census taking is the collection of information as to our industrial, agricultural, fishery and forest productions, to furnish information to people who want to invest money or to settle in this country and also to furnish information to those who are engaged in the active life of this country as to openings and the possibilities of development in their own lines of business. I would be sorry indeed to think that our census should be changed to a census such as that taken in England, even to make that saving to which my hon. friend alludes. The two things are totally different, and with census taking of the kind we have here, the de jure system works out on the whole the most satisfactorily. Under our social system here there are a great many people who are away from home at any particular date. If these people were to be enumerated only where they were at that date, the information gathered would be in many cases misleading as we have to take not only the actual counting of the people, but also all this other information to which I have alluded, and we can easily take the number of people even though they might not be under the roof in which they ought to be numbered on that particular date. Our census is not taken in a night, but it is taken during a very short period, of two or three weeks, during which the information is gathered by a comparatively small number of enumerators. If the work was done as it is in England we would have to depend entirely on the people filling up correctly a paper left at their houses, and I think we would be led astray by the results even in the number of the people alone, but to get the other information, would be quite impossible.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you not introducing the same principle here where you send out papers and expect parties to make returns ?

Mr. FISHER. We expect selected parties not everybody. In the case of industrial establishments all the information is obtained from the people actually engaged in the management of the industry who would be able to give us the information we want. We are not going to every household, but only to the people who will give information about the industries and who can also give it about other things.

Mr. SPROULE. You would have to send them to a class of people intelligent enough to understand. There are not sufficient instructions accompanying these schedules to enable every one to understand them, and therefore they will not be correctly answered.

Mr. FISHER. I think my hon. friend does not quite understand me. In the case of industrial establishments of course the form would have to be sent to every establishment; in the case of other information a great deal of it would have to be gotten from an official or individual in the community who would give the information in general terms. That information would not be absolutely accurate; it would be sufficient to give the information, but not sufficiently accurate for census purposes. We cannot expect, without actual enumeration, absolute accuracy, but in general statistical work we can get by such a system as I have indicated information sufficiently accurate to serve between the census.

Mr. SPROULE. Do we not get much of this information already through the Statistical Branch of the Department of Trade and Commerce ? Then too, much of it is obtained from the Bureau of Industries, that is carried on for the province of Ontario which makes these returns annually, while the Department of Trade and Commerce makes its returns every month. It seems to me this is duplicating this work.

Mr. FISHER. I have not under my hand at the moment the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce, but unless I am mistaken that is compiled to a large extent simply from the customs returns and does not give the production. I do not think it goes into industries at all; I know it does not go into agricultural, forestry or mineral

production. I am speaking now subject to correction, but I think it is purely in regard to the movement of trade and is prepared almost entirely from the trade tables of the Department of Customs.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood it was to extend not only to the Department of Trade and Commerce, but to the Department of Minerals and to the various other branches of industry. That is my remembrance of what was told the House when the Bill was passed. This information was to be collected and a certain number of parties in the office were to be permanent officials to collate these figures and to publish them in such a shape that they could be issued from month to month and distributed throughout the country. I am not prepared to say if the production was to be given. That information we in Ontario, get from the Bureau of Industries. I think we have a permanent staff in connection with the census working for the whole ten years.

Mr. FISHER. We have a staff which is working on statistics and which prepares the year book annually, practically nothing else.

Mr. SPROULE. How many years is it since the census was taken ? We are now in 1905 and it was taken in 1901. The work of the census has all been done and yet you still have that staff ?

Mr. FISHER. As I said in answer to a question by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) yesterday, the work of the census as a census has been finished. There is still a small staff which is working on general statistics trying to work out tables and information from the census compilations. That is a portion of census work which is practically permanent and which the office that I am now about to create will be doing all the time from one census to another. Such information as is contained in former census volumes has been prepared and finished ; but there is a constant desire to make comparisons and to draw tabular information from these regular compilations of the census which would supply work for a considerable staff from one census to the other. That work would be done all the time by this office. But besides that, I want to get corroborative or corrective information between the censuses. There is an infinite variety of information of great service to the community to be made up from the census returns and from tables which have perhaps never been included in the census volume, but which can be and ought to be taken for the statistical information of the people at large, and which ought to be issued from time to time. As I have said, there is a little of that work now being done in my office, and, if this Bill passes, there may still be a little of it done by the general statistics staff ; but I want to provide a machinery by which that can be done better and by which interim information can be collected between the censuses.

Mr. SPROULE. It certainly seems to me that this Bill will duplicate many of these offices. We have already a mines branch in connection with the geological survey which collects mining information; we have a staff collecting information for the Yearbook ; and we have a staff connected with the Department of Trade and Commerce collecting much of the information which the hon. minister proposes to use in this new department. If we add another branch to these three, shall we not be rather multiplying the work ? You might possibly consolidate the work, and make one staff do the work now done by three or four ; but unless you do that, it seems to me that you will be increasing the expense, very materially without obtaining any compensating return therefor.

Mr. FISHER. With regard to the Yearbook staff, that is in my department and will be consolidated with this. With regard to the mines branch referred to by my hon. friend, I confess that I am not very familiar with what information they are issuing.

Mr. SPROULE. They give the output.

Mr. FISHER. That would be included in the work proposed here. My memory of the Trade and Commerce returns is that they are simply a compilation of trade statistics.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood the hon. minister to say that the annual expense of this proposed office will be between $35,000 and $40,000 per year—say $40,000. In ten years that will amount to $400,000. Are we to understand that when the time comes for taking the general census, the cost of that work will be decreased by that amount as a result of the introduction of this Bill ?

Mr. FISHER. No, I do not think so.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand, then, that the cost will be increased by that amount ?

Mr. FISHER. I mean to say that when the census year comes, the census will have to be taken, and that the work connected with this office will only decrease the cost of that work in so far as the staff of this permanent office will be more complete and better prepared for the census work.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose some calculation has been made. Perhaps the hon. minster could say about what amount that would be ?

Mr. FISHER. I would not like to venture a statement on that point. I believe it would somewhat decrease the cost of taking the decennial census. I could not just say how much until I have had experience.

Mr. KEMP. So far as my knowledge goes, I have not heard that there is any de-

mand from the public or from the members of this House for any more statistics of this character. It may be that some of the work proposed by this Bill could be done by strengthening some of the departments that already exist. We have now a duplication of statistics, as in the Trade and Navigation returns and the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce. We are overloaded with statistics; we have more statistics than any member of this House can digest. It is a very difficult matter to know how to dispose of the various books that come to us during the recess, in such a manner that they will be useful. Moreover, we are spending an enormous amount of money on the census. While the census of 1881 cost $456,904.19 and that of 1891 cost $570,115.54, the census of 1901 has cost up to the 7th of March, 1904, $1,179,376.01, and notwithstanding that the complete census is not yet at the disposal of members of this House or ready for distribution to the public. No later than this afternoon I inquired for the last volume or the last two volumes, and I was told that there are certain portions not yet completed ready for distribution, although four years have passed by since the census was taken. It seems to me that there is a good deal of theory in this Bill; and, considering the tremendous cost of taking the census and the immense amount of statistics we already have, and the duplication of statistics that takes place at present, it seems to me that we ought to hesitate about adopting such an elaborate plan as that laid before us in this Bill.

Mr. PRINGLE. I fail to see the necessity for this enormous expenditure. I do not think the hon. Minister of Agriculture has considered fully the very valuable statistics we now have in our different provinces and territories. For instance, in the province of Ontario we have almost every statistic that could possibly be required. We have the annual report of the Ontario Bureau of Industries, in which you will find all the agricultural statistics which could conceivably be obtained in our province; and I understand that there are similar reports in the province of Quebec and the other provinces. Then, we have reports in regard to the industrial industries of the province. In fact, our province has an army of inspectors going about obtaining statistics in regard to the different industries of the country, and their reports are very full and complete. We have also our annual report as to population, births, marriages and deaths.

We also have reports regarding the mining industries of Ontario and covering in fact all the industrial, agricultural, and mining life. As I understand the proposition here, under subsection 2 of section 4, is that the minister takes to himself the right to employ from time to time such persons as are necessary to collect statistical information, and he tells us that, according to his interpretation of that section, he will inquire from parties who are friendly throughout the different provinces and they will give him the information. But such information cannot be as valuable as that which we find in the reports issued by the different provincial authorities. We are going to add an expenditure in the next ten years of half a million dollars, according to the statement of the hon. minister, for reports which are not authentic and which are to be obtained from the friends of the minister throughout the Dominion, and this, in spite of the fact that we have to-day in the different provinces, authentic reports of a similar character which are issued yearly. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that this Bill should stand over until we have the opportunity to look more carefully into it. Take up the last report for the province of Ontario issued by the Ontario Bureau of Industries, and you will find the minutest details given regarding the crop production. You will find that they take up the question of fruit trees and live stock, and labour and wages, and give statistics on all these points. Then take up the factory inspector's report and you will find that it gives the number of employees, the output of the various industries, and so on. Take up the report with regard to the mines and you will find similar information in detail.

Mr. FISHER. What I said was that at present we are spending a little under $20,000 on this kind of work and we would have to add to that $20,000 more. The addition I am proposing is $20,000, or $40,000 in all per annum.

Mr. LALOR. Did the hon. minister not say that that would be liable to increase every year?

Mr. FISHER. It may. As the demand for information increases, the expenditure will be apt to increase. If there is no demand for this information, the expenditure will not increase. I am proposing an increased expenditure of $20,000 a year. As regards what my hon. friend from Cornwall has said, while it is true that the province of Ontario has the report of the Bureau of Industries, there is no such report in any other part of the Dominion. I think that Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, give some vital and mortuary statistics and that Manitoba furnishes some agricultural statistics. As regards the reports of the industries in Toronto, there is not an army of officers going around collecting these reports. They are largely the results of correspondence and are sent in by individuals from different parts of the country. With regard to the report of the inspector of factories, it deals mainly with the conditions of the factories from a hygienic and safety point of view, but I do not think it gives the details of

their production. The province of Quebec does not collect statistics of this kind. It does collect certain mortuary and vital statistics, and has a report of the factory inspector on the conditions of the factories. Those we will certainly make use of. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Osler) says there is no demand for this measure. I would reply, there is a constant demand in my office for just such information as it is proposed we shall get by virtue of this Bill.

Mr. OSLER. The information published by the province of Ontario is regarded as fairly complete.

Mr. FISHER. I believe so.

Mr. OSLER. Does the Ontario government employ outside men at salaries as the hon. minister proposes? It seems to me that one of the weaknesses of this Bill is clause 4 which gives the minister power to appoint an unlimited number. Such appointments will no doubt be made through political influence, and I do not believe that such discretion should be vested in the hands of the minister. While I am not quite aware how the Ontario government obtain their information, I do not think they have any such agents. I think they get it through officials in the parliament buildings. I think that this clause giving the minister that power is a very dangerous one, and I do not believe it is one under which reliable information would be obtained. My understanding of the Ontario procedure is exactly the same as his own, and the same as I would propose to pursue under this Act. At the same time, if it were necessary, under certain circumstances or in order to collect certain classes of information, to appoint a special commissioner, that ought to be done.

Mr. FISHER. I would call my hon. friend's attention to a clause of the General Statistics Act that perhaps, he has not noticed. Clause 3 of that Act provides that the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Agriculture as to the persons to be appointed, may appoint officers, clerks or other employees necessary for the purposes of the Act. And, under another section, I have power to collect practically any kind of statistics I want.

Mr. OSLER. Then why ask specifically for that power here ?

Mr. FISHER. This is a consolidation of the three laws that I have spoken of, but it gives me the added authority of collecting information in the same way that I now collect census information, by making it the legal duty of parties to give me the information on demand.

Mr. COCHRANE. Will the hon. minister please read the clause under which he claims to have power to collect these statistics ?

Mr. FISHER. I read from chapter 59 of the Consolidated Statutes, section 1 :

1. The Minister of Agriculture shall, from time to time, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, make such rules and regulations, and prescribe such forms as appear necessary and expedient for the purpose of collecting, abstracting, tabulating and publishing vital, agricultural, commercial, criminal and other statistics ; and such rules, regulations and forms, when assented to by the Governor in Council and published in the 'Canada Gazette,' shall have the force of law.

That enables me to decide what information I shall collect. Then section 3 provides:

3. The Governor in Council, on a report of the Minister of Agriculture as to the fitness of the persons to be appointed, may, from time to time, appoint such officers, clerks and other employees as are necessary for the purposes of this Act ; and such officers, clerks or employees shall hold office during pleasure. The Governor in Council may also appoint temporary clerks or employees for an indefinite period,—the term of whose service shall cease and determine upon notice given to them by the Minister of Agriculture, when such portion of the statistical labours for which they were so engaged, and for which they were employed, is terminated.

This clause gives me power to employ clerks and others to tabulate the information which the other clause gives me power to collect. The section of this new Bill we are now discussing gives me practically no more power than I have now.

Mr. OSLER. It gives the minister more direct power.

Mr. FISHER. It gives it in a more concise and definite form.

Mr. OSLER. It gives the minister the personal power.

Mr. FISHER. I have the personal power under the old Act. The Governor in Council can do it.

Mr. BARR. So far as the province of Ontario is concerned, I think the collection of information under the provincial authority is much more exact and much cheaper than it can possibly be under this measure. As I understand it, in the province this information is largely collected by the assessors and county clerks. By these officers vital statistics and statistics relating to agriculture and other industries can be collected at a minimum of expense. And the information must be exact, for the assessors go about and get the information at first hand and report it to the Bureau of Statistics. It seems to me that there is a good deal of haziness about the methods to be followed under this Bill. So far as the other provinces are concerned, I suppose the conditions are much the same as in Ontario. Under the Bill clerks are to be appointed, but there is nothing to show what machinery is to be used to gather the statistics. Is it intended to get the facts from the assessors, or will the facts be collected by agents specially employed ? In the latter case, I believe it will be impossible

to obtain reliable statistics. I do not see why the machinery now in use in the province is not quite sufficient, except for gathering the facts called for by the decennial census.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Barr) probably was not present when I answered a similar objection. If he will turn to section 16 of the Bill, he will see that I take power to obtain from provincial or other organizations any information they may have. But this information may be in different form in different provinces, and work must be done in the offices here to correlate it, compile and tabulate it as information concerning the whole Dominion.

Mr. KEMP. But it seems to me that this information that the minister speaks of can be much more conveniently and more cheaply acquired through the local governments than through the Dominion government. The provincial governments are more closely in touch with municipalities and the municipal officers than is the government of the Dominion. It has been said that Ontario has taken the pains to publish statistics that other provinces have not published. Is not that itself evidence that these other provinces do not think it worth while to compile this information ? It seems to me that this is a work for which the provincial authorities should be responsible, and they can vary the form of the publication to suit the conditions of their several provinces.

Mr. FISHER. What my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) says may be perfectly true. At the same time, information may be collected by one provincial government on certain lines and by another provincial government on totally different lines. This prevents the figures being taken as national figures relating to the whole Dominion. It seems to me it is the duty of this parliament to provide information regarding the whole country, information which people outside will look upon, not as Ontario information, or Nova Scotia, or Quebec, or British Columbia information, but as information about Canada. And the more of that kind of work we do, consolidating our Dominion into one country and giving information of a national character, the more are we doing to make Canada a nation in the eyes of the world.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand the minister to say that when this Bill becomes law it will have no special application to the province of Ontario ?

Mr. FISHER. Not at all, I did not convey that impression at all.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps I did not understand the minister. In clause 16 it is provided that wherever such information can be procured through the local government it will be procured, and the minister tells us without any additional cost. It has been pointed out this afternoon that every possible information that could be procured even by special commissioners is already compiled by the Ontario government. For instance, in the Statistical Year Book, published by the hon. gentleman's own department, I find given the number of horses in Ontario, not every ten years, but every year, in 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900, and so on every year; also the number of milch cows in the province of Ontario, the number of sheep, the number of hogs, the number of poultry, and so on, the details given from every county, and taken every year. My hon. friend now says that under this Bill he will use that information as far as possible. May I ask the minister what other information he will be able to get from the province of Ontario that he would send out to the people.

Mr. FISHER. I would point out to my hon. friend that there is nothing in the report of the Bureau of Industries of Ontario in regard to industrial productions, a very large item in our census work, and a large item in the information which is constantly asked for from my department and other departments. That would have to be obtained from the province of Ontario as well as other provinces. But independently of that, the portions of this Bill which deal with the collecting of information are only a part of it. It also gives power and authority to compile, and tabulate, and correlate information on these points which has been got from Ontario, and to put it along with the information on similar points got from the other provinces, so as to give information for the whole Dominion.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose the hon. gentleman knows that so far as Ontario is concerned it is all tabulated.

Mr. FISHER. I think it is to a large extent, although it may not be tabulated in certain lines, in such a manner that it would work into similar information gathered from other provinces. It might have to be changed in the tabulation and compilation, in consequence of the information which is got from other provinces, that being local in its character.

Mr. BLAIN. The agricultural statistics in the province of Ontario are pretty well tabulated. May I ask the hon. gentleman what way he will take to collect other information from a county such as I represent, the county of Peel ?

Mr. FISHER. I am not aware that there are any industrial establishments in his county.

Mr. BLAIN. There are.

Mr. FISHER. Well, my idea would be to send to those industrial establishments, supposing this work was being done within a few years of a census—send them a copy of the schedules which they them-

selves filled up at the time of the census, and ask them to fill up another form showing the changes, the increases, the additions, decreases, subtractions, and so forth. That would be the information concerning that industrial establishment for the year when that form was filled up. That would not require any agent, it would simply require us to send a form from the office here to the establishment to be filled up. I take power to require that that should be done, the same as I have power to require that it should be done in the census year, by enumerators, and it is a necessary part of the Act. All these returns would be sent into the office here to be tabulated and compiled.

Mr. BLAIN. After all that is done, what does the hon. gentleman propose to do with the information ?

Mr. FISHER. To compile it.

Mr. BLAIN. And publish it, send it out ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, there would be no object in getting the information unless it was put into the hands of the public, as a special report of this office.

Mr. MACDONELL. The hon. gentleman has given us an idea of the proposed expenditure for enforcing this Bill, which will be an additional expenditure. Might I ask him what was the cause of the great increase in the cost of taking the last census over that of 1891 ? In 1891 the cost was $570,115.54, whereas the census of 1901, taken under and by the present government, cost $1,079,376.01. A short time ago attention was drawn to the fact that the increase between the cost of the census of 1881 and that of 1891 was comparatively small, a little over $100,000 ; whereas the increase between the two last census was over half a million dollars. I would like to ask if there is any explanation of that ?

Mr. FISHER. As my hon. friend is a new member of the House and consequently has not heard the debates upon this question, I will give him a short resume of the reasons. They have, however, been thoroughly exposed in the former parliament, and therefore I will not develop them at great length. The increase was due mainly to three causes. First and most important, was the larger amount of information obtained, which necessitated a great deal more labour on the part of the enumerators, and a great deal more work in the office here in compilation. Secondly, the collection of every detail in the census, not only in the thickly populated parts of Canada, but also in the outlying portions of the country. For the first time in the history of census taking in Canada that was done, we enumerated the people and everything in detail all over the country. The questions were asked in various schedules that were sent with enumerators, even as far as the territories adjoining the Arctic ocean, in the Yukon, and in every part of the outlying and unorganized territories of the older provinces. In the former census that was not done, there was less expense in the enumeration of the people, and less details were given ; but in the previous census those things were only estimated in the office here. In the census of 1901, all those details were covered by the enumerators, and the actual facts were obtained by definite questions put on the spot to the people themselves. In the third place, these additional details involved a large increase in the cost of compilation in the office here at Ottawa, because these figures had to be again examined on the schedules, and put together by the compilers and made up into tables. In the former census that was not done. Another reason was the greater cost of living, the cost of wages, which was much greater in 1901 than in 1891.

The result was that we had to pay higher prices to the enumerators for all their work and all the expenses in connection with the census were largely increased by the difference in the cost of living and the cost of supplies generally in the one year over that of the other. Another reason was in regard to the compilations. In the census of 1901, partly because of certain curious facts deduced by the figures of the census in comparison with the former census and partly because we wished that the final results of the census of 1901 should be absolutely accurate, we checked and rechecked all the compilations so as to make sure that there should be no errors. In the former census, after the first compilations were made, there was no further checking. They were issued and the result was that we found that there were a large number of grave and serious errors in the census of 1891. A census taken in that way was not sufficiently accurate to meet the demands of the people of this country, it was not sufficiently accurate to justify the expenditure that was made upon it, low as that expenditure, comparatively was, and was not of a character which I wished to father as a presentment to the people of this country of the work of my department. Under these circumstances the compilations and the work of checking over and making up the final returns were more expensive than that of the census taken before the last or the census of 1881 either. These are the four main points of the reasons for the difference. I am not prepared at the present moment to go into the question in any further detail.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. There is need in the country for a department like this, but it must be well administered. I quite agree with what has been said that a similar office in the United States has rendered valuable service to the people there and especially in the way that there is a great development of trade. Statistics of this kind help to promote trade. But, it all depends upon

the methods. If the methods which the hon. minister proposes to introduce are as prosy as his speeches, I do not hope for much from the measure, but if he will get a move on, organize this department with a very moderate expenditure to begin with and cut off some of the other expenditures in other departments of a somewhat similar character it may be that some good will be effected. But, as I said, it all depends on the organization. For instance, if he proposes to put into this office mere partisans when the universities of this country are in a position to turn out clever young men fully trained for work of this kind, the object which he has in view will not be accomplished. If he would make it a non-partisan department, if he would get the best possible clerical and statistical service that can be got in the country, and devote it in an energetic way to the presentation of this information, as they do in the United States, a considerable amount of good could be done. But, he ought to be able after what has been brought out here to-day almost to establish this new department out of the savings from other departments that are more or less engaged in collecting information of this kind. I must say that I sympathize largely with the object he has in view, but it all depends on the methods he employs and the kind of men he puts into this service. It may be made a mere office for expending public money, but it can be made an office that would promote the trade of the country and that would advance our industrial and agricultural interests, by furnishing them with information. The way to get that information is largely by pursuing a system like that which he has outlined to this House, that is to take up one department one day and some other department on another. It all depends on the vigour with which these statistics are prepared and presented to the public. There is nothing more interesting to the people engaged in trade than the bulletins that come from the census office in Washington to-day. One day they take up one interest, another day another and really a lot of valuable information is contained in these bulletins, but again, I say, we do not want prosy methods collecting this information and presenting it to the public.

Mr. FISHER. I appreciate my hon. friend's views and I will tell him that my speeches may be a little prosy, I am quite willing to press the passage of this Bill through the House as fast as hon. gentlemen opposite will allow me. No one wants more hasty methods in that respect than myself. My hon. friend has spoken about the work done in the United States. I have all the reports of the debates and the statements upon which the permanent census bureau was established in the United States. They have guided me to a large extent in what I have said here this afternoon. It is well to learn by the experience of other countries all we can. Exactly the same condition of affairs as exists to-day in Canada existed in the United States, until a permanent census bureau was established and after it is established here I believe the same results will be brought about here as have been brought about there. I would like to say to my hon. friend that I quite agree with the view he expressed in regard to university graduates. We ought to take as generally as we possibly can well trained minds for important public work. I have done that in the patent branch of my department. I have appointed examiners who are university graduates in some applied science. When I came into office I found that the men who were doing that work did not have a university training, and as vacancies occurred I added to the staff men with a scientific training in the work in which they are engaged. I would be quite prepared to adopt the same system in carrying out the provisions of this Bill.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It would be an encouragement to our universities to turn out high class technical men if the state would avail itself of their services. Unfortunately we have been appointing men to many of these offices who are not technically trained and the consequence is that men who are trained in our universities go outside for employment. I would like to see these young men retained here and the universities encouraged to turn out high-class technical men. Toronto university is turning out graduates who are first-class men in mathematics, statistics, calculation and compilation, and if the government would encourage them the universities would turn out a still better class of men and devote more attention to these special subjects.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. minister will remember that last session, or perhaps the session before, when his estimates in connection with the census were being discussed a letter was read from a gentleman named Mr. McCraney, who, for a considerable period was, I think, the Liberal member for Halton county, Ontario. In that connection Mr. McCraney alleged that gross frauds had been perpetrated in one of the counties of British Columbia. I have not charged my memory with the name of the county. In that circular which he caused to be mailed to every hon. member of this House—I know I received one—this gentleman made the charge substantially that in all ways, shapes and forms the accounts had been padded and speaking of that particular riding, he said that the cost of the census was double what it should honestly have been. Does the hon. minister remember that case and has he made an inquiry as to the action of the enumerators and the census officer ?

Mr. FISHER. I confess that I do not remember the case. The question of the expenditure in connection with the census was taken up in the Public Accounts Committee

of this House in the year succeeding the census. It was dealt with by several investigations before the Public Accounts Committee. That is the proper place to discuss it. No motion in regard to it was made in this House and no discussion in regard to that particular case that I remember of occurred.

Mr. BENNETT. The letter referred to was published by Mr. McCraney and it, of course was actionable, it being sent throughout the country. It certainly was read in the House and the hon. minister must have heard of it although he may not remember it now.

Mr. FISHER. I may have although I do not remember it.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the minister remember a case in East Simcoe where it was shown that three enumerators had each charged $3 a day for hotel expenses, when as a matter of fact they had not paid out a single cent? That case was exposed among many others, of what might be called not only deliberate overcharging but deliberate theft. During the campaign last November I made that statement publicly on the platform and reiterated it time and again. There is not a hotel in Orillia that charged $3 a day, and it was notorious that these men had simply each pocketed $6 and charged it up to the country. The worst of it is that the chief enumerator for the riding certified the accounts knowing that they were false and wrong and acts of petty thieving. If the minister wishes to look into this I shall give him the names and he can ask for a return of the amount. It is a small thing, but when you consider that there are two hundred constituencies with twenty or thirty enumerators in each constituency, if you have this petty thieving in each riding the amount involved must be very great.

Mr. FISHER. That whole question was threshed out in the Public Accounts Committee two or three years ago. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) and all his friends had abundant opportunity of bringing it up in the House if they had chosen. I have not the details in my memory at the moment and I cannot discuss the cases which are finished so far as the department are concerned. I cannot now go into it.

Mr. BENNETT. After we made the exposure in the committee it was not our business to prosecute these men or to ask for the money; it was the business of the minister and his department. If the department has not taken action I am going to recall this and other cases and hope the minister will look into them.

Mr. SPROULE. In addition to that there were two or three cases where enumerators had charged horse-hire in their accounts and when they were brought before the committee and put on oath swore that they paid no horse-hire and had no need to do so. This was brought to the attention of the government and mentioned in this House. When that was done by the opposition I assume had done all their duty and it lay with the government to ask for an explanation or a refund from these men.

Mr. FISHER. I do not remember any such case.

Mr. BENNETT. Let me call the attention of the minister to another case mentioned by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup). There was simply a scandalous state of affairs in that riding with regard to overcharging by enumerators. Surely the minister remembers the East Hastings cases brought up by the hon. member (Mr. Northrup)?

Mr. FISHER. I do not remember the case under that description.

Mr. BENNETT. That is the case of Mr. Hurley. I cannot say without referring to the evidence that Mr. Hurley did anything wrong, but I know that in the case of the enumerators there were gross over-charges.

Mr. FISHER. I remember the case of Mr. Hurley who was examined before the Public Accounts Committee. I do not remember any details on which a prosecution could be based.

Mr. BENNETT. I did not charge my memory with the details for every riding, but I remember East Simcoe and I say that there there were cases of deliberate thieving.

Mr. FISHER. The amounts were sworn to by the enumerators, initialled by their superior officers and paid on these statements.

Mr. BENNETT. Then the mere fact that they have sworn to the statements and that the enumerator has initialled them is all there is to it. I shall give the minister the three names as I do not wish them to go on 'Hansard.' I made the statement publicly in the town of Orillia. The worst of it all is that the chief enumerator must have been a party to it. I have discharged my duty and if the minister does not wish to ask for a refund well and good.

Mr. FISHER. Will the hon. gentleman give me the names?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes. I may tell the minister that as the administration of the criminal law in Ontario will now be in other hands there may be some criminal prosecutions in connection with cases of that kind.

Mr. FOSTER. Could the minister give the staff and the salaries in each of the departments that he is amalgamating?

Mr. FISHER. The present staff of the Statistical Branch which is the only staff we have is: One chief clerk, $2,500; one first-class clerk, $1,900; three second-class

clerks, $1,100 each. These are on the Civil Government list, on the staff of the department. Then in addition we have paid from the General Statistical Vote, officers who are not members of the civil service, one at $1,800 ; one at $900 ; one at $700 ; one at $500 ; one at $4,000 (Mr. Blue) ; one at $2,000 (Mr. Savard) ; two at $1,200, and one at $600. That comes to $18,650 a year for salaries. I think that for the work I have spoken of, as a commencement—I would not like to bind myself to any term of years—but I think that about double this expenditure annually would be sufficient for several years. That is not all for salaries but for the work altogether. I do not think the expenses for stationery, &c., would be very great but there would be considerable printing in connection with the issuing of the bulletins and the report, which would be included in the extra expenditure.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would like to ask the minister when the census will be completed ? I received a letter from a medical gentleman in my riding asking information which he and everybody else supposed was obtained when the census was taken, and when I sent to the department for it, I was told that that part was not compiled yet. When is it likely to be done ?

Mr. FISHER. It is all in the hands of the Printing Bureau at the present time.

Mr. COCHRANE. When the party which I have the honour of supporting was in power, we heard a great deal time and again from hon. gentlemen opposite about the delay in taking the census. You have had an opportunity of taking the census and it will be hoary with age, if not with respectability, before you get it out, and it cost three times as much as it did in 1891.

Mr. FISHER. I may say to my hon. friend that the information which has been issued up to the present time has been got out much more promptly than it was in the previous census.

Mr. COCHRANE. But up to the present time it is not out. You have only got it in the hands of the printer, and, perhaps, when I ask for it next session, you will say it is somewhere else.

Mr. FISHER. The volume which I laid before this House at the beginning of this session of 1905 contains the same information, and much more, which was contained in the volume of the last census which was laid on the table in 1897, or two years later in relation to the census year.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is wonderful how correct the minister's memory is in regard to that, but how, when he is asked in regard to his own work, he forgets. I want to call his attention to what occurred in the riding which I have the honour to represent. One of the enumerators for the village of Brighton was appointed from one of the townships outside, and his horse-hire cost more than his wages ; and in the village of Hastings, with a population of less than a thousand, the enumerators all charged horse-hire in addition to their pay—I suppose because they were sworn to. The said parties were not asked to refund.

Mr. BLAIN. When may we expect the full returns to be printed and ready for distribution ?

Mr. FISHER. As I stated just now, the second volume contains all the agricultural, mineral and forestry compilations ; and the third volume, which is still in the hands of the printer, contains the industrial and the other compilations. I cannot really tell when that volume will be finished—I hope before the end of the session. The whole information of this census will be contained in four volumes. These four volumes will contain a great deal more information than was contained in the four volumes of the last census. The last volume of the previous census, which contained the agricultural statistics, was not issued till the year 1897. The same information, which is contained in the second volume of this census, was laid on the table of the House at the beginning of this session.

Mr. LENNOX. I have listened very attentively to what has been said this afternoon, with a desire to ascertain certain things definitely. I wish to take this question, whether we should have this new department or not, seriously into my consideration ; and I admit that, although I have given the matter my most minute attention, I have not yet got all the information I need. We have had a great deal of information from the hon. minister, but it is something like that in the census—it will take probably more work to classify and rearrange it than it does even to get the information from the minister. But we are yet at the threshold of this matter, and, as we have half an hour before we rise for dinner, that time might be usefully employed by the minister in giving us some necessary information. Just what we want, definitely and clearly, is : What is the need of this legislation ? What call has there been for it ? What additional income will it bring to the people of Canada ? What increased facilities will it afford to the people of Canada for making a livelihood, and that kind of thing ? Nobody is in a better position to give that information than the minister, and I ask him to use the half hour now at our disposal to give to the House and the country a clear and distinct statement of just in what way Canada will be benefited by having this large additional expenditure cast upon the people.

Mr. FISHER. Well, Mr. Chairman, I suppose, in deference to my hon. friend's question, I shall have to run the risk of offending the hon. member for South York (Mr.

Maclean), who objects to my speaking at length ; but I think I can give the hon. gentleman the reasons in a much shorter time than half an hour. I gave it fully in the early part of the debate, but the hon. gentleman was not in the House.

Mr. LENNOX. Excuse me ; I heard every word the minister said this afternoon. He told us the condition of things in the province of Ontario and all the other provinces ; but he has not told us of the difficulties that have arisen or of the remedy that will be brought about by this measure. He has told us, it is true, that some people have made application to his office for certain information which it is difficult to give ; but that is very far from the kind of information which the country wants as to the necessity for this large increase of expenditure. What I want is something that I can lay before my constituents, saying to them : 'I am a great friend of the Minister of Agriculture ; we are engaged in the same general calling, and I want to justify him before the people.' What I want is something in two or three pages with which I can show the reason there is for what the minister wants to do.

Mr. FISHER. I think I can gratify my hon. friend to a certain extent, though I cannot promise to a complete extent. We want to give the people of Canada information in detail between the census years in regard to the industrial and agricultural productions of the country—statistics which will be of later date than those contained in the census. We do not want the people to have to go back, as at the present time, five years, or, as it will be next year, six years, or, as it may be, nine years, to get that information. We want to have it between times, so that they will be able to study the economic conditions of this Dominion with later information than we now have.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask a question just there ? He has taken the census in 1901, and he has certain information as to that year placed before parliament and the people in 1905. By this method he proposes to obtain certain information as of the year 1902 or the year 1903. Well, if the information as to the year 1901 is placed before the people of this country in 1905, at what date may we expect the information ascertained in 1902 and 1903 to be placed before them ?

Mr. FISHER. I believe that by an organization of this office we shall be able to get the census information before the public more rapidly than it has been got in the past. The information we will obtain will not be quite so much in detail as that which is obtained at the decennial census, but it will be put in the hands of the public in less than two years from the time it is collected. The information which we got for the census of 1901 was only concluded in 1905, or four years later, and that is still two years' quicker work than was done in the case of the census of 1891.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand the hon. minister to say that he will be able to publish this supplementary information in a year and a half from the time it was taken. We will thus have in the middle of 1903 information as to 1902, but we have not got until 1905, information as to 1901.

Mr. FISHER. I hope that this office, when established and the work done by a permanent staff, will be able to turn out the information much quicker than at present.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Or it might lead to some more rapid method of compilation so far as general results are concerned.

Mr. KEMP. How long will the hon. minister leave the manuscript in the hands of the Printing Bureau before handing it over to a private printing office where the work would be done promptly ?

Mr. FISHER. By law we are required to have the work done in the Bureau, but the Bureau has the privilege of giving it out to other people.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like to know what the difficulty or disease is which the minister proposes to remedy. We have a census taken every ten years. What additional benefit are we going to get by what is now proposed and which is going to cost us half a million dollars. What specific advantage, for instance, is going to accrue to the farmers ?

Mr. FISHER. They will benefit by getting information regarding their business which they are not able to get now. The work, for instance, done by the Bureau of Industries in Ontario is so much appreciated by the farmers that they are willing to contribute all the information they can give, by filling in the forms and sending them to the Bureau at Toronto, and are quite satisfied to get the bulletins in return.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why should the farmers of Ontario contribute for the obtaining of the same information from the other provinces which they are giving themselves without charge ?

Mr. FISHER. The farmers of Ontario are sufficiently public spirited to want the information for the whole Dominion. They have at present no means of getting that information except as regards their own province.

Mr. LALOR. Of what nature is the agricultural information to be obtained from the farmers ?

Mr. FISHER. Very largely the kind of information given in the report of the Bureau of Industries in Ontario.

Mr. LALOR. Is it information as to the number of horses, sheep and cattle raised, or what class of information ?

Mr. FISHER. That information is included in the reports of the Bureau of Industries of Ontario. Also the areas of crops and the average crop production, the number of animals and the increases of animals. That is the character of the information to be obtained and distributed. That is the character of the information that to-day is set forth in the reports of the Bureau of Industries of Ontario, which hon. gentlemen familar with that province have stated is of great value and is accurately and well collected.

Mr. LALOR. Then, if I understand the minister aright, he will gain this information simply by sending circulars indiscriminately to the farmers and asking them to reply ; and if the farmers do not happen to reply, or if, say, one-third of the farmers of the province do not happen to reply, he will have practically no information at all.

Mr. FISHER. That is the way that to a very considerable extent the information is obtained by the Bureau of Industries of Ontario. Yet, it has been obtained successfully and accurately, so that those who are familiar with it accept it with confidence as being accurate. I do not see why information cannot be got for the rest of the provinces in the same way.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the information is already collected for the province of Ontario, what object has the minister in trying to collect it again ?

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) will see that this information is gathered by the provincial government of Ontario. The same is done to a certain small extent by the provincial government of Manitoba. But it is not collected anywhere else in Canada. We want to obtain information for the whole Dominion. If the information is already gathered for the province of Ontario, then, under section 16 of the Bill, we are empowered to make use of it. We will not duplicate it. But, where the information has not been obtained, we will have to do the same work as has been done for the province of Ontario. But, even in Ontario, the figures cover only the facts for that province, and neither the people of Ontario nor any others have the figures for the whole Dominion. We know, for instance, how many horses there are in Ontario, but we do not know how many there are in the Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. How is the minister going to collect that information ?

Mr. FISHER. Just as it is collected in the province of Ontario.

Mr. LALOR. But let me call the minister's attention to the fact that the information for Ontario is not collected as he proposes to collect it elsewhere. The information for Ontario is collected by the assessors, whereas the minister proposes to collect it by sending circulars indiscriminately to the farmers in the different localities. In the one case the information is authentic and reliable, and in the other it will not be.

Mr. BARR. It is the fact not only that the statistics in Ontario are carefully collected, but also that they are sent broadcast to the farmers. Every member of the agricultural society in the province of Ontario, and, I believe in the province of Manitoba as well, receives, week by week or month by month, the bulletins containing this complete and accurate information. And not only farmers but business men and men of all classes, have that information. And I cannot see in what way the minister proposes to increase the volume of our knowledge by the information he proposes to gather.

Mr. FISHER. I do not expect to increase that knowledge so far as the province of Ontario is concerned ; but I want to try to get the same information for the rest of the Dominion and compile it with the knowledge we get from Ontario and make a national return covering the whole Dominion. My hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) says that this information collected by the provincial government of Ontario is furnished by the assessors. He is quite correct, to a certain extent, but not altogether, as I am informed. Some of it is collected by the assessors, but a good deal is collected by direct communication with the farmers in the way I have suggested.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) has assisted me in getting a partial reply from the minister as to the benefit to the farmers of Canada to be secured by collecting and disseminating this information. I understand the minister to say that, by reason of what he proposes to do, the farmers will obtain more promptly, certain statistical information. He gives an illustration of that by saying that information will be given, earlier than is now possible, as to the number of horses in the country, the number of acres under cultivation, the number of acres devoted to other uses and so on. But what, I ask the minister is this : Assuming that he is correct, how is that going to benefit the farmers ? Is there any other way that he can suggest, beyond the one he has mentioned, by which the farmers will benefit in the result of this measure ? If there is no other way, I am content to let the matter drop. But I want to be definite about it ; to be able to say that I asked the minister to state all the benefits that would accrue from his plan and that I had a direct answer to my question.

Mr. FISHER. I thought I answered that completely a few minutes ago when I said

that the farmer wants information about his business which he has not got, but which will be collected and prepared for his use by the machinery I propose to establish under this measure.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister does not seem to distinguish exactly the point we put. He is assuming that certain information is necessary. Granting that we shall get certain information at an earlier day than we otherwise could—not very much earlier—I ask what dollar will the farmer make that he does not make to-day ? I have been unable, as yet, to see that the minister has explained that point. It may be owing to my density—

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LENNOX. In answer to the hon. gentleman who says hear, hear, I may say that I, at least, am trying to bring out information of interest to the people. But I have been unable to see what pecuniary benefit this will be to the people of Canada, and I spoke of the farmers merely by way of illustration. The minister has not yet explained that point so far as I can see.

Mr. FISHER. I must grant to my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) that the actual dollars and cents value of statistics is rather difficult to define. We take a census every ten years. We issue reports from the several departments. I believe all this is a necessity of civilized government, and that the more of that information we can give the people concerning the business of the country the better it is for the people. And the sooner that information is before the people, and the better the shape in which it is furnished, the better they will be able to prosecute the enterprises in which they are engaged. I do not think I can particularize more than that.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister does not seem to grasp the full meaning of his own Bill. He is adopting a system that is partially in use in the United States. What good would the information now published under the United States system be if it were published a year or two later than it actually is under their present system ? The statistical information which is gathered in the United States by means which the minister proposes to adapt to Canada, is used immediately in the United States, where it is furnished within a week or two after the result is known. For what purposes is it furnished ? For commercial purposes, for railway purposes. You know the amount of corn which is likely to be cropped in a given year long before it is marketed ; the same with wheat, the same with cotton. The farmer in the United States knows the condition of the market every month. The Minister of Agriculture does not seem to know, to understand, or to grasp the object of this Bill he has introduced. The object of the Bill is to furnish to the mercantile class, to the farmers, and to the producers throughout the country, information as to the amount produced every month during the year. When he has possession of that information he knows what price to ask for his grain, or whether to hold it any longer. But the minister says, Oh, this information is supplementary to the census, and it will be gathered a year or two afterwards.

Mr. FISHER. I think perhaps my hon. friend did not comprehend me when I spoke about the time the information would be given out. I meant that to refer to inter-census work to be done on a large scale. The office I speak of would issue interim bulletins much more frequently that that, information regarding crop returns, for instance, and matters of that kind, regarding which information would be given out from time to time as soon as it was obtained and compiled.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman stated also that this was a statistical Bill, an amalgamation of the census and statistics branches, that he was following the lines of the census law of the United States, the object of which he did not seem to understand. Then the minister speaks of the statistics gathered from the different provinces. What will be the result of the plan that he proposes to follow ? For instance, Ontario at the present time furnishes these agricultural statistics, so does Manitoba ; but as respects the other provinces, these statistics are to be procured at the federal expense. What will be the result ? The result will be that Ontario will say to this government, if you get this information at the expense of the Dominion for the other provinces while we have to pay for our own, we will drop our work, and you must pay for it the same as you do for the other provinces. All these things must be considered. The hon. gentleman brags about his census returns that he says he sent down to the printer so early that we will get it all in 1905, whereas the late government did not get their returns published till after 1897. He forgets to tell us the cost of the census of ten years ago, which was about half million dollars, and that of twenty years ago about $400.000, while his census up to the present time has cost about $1,200,000.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire where we are. I understand that you reserved your decision on a point of order until to-morrow. Has it been decided that we shall proceed with the Bill before we get your decision as to the point of order ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand that there was a kind of agreement entered into that the money clauses would not be taken up until the decision was rendered to-morrow.

Mr. TAYLOR. And that we shall go on with the other clauses ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Go on with the others, if there is no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Clause 1 is a mere title clause, and that is generally left until the end. I would, therefore, ask you, Mr. Chairman, to proceed with clause 2.

Mr. SPROULE. Before you proceed with clause 2, I would like to have a little more information on this Bill, because it seems to me we are not going to realize what the hon. minister told the House we might expect to realize ; that is, by adopting this method suggested now we would materially reduce the cost of taking the census at each decennial period, and that we would get the census much more correctly taken than at the present time. In answer to a question, I understood the hon. minister to say that one of the ways in which this would be accomplished would be the education of certain parties to do the work. In order to ascertain whether that might be accomplished or not I inquired whether it was intended to educate the enumerators. I understood the hon. minister to say that it was not, that there were only certain parties in the office who would be working at the census from year to year between the ten-year periods. So that the parties, above all others, who, in my opinion, would require education to get the work correctly and expeditiously done—the enumerators—would not be touched by any provision of this Bill. I did not understand the hon. minister to say that they would be in any way touched.

Mr. FISHER. No ; I do not think so.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, in what respect are we to decrease the cost ? I cannot understand that. There is another question. On what particular lines are we to benefit from it, and what statistics are we likely to gather under this system that we have not already under the system in operation at the present time ? The hon. minister spoke about the importance it would be to the farmer to know what he was raising and how it would affect the market. Our answer is that you get all that in the report of the Bureau of Industries, a copy of which I have here, for Ontario at least. You get the information from two sources ; one is through direct inquiry of the farmer, to whom a schedule is sent which he fills out himself, and the other is from the assessment. The assessors go around and take this all down when the assessment schedules are made out ; and, therefore, you have this information, which I take to be approximately correct. The Bureau of Industries issues reports on the condition of the crops, the yield per acre of peas, oats, wheat, barley, potatoes, turnips, and every one of these lines ; the number of acres that are under crop, the yield per acre, and the amount in value that it represents. The Bureau of Industries also gives statistics of horses, cattle, sheep, swine, poultry and everything else. This information is all gathered here and is all before the public to-day in the report which is issued from year to year. It could not be expected that this proposed method of collecting the information would give it to the farmer and the country much earlier than it is given at the present time, because, although the crop reports are monthly, the yield can only be given yearly in any event. The only advantage to the farmer would be to know how much is raised of these various crops from year to year. That information is all given in the report of the Bureau of Industries. That relates to the farmer, to everything the farmer raises, everything he has to sell, how much wool is raised, the number of horses, sheep, cattle, grain, &c. Then it is said that this proposed system will collect information respecting lines of manufactured goods. Well, take the report of the Department of Inland Revenue. We have the amount of malt, spirits and tobacco manufactured, the number of pounds of leaf tobacco raised, the different kinds of grain used, and the product as well. That is contained annually in the report of the Minister of Inland Revenue ; so that we get a portion of the statistics there that apply to certain lines of manufactures which will not be found in the report of the Bureau of Industries. Well, then, we turn to the Deparment of Mines, and we have here, at least in Ontario, and we have in another form in the Dominion as well, a report of the mineral products of the various mines. We have a report of the product of every mine in the country. We have a report of the production of gold from 1898 to 1902. Of gold, the production was as follows :—1898, $375,000 ; 1899, $428,000 ; 1900, $297,000 ; 1901, $244,000 ; 1902, $229,000 ; and we have also a return of the production of silver, lead, copper, nickel, iron ore, pig iron, steel, molybdenite and zinc. The output of all these mines is found in the report of the Bureau of Mines. That is an annual statement, and I do not know how the output of these mines can be ascertained by this new bureau which it is proposed to establish and presented to the people at any earlier date than we have it in the report of the Bureau of Mines. We have the statement not only in regard to these lines, but also in regard to coal oil, or petroleum and the products of oil, brick, tile and everything else. That information is collected already and given annually to the people. Then we come down to something that interests the wage-earners of the country. But we have the report of the Department of Labour, which is published monthly.

We have as well the report of the Bureau of Industries in Ontario showing the prevailing rate of wages for farmers and other labourers. We have the very same thing collected, collated and presented to us in the monthly bulletin or paper that is got out by the hon. Minister of Labour (Sir William Mulock). It relates to the labourers and builders of the country, and shows how the people are employed. Now, then, we come down to commerce, and we want to know what is being produced and handled from month to month during the year. We have the product of the dairy—the cheese factories, the butter factories, eggs, poultry and all those lines. Thus we have these figures in the report of the Bureau of Industries of Ontario, and in the report of the Minister of Trade and Commerce in regard to exports from month to month, while the vital statistics are collected both in the province and also at Ottawa in connection with the Health Department. Thus it seems to me that in all these lines we have a surplus of statistics at the present time ; whether they are published in the most convenient form for analysis or used from month to month, I am not prepared to say, but as we have so many statistics now that I imagine this Bill is comparatively unnecessary. It will also involve a great additional outlay and the creation of an increasing number of highly paid officials. I do not know whether we make the very best use of the various collections of statistics that we have now, and I am not prepared to say that we are justified in adding much to our present expenditure for the collection of statistics.

Mr. FISHER. I am unable to agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule). I would rather look upon a great deal of what he has brought forward as an endorsation of the objects of this Bill. He says, for instance, that there is certain information about labour, wages, &c., in the report of the Ontario Bureau of Mines, and we have also a labour bureau here which issues under the authority of the Dominion government—and I think that the publication of the 'Labour Gazette' has been endorsed both by the House and the country—a compilation and statement of the condition of wages and labour in this country. Just as that report of the Labour Bureau is for the whole Dominion of Canada, while the report of the Bureau of Industries is for the province of Ontario alone, so the work that will be done under this Bill in regard to the several branches of industry referred to would be for the whole Dominion. The information to which the hon. gentleman referred is for the province of Ontario, but we want to get that information for the whole country. Then too, the report of the Bureau of Industry deals only with the agricultural and to a certain extent the mineral productions of the province, although the report of the Bureau of Mines in Ontario gives certain information about the mining and mineral production in that province.

Mr. SPROULE. And the Geological Survey gives it for the whole Dominion.

Mr. FISHER. The report of the Geological Survey does not deal very much with the actual production of minerals. The Geological Survey report is a report on scientific geological work more than on the production of minerals although it does deal with these figures to a certain extent. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) spoke of the returns of the Department of Inland Revenue. It is true that on certain lines the department gives a good deal of information in reference to articles connected with excise and taxation through excise, but it does not give the information about any other products, and the information which it does give us is with relation to the taxation more than with relation to the production. Incidentally it gives some statements in regard to the products that enter into the production of liquor, cigarettes, &c., but still after all this is done in the Department of Inland Revenue with an eye to and in relation with the collection of revenue and not in connection with the products of industry.

Mr. SPROULE. So long as the information is given what difference does it make what the connection is ?

Mr. FISHER. It gives that information and we would be able to make use of it for tabulated statements that might be drawn up in connection with the same subject, but not particularly with the production of revenue. My hon. friend will agree with me that the questions of tabulated statistics is practically interminable. It is possible to deal with a certain set of figures in many different ways according to the object that the student for instance, may have in view. The figures collected by the Department of Inland Revenue are dealt with by that department for the purposes of the revenue, but that particular set of figures might not help the person who is studying the culture of barley for malting purposes. But still they would be identically the same figures in the original collection of information. My hon. friend says that certain labour statistics are collected by the provincial government of Ontario and certain other statistics of a different character altogether by the inspectors of factories in the different provinces, figures that are collected chiefly from a hygienic standpoint, having in view the safety of the operatives in factories, and yet these figures can be made use of in the reports of the Bureau of Labour here, and so collated as to show the condition of the workmen all over Canada. With the new system we will be able to furnish information on many subjects from a Dominion or national standpoint, using the information that is collected by the provincial auth-

orities and also that collected by various associations such as dairy associations which might collect various statistics in regard to the production of cheese and butter.

Mr. BLAIN. Is Ontario the only province that collects agricultural statistics ?

Mr. FISHER. The province of Manitoba does a little, but not nearly so much as Ontario. I am not aware that any other province collects any.

Mr. BLAIN. I see here in the statistical year-book a table of live stock in Manitoba, giving the value each year. For 1897, 1898, 1899 and 1900 there is a complete statement of the value of stock in the province of Manitoba. The hon. gentleman's Bill would not encroach upon that ?

Mr. FISHER. Not so far as Manitoba is concerned.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that that information is published only for Ontario and Manitoba ?

Mr. FISHER. I know of no other. I do not think the hon. member will find it in regard to Quebec, the maritime provinces, British Columbia or the Territories, and the extent of agricultural information gathered in the province of Manitoba is not as great as that gathered in the province of Ontario. I have already referred to the point mentioned by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and I rather take most of what he has said to be an endorsation of a good deal of what is in this Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not the interpretation that I intended to have put upon it. I said what I did because I have heard at different times almost the same line of reasoning with regard to other plans for collecting statistics. When we were asked to incur the expense of getting statistics for the Year-Book, we were told that it was for exactly the same purposes for which the hon. minister says we are now justified in incurring this expense. When it was proposed to have a monthly report from the Department of Trade and Commerce, we were told that it was in order to furnish statistics for the mercantile community. When the establishment of the Bureau of Labour was proposed, we were told that statistics were required from time to time to inform the wage earners of the country of the conditions of wages and labour, in different localities. The same argument has been put forward with regard to all these proposals, and the question that presented itself to my mind was whether we had not reached the limit of expenditure for the purpose of collecting and publishing statistics. The hon. minister says that figures can be arranged in a great variety of ways. I have no doubt that they can ; but is that any justification for going on to devise other ways of arranging them in order to spend money ? I do not think it is.

Mr. FISHER. If this Bill were going to repeat what has already been done, my hon. friend's argument would be quite right ; but it is not. It is taking up work in other directions. The Trade and Commerce Reports, for instance, do not deal in any way with agriculture ; they deal only with trade and commerce, and with external commerce. They are compiled practically from the Trade and Navigation returns, besides containing reports of our agents abroad. But they do not give any information about our home production. My hon. friend says this is exactly the argument that was put forward when the Year Book was established and when the Labour Bureau was proposed. I quite agree with my hon. friend. Parliament decided to establish the Year Book and the Labour Bureau for specific purposes, and this Bill has a specific purpose in another direction. There is at present no provision for compiling the kind of information for the whole country that this Bill makes provision for. It is exactly on the same principle as the establishment of the Year Book and the Labour Bureau, and in that sense I venture to think that what my hon. friend has said is rather favourable to the principle of the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. If I could see in what way it would benefit the country, I would be ready to support it, because I am in favour of correct statistics. The hon. minister does not propose to deal with all the products of the country at the same time, but he proposes to deal with one line in one year and with another line in another year. I do not see how that is going to be of any great benefit to the country at large. I could see how it might be of some use to ascertain all the products of the country over three or four years. The statistics must include everything, I think, to be of any great value. What I would like to understand is in what particular way this is going to benefit us ? What particular phase of it can we utilize, and thereby make more money ? We cannot follow the markets any more closely, we cannot diversify our pursuits any better, I take it. If the information which we are getting from various sources to-day is as reliable as the proposed information will be, I do not see that it is going to be of much if any value. If I thought it was going to be an improvement, I would commend the establishment of a new system.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the hon. minister, from what class of the community has the demand come for this legislation ? Has it come from the manufacturers, from the merchants, from the labouring classes, from the farmers ? The only class that has made any demand, so far as

I can see, is some gentlemen who want positions varying from $4,000 a year down, for the purpose of compiling some statistics. I have listened to the hon. minister very attentively, and he has failed to answer the question propounded by my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), as to what value these statistics, when gathered, will be to the great tax-paying class of the country, the farmers. Are they making any demand for this legislation, and in what way is it going to benefit them ? The hon. minister has signally failed to answer that question. I understood the hon. minister to say that he wanted to gather for the whole Dominion such information as that published in the province of Ontario by the Bureau of Industries.

How is my hon. friend going to get this information from the maritime provinces and the province of Quebec ? Does he think he will get it by sending out circulars ? Will the parties to whom these circulars are sent tell him how many cheese factories there are in the province of Quebec. In my opinion, in no other way can the information be gathered except through the municipal assessors. If you have a province in which there are no assessments taken, you cannot get the information unless you send out a staff of your own. All I can see in this Bill is to furnish the minster with a pretext for employing a staff a few weeks before the election and sending them out to find how many grit and tory votes there are in the various constituencies. The hon. gentleman tells us that he will send out schedules to the manufacturers and will have a law passed compelling the manufacturers to answer the questions contained in these schedules. But why did he not compel them to do this in the last census ? Many of them replied to his questions by saying: It is none of your business. He wanted them to divulge the secrets of their business, to tell the public how much goods of a certain kind they manufactured, how much money was invested in their business, what wages they paid per day; and lots of manufacturers refused to answer. But even if he had these schedules filled up, what benefit would that be to the manufacturers generally ? I can see no benefit to any class of our community from this expenditure of $20,000 the first year and double that amount the next year. You certainly cannot gather the information the hon. minister requires, except by employing a staff in each municipality to go from house to house and collect it. I am confident that our farmers will see no advantage to them in any such expenditure. That will not make their land produce an extra bushel of wheat or a cheese factory turn out an extra pound of cheese. The hon. minister should answer the question put him by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) and tell us what benefit these statistics will be to the farmers, when gathered, and also from what class of the community comes any demand for this legislation.

Mr. FISHER. We have had demands from all classes of the community and all parts of the country for the information we propose gathering.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. minister lay these demands on the table?

Mr. FISHER. Surely the hon. gentleman does not want me to lay on the table the letters received by the department during the last ten years.

Mr. TAYLOR. We will take one year.

Mr. FISHER. Those demands come in all shapes and forms. Sometimes they are for information we are able to give and frequently for information not at our command. In the second place, the demand has not come from anybody seeking positions. There has been no demand for this particular measure, but I am introducing it in order to meet demands for information which we have not now the power or the machinery to collect. This measure is a consolidation of three Acts now on the statutes, and very little additional machinery or power is required to carry out the object I have in view. The three Acts are for three different purposes, and are here consolidated into one, which will cover the whole ground and add some necessary powers to make them complete. I have the power to-day, under the General Statistics Act, to appoint agents all over the country to collect information, and have only to ask parliament to vote the money. Under the Census Act, I have the power every ten years to appoint enumerators and make a census.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the law give the hon .gentleman the right to take the census every six years in the Northwest?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, and we are extending that power to the new provinces which are to be created. The intention is to take one census between each decennial census for those new provinces just as we are required to do by the Manitoba Act for Manitoba.

Mr. TAYLOR. But the five year census in Manitoba is simply to count the heads of the population for the purpose of ascertaining the amount that province is to receive per head.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, but this measure goes further and extends to the new provinces to be created in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. TAYLOR. How is the hon. gentleman to get information from the other provinces which do not make a report as the Ontario Bureau of Industries does? When the office is fully equipped, how is he going to find out for instance, how many cheese factories they have in New Brunswick, and

how many horses and cattle? How is he going to get it for the other provinces ?

Mr. FISHER. These statistics for the province of Ontario to which my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) refers are gathered largely by correspondence—by sending out forms——

Mr. TAYLOR. No, no.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend must not shake his head. These facts are not all taken from the assessors' returns by any means. Certain of them are, but not all. Some are secured by sending out circulars with questions and requests that the answers to these questions be given. There will be no difficulty in dealing with the subjects my hon. friend referred to in the case of such industries as the cheese and butter factories. That information, I know by experience—having tried to get it in individual instances and for particular localities—can be got perfectly well without an enumeration—it can be got in complete and accurate form. Similar information can be got in regard to other industries, just as it can for factories or dairy products.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the hon. minister mean to say that the information for Ontario is got by sending out circulars ?

Mr. FISHER. I understand that a good deal of that information is got in the way I have outlined.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood the minister to say that he would issue circulars promiscuously and so get that information. But that is not the way the information is secured for the Ontario Bureau of Industries. That information is obtained from municipal officers, who report to the bureau in response to its circulars. How else, for instance, would the hon. Minister of Agriculture obtain the assessment of a municipality ? Will he take it on a report of some farmer ? He must get such information, if he gets it at all from the municipal officers. And so all along the line, as described by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule).

Mr. FISHER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) will allow me a moment ; He is right to a certain extent. The Bureau of Industries of Ontario publishes much information obtained from municipal officers. And the same kind of thing can be procured in the same way in the other provinces. In the province of Quebec there is a vast mass of municipal information available. I believe the same is true of some, if not all, the maritime provinces. This Act contemplates the collection of that information for these provinces in the same way that such information is collected in Ontario by the Bureau of Industries.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman's (Mr. Fisher's) department already obtains information in that way. He sends out circulars from time to time asking concerning the success or failure of certain crops, for instance, and, on the strength of the replies to these circulars, he prepares a bulletin. But, the hon. gentleman, as we understand him, says he is going to establish a Bureau of Industries for the whole Dominion for $35,000. The hon. gentleman can no more do that than the sun can shine at mid-night. This is simply the thin end of the wedge, and, in the course of a year or so, instead of $35,000, we shall find an expenditure of $135,000. Up to this time the difficulty that this House has had, and that the country has had, is that the statistical year-book is laid on the table and is distributed among the people far too late. And, when you inquire into the cause of this delay, you find it in the fact that the government has starved the statistical department it already has. Sufficient force is not employed to expedite matters and push the year-book out in good time. Yet, the hon. minister is establishing a department that will conflict with the department he already has. Why not spend the money in improving the existing department instead of establishing another ? Coming from Ontario, and as a representative of Ontario, I do not see why we in that province who pay for collecting and publishing our own statistics, should be called upon to assist in publishing statistics for the rest of the Dominion.

Mr. FISHER. I am sorry to have my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) say in effect, that, so long as Ontario gets certain information the people of Ontario do not care whether the rest of the Dominion gets it or not.

Mr. LENNOX. He did not say that.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) thought that the information secured for the province of Ontario was sufficient for that province. I believe that a large number of people in Ontario, as well as in the rest of the Dominion, want to get the same kind of information about the whole Dominion as is now collected for Ontario—information concerning our national industries and productions. For that reason, I think, it is necessary that this work should be done under the Dominion government. Each province now collects a certain amount of information. Ontario collects a great deal, Manitoba a certain amount, Nova Scotia, Quebec and the rest, a certain amount. But the information gathered varies, the method of making up the tables varies. When the Dominion office is established and collects that information from provincial and local sources, through assessment rolls, reports of municipal secretary-treasurers or in any other way, it will be able to collate that information in tables covering the whole Dominion. I am quite sure that the people of Ontario are as anxious to have that information as are those of any other part of the Dominion.

Mr. LAKE. I think the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) was scarcely fair to the Northwest Territories when he made the statement that agricultural statistics were collected only in the provinces of Ontario and Manitoba. For many years past the Department of Agriculture of the Northwest Territories has been collecting agricultural statistics, statistics which have proven accurate and which are of very great use not only to the farmers, but to all classes of the community. Especially have they been of use to us in making arrangements with the railway companies for carrying out our grain and in other matters of that character.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I think this committee should be very slow to pass a measure such as that now under consideration. I do not think that the minister has shown that the information he proposes to collect will be of any great service to the country. And, in any case, it is clear that he cannot collect that information at the expense he proposes. Statistics about Canada, to be useful, must be had promptly. There is no use in having the facts about last years crop presented to us next year. To be of service those figures must be had within a month or two; and surely the minister does not seriously tell this committee that he can accomplish the collection and publication of statistics on this basis for any such sum as he has named. From the experience we had in connection with the last census, I think the committee may well hesitate long before handing over to the disposal of the minister any sum as he suggests for the carrying out of the purposes of this measure.

The census taken five years ago shows, I think, the need of this committee going slow in placing a large sum of money at the disposal of the hon. gentleman. I have here the Auditor General's Report for the year after the census was taken. I turn over a few leaves, and when I see how lavish the hon. gentleman has been in the expenditure of public money, I am astonished, and yet I know what it all means. For instance, take page D--143, and what will he find there? 'Commissioner for the county of Inverness, N.S., Mr. J. G. McRae, $289.67; overpayment, $150.' What became of that $150? $150 was paid to that commissioner over what he ought to have got. I was running an election in my riding at that time, and I know what every one of these appointments of commissioners meant, I know why this large expenditure of money became necessary. I would like to know whether there was an attempt made to recover that $150 from this man. In opening this book I have struck this account at random, but there is enough here to show that this committee had better go slow in voting money to be spent by the hon. gentleman. Have we any reason to suppose that this information which he is going to collect will be forthcoming in time to be of any service to this country? We have no assurance that it will be.

Mr. LENNOX. Section 2 is a very important one, and I wish to call the attention of the minister to a question involved in the consideration of this clause.

In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires, the word 'minister' means the Minister of Agriculture, and the word 'office' means the census and statistics office.

Well, this is an important question, it is important for us to consider whether the minister who administers this Act is to be the Minister of Agriculture. To make plain what I am aiming at, I will refer to a line in the next section.

There shall be a permanent office under the Minister of Agriculture to be called the census and statistical office.

Now, I say that the time has come in Canada when, having regard to the large amount of money invested by the farmers in their operations, we shall have a whole, able-bodied Minister of Agriculture all to ourselves. The Minister of Agriculture himself has dealt with this question. It may be that he had in view some other Minister of Agriculture, and he thought that it might be proper to divide him. But in this case, on behalf of the farmers of this country, I protest in all seriousness against dividing our Minister of Agriculture. Mark Twain, I think it is, tells us about the cannibals of some south sea islands who, as showing their appreciation of the missionary, came out of a 'restaurant' smacking their lips, and saying he was a good, tender missionary, and they wished they had more of him. So far as I am concerned, having regard to the fact that the Minister of Agriculture has in the past been so distracted from the concerns of the great producing class in this country, I think we should take this matter seriously in hand now, and that we should consider, not whether we shall enlarge the duties of the Minister of Agriculture, but whether we shall not insist, so far as we can in a parliamentary way, on having some gentleman to represent the agricultural interest of this country who will be content with the glories attaching to that office, without desiring to grasp a large measure of glory from some other source. Now, to show the position we are in in regard to agriculture, I will quote from the mouth of a witness that cannot be disputed, I will take the liberty of reading from a most authentic source. Take the 1st volume of the census of 1901, which according to the minister himself is as much ahead of any other census that has ever been compiled as the Bible is ahead of the Toronto 'Globe.' I presume no pains are spared there to point out the imperfections of the former census and the perfection of the last one.

Provision has been made for the first time in a Dominion census for collecting figures of farm values——

This will be information to the public.

——and it can be premised that the data obtained will present a striking confirmation of the greatness of our agricultural industry, and of the leading place it occupies in the development of national life.

That is what I claim for the agricultural interests of this country. We are told by Mr. Blue that agriculture represents an investment of 72 per cent of the entire investment of capital in the Dominion of Canada. We find that out of a total population of Canada of 5,371,315, the urban population was 2,021,397, while the rural population was 3,349,516. I took occasion nearly a year ago to point out to the Minister of Agriculture the importance of not having his time distracted from agricultural concerns by the multiple, and in some cases useless things dumped into his department; and perhaps I cannot do better than quote the hon. gentleman's own language which I find on the Hansard of last year, page 3736. We were discussing the manner in which the agricultural affairs of Canada were conducted by the Imperial Institute in Britain, and the minister said :

The Board of Trade in England is one of the departments of government that is something like the Department of Agriculture here.

That is his own comparison.

It has a large number of branches connected generally with trade and commerce, and I think it is a department where they put a lot of different things that they do not quite know what to do with.

It is something like the Department of Agriculture in this country. Patents, trade marks and various things have been put into the Department of Agriculture here, although they have nothing whatever to do with agriculture. The Board of Trade seems to be an omnibus department.

What I do say, and I hope I will have the serious consideration of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, is that it is time that we had a department devoted purely to agricultural concerns, having regard to the enormous interests that are involved, and if it is said that the hon. Minister of Agriculture will not have enough to do if he devotes his attention solely to agriculture, I may say that he can well spend a portion of his time in listening to the farmers of this country discussing the various practical questions that arise, and that they will give enormous interests that are involved; and him a large amount of practical and valuable information. Mr. Clancy, then in the House, said :

He tells us that it is under the Board of Trade, which is an omnibus department, a sort of receptacle for worthless articles—things which are not good enough to keep, but which it is hard to throw away.

And the minister apparently concurred in that view. Then the member for South Simcoe calls the hon. minister's attention to it in another way. He says :

I wish to speak to the Minister of Agriculture as a farmer talking to a farmer. I presume the hon. gentleman is a practical farmer, and to that extent there is a bond of sympathy between us.

Then, skipping a few lines :

I think it was the president of the Board of Trade with whom we had all the difficulty in regard to the embargo on Canadian cattle; and therefore I think the Minister of Agriculture should have approached this proposition with a good deal of suspicion on behalf of the farmers of Canada.

That seems to be emphasized to-day, having regard to the position of matters, when we find an ex-Minister of Agriculture in the old country urging what is not exactly fair in the interest of the farming community of this country. Then it is pointed out that this department is like a department in England—

——which takes up everything that nobody else wants to have anything to do with.

The gentleman who held that view at that time—and I had the honour of calling that matter to the hon. minister's attention in that way—has been much more impressed with it since. I have been through the recent Ontario campaign, and what did we find there ? We found that the very matter for which the Prime Minister of Ontario, who has just resigned, took especial credit was the creation of, as he called it, a Minister of Agriculture for the province of Ontario. That was not the creation of a Minister of Agriculture for the province of Ontario. Previous to the time that he spoke of we had a Department of Agriculture in which other things were taken up as well, we had a Commissioner of Agriculture whose duties were not simply confined to agriculture, and if it was necessary in the province of Ontario to separate the departments and assign a minister solely to the interests of agriculture, how much more necessary, Mr. Chairman, must it be when the interests of the whole Dominion are at stake ? I submit that this is a matter which requires the immediate attention of the government. It involves no additional expense. Already we have a Department of Trade and Commerce collecting certain statistics, the hon. minister of Agriculture is collecting certain statistics as well, and there is no reason in the world why the duties now assigned to the Minister of Agriculture, outside of those which are purely agricultural, should not be assigned to some other department. I believe that I will be within the judgment of hon. members of the House on both sides——

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. LENNOX. I may not probably be in the judgment of one, but one swallow does

not make a summer—I will, at all events, be in the judgment of the great tribunal to which I turn with very much more regard than to hon. gentlemen on the other side, I shall be in the judgment of the people of Canada when I demand on behalf of the agriculturists of this country that a new order of things shall be inaugurated, and that instead of distracting the attention of the minister from the great duties which should be his and which, I am sure, he is anxious to discharge, he shall concentrate his attention solely upon agricultural questions.

Mr. WALSH. May I say a word as representing an agricultural constituency ? I do not think I need bring to the attention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) the condition in which agriculture, or the production of horses and cattle, is in my county, because I think he is perfectly well aware of it. If this information is to be collected in the same way the last census was taken, I must say, as representing that county, that I think we would be much better without it. The returns for agriculture have only been given some four years after the census is taken. If they were correct they were too late, but, as they were not correct, I can only hope that the people will look on them as ancient history, and that they will not judge our county according to the census as given. We have what we consider amongst the best farmers in the Dominion of Canada in our county, and we believe that our cattle are amongst the best, but the return given here would indicate that we are much behind our neighbours. I would like to read an article which shows that I am not speaking simply because I am in the House. I shall read this article from our local paper, a journal which, some years ago, members of the government appreciated very highly, although they may not appreciate it so highly now. I refer to the Huntingdon 'Gleaner,' and the article that I would like to read is in regard to the last census. The date of his paper is 5th January, 1905. It says :

The census was taken in the spring of 1901 and we have only now the final volume, which relates to agriculture. Examination of the figures, we regret to say, shows they are not merely ancient history, but unreliable. The figures for dairy factories establish this. For instance we are assured there are no creameries in the county of Beauharnois (!), that there are twelve in Chateauguay, and eight in Huntingdon, and that Chateauguay sold nearly double the quantity of creamery butter that Huntingdon did. This is absurdly misleading. The figures for cheese are more approximately correct. The census declares six factories in Beauharnois made 364,000 lbs. of cheese, 14 in Chateauguay 1,112,000 lbs., and 19 in Huntingdon, 1,464,000 lbs. That the information here conveyed is erroneous can be shown in another way. The report declares there are 13,691 milch cows in Chateauguay and 18,489 in Huntingdon, yet the quantity of butter and cheese made by the two counties is about equal, the figures being : Chateauguay 2,053,000 lbs., Huntingdon 2,084,000. Either the extra 4,798 cows with which Huntingdon is credited over Chateauguay must be what the Hon. Mr. Fisher terms 'robber cows,' or this census is not worth the paper it is printed on.

If that is a sample of the census we are going to get, I, on behalf of the agriculturists in the county of Huntingdon, object to this money being spent.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall the section be adopted ?

Mr. FOSTER. We want an explanation of that Huntingdon business.

Mr. FISHER. I am not in the position off-hand to explain a matter of that kind. I can only say that a while ago my attention was drawn to another statement in the Huntingdon 'Gleaner' which I did investigate, and which I found to be inaccurate according to the census returns and according to the facts. This statement I have not seen before, but I will investigate it and report.

Mr. FOSTER. I would imagine that according to the practical agreement we came to, the minister had better move that the committee rise.

Mr. FISHER. I hope that facility will be given to the consideration of the Bill clause by clause when we next go into committee.

Progress reported.

PACKING AND SALE OF CERTAIN COMMODITIES

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Act respecting the packing and sale of certain staple commodities, by inserting the following sections after section 4 :—

4a. When apples are packed in Canada for export for sale by the box they shall be packed in good and strong boxes of seasoned wood, the inside dimensions of which shall not be less than ten inches in depth, eleven inches in width and twenty inches in length, representing as near as possible two thousand two hundred cubic inches.

2. Every person who offers or exposes for sale, or who packs for export, apples by the box otherwise than in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section shall be liable, on summary conviction, to a penalty of twenty-five cents for each box of apples so offered or exposed for sale or packed.

4b. When apples are packed in boxes or barrels having trays or fillers wherein it is intended to have a separate compartment for each apple, then the provisions of sections 4 and 4a shall not apply.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the hon. minister explain the purpose of these resolutions ?

Mr. FISHER. I may say that the purpose is to introduce a Bill to define the size

of boxes for the packing of apples. We have under a clause of the Staple Commodities Act, Chap. 26, Edward VII, 'An Act respecting the packing and sale of certain commodities,' provision for the size of barrels for apples. Of late years our export trade in apples has been turning towards the use of boxes instead of barrels. For some time there was a considerable variety in the dimensions of the boxes used. A little over a year ago the fruit growers and exporters asked for a standard box. At that time resolutions were passed by the fruit-growers' associations in the different provinces, adopting what is known as the British Columbia box, the size of which is given in this resolution and I think I am safe in saying that there was a practically unanimous expression of opinion that this size was the most convenient, the most suitable and the one that would meet the demands of all parts of the country most completely. The Bill simply provides for the adoption of this standard and it also provides that the standard shall not apply to boxes where what are called 'fillers' or pasteboard partitions are included, because there is a trade in this country in very choice apples both for export and sale in Canada and these apples are put into boxes like egg boxes with pasteboard compartments all through. Such a box requires to be a little larger to contain the same amount of fruit as the other boxes and its dimensions would depend considerably upon the size of the fruit selected for packing in a certain box. Therfore these boxes are omitted from the provisions of the Act.

Mr. INGRAM. I see that the hon. minister here deals only with boxes. Is it not a fact that some provinces have different sized apple barrels?

Mr. FISHER. Not to-day. The law fixes a standard size of apple barrels.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood that one province to-day ships in a barrel of a different size from the other provinces.

Mr. FISHER. Not since the passage of the Act of 1901, the Act we are now amending, chapter 26 of 1901, 'An Act respecting the Packing and Sale of certain standard commodities.' The size of apple barrels is determined by the provision of section 4 of that Act to which this amended clause is intended to be added. The dimensions of the minimum barrel represent as nearly as possible 96 quarts. That is the minimum size, they can use a large size if they choose.

Mr. INGRAM. That is the point I am getting at; some do use larger barrels. There are two classes of barrels used; that is why I asked the question.

Mr. FISHER. The amendment does not apply to barrels at all except that clause 4b, the last part of the resolution, says that when apples are packed in boxes or barrels having trays or fillers, the provisions of this Act shall not apply.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Would it not be better to have the barrels all of one size, to adopt a standard size for all Canada and make it compulsory?

Mr. FISHER. The minimum size is fixed, and if people choose to use a larger barrel they will suffer a loss. Shippers are trying to get to the standard barrel as rapidly as they can. When the Act was passed, in 1901, it was thought best to leave the possibility of using a larger barrel if they chose, because at that time differnt sizes of barrels were used. Boxes, however, are not used to any very great extent and it is thought that a standard box can very soon be adopted.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Will the minister tell me to what extent boxes are being used for the exportation of apples to the old country?

Mr. FISHER. I could not give the number of barrels or the quantity of apples exported in boxes but I may say that it is increasing from year to year very considerably. I am only making a guess but I am quite sure that not 10 per cent are sent in boxes. I doubt if 5 per cent of all the apples sent last season went in boxes.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Has the shipment of apples in boxes been satisfactory? Have the apples been largely bruised?

Mr. FISHER. I think the trade in boxes has been very satisfactory. Apples shipped in boxes have as a rule returned better results than those shipped in barrels.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I understand that a few years ago in the United States, where the experience has been far greater than with us, a commission went thoroughly into the matter of box shipping versus barrel shipping, and reached the conclusion that the use of boxes was not satisfactory to the apple trade, and highly recommended barrels.

Mr. FISHER. That has not been the observation of our own fruit shippers at all, and in that respect I think we have not a great deal to learn from the United States.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What particular call is there, then, from the people of Canada for the box to replace the barrel?

Mr. FISHER. It is not proposed to require the box to replace the barrel. Nobody is trying to force anybody to substitute the box for the barrel. We are simply providing a standard box for those who choose to ship in boxes.

Mr. BARR. Will the hon. minister tell us which is the cheaper, the barrel or the box? During last year it is a fact that barrels were very scarce.

Mr. FISHER. I have no information on that point. The box as indicated in these dimensions has only one-third of the capacity of the standard barrel.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. minister tells us that he is providing for a standard box. I do not so understand the resolution, because it does not provide for a box of a uniform size. If we are going to have a standard box, one which may be used for measurement, we ought to make it uniform. It would be more convenient for packing in railway cars and in steam vessels than boxes of all sizes. We have provided for a strawberry box of uniform size, and if apples are to be sold by the box, I would strongly advise the minister to require that all the boxes shall be of the same size, so that the matter will be clearly understood both by the buyer and the seller.

Mr. FISHER. We are following in this proposed amendment the principle adopted in the law already in force in regard to the barrel, that is, that it shall not be less in size than a certain dimension.

Mr. SPROULE. In both cases I think there is this defect, that if you want to compare prices per barrel, the barrels ought to be all of the same size, and for the same reason the boxes ought to be all of the same size. Then people will know what the market is.

Mr. FISHER. As a matter of fact, it is found that the shippers try to get the smallest barrel that will pass, and the same would probably be the case with regard to the box. If we provide positively that the box shall be of such and such measurement and no other, a person using a box a little larger than that measurement might be punished for an infraction of the law; but if a person sees that the box is not smaller than the permissible size, he may use one a little larger if he chooses. It is thought that there should be that degree of elasticity and freedom in regard to the size of the box or barrel. I may say that the resolution of the Fruit Growers' Association asked that a minimum size of box should be made law.

Mr. A. MARTIN. The hon. minister has mentioned one fruit growers' association. There is more than one fruit growers' association in Canada, and unless a Bill of this nature is asked for by a large majority of the fruit growers' associations, I would hesitate before giving it my support. One objection I have to it at first sight is that the size of the box is not uniform. However, I would rather trust the opinion of the fruit growers' associations in different parts of the country on this point, and if the minister could give us any information as to the number of associations he has corresponded with, and as to their opinions with regard to this measure, that would go some distance in enabling us to come to a conclusion with regard to it.

Mr. BARR.

Mr. FISHER. I am informed that these dimensions are the dimensions of the standard British Columbia box, which has been adopted after full discussion by the fruit growers' of that province, that the question was discussed by the Ontario Fruit Growers' Association, who passed a resolution endorsing and adopting that box, that that was followed by a resolution of the Nova Scotia Fruit Growers' Association and the Prince Edward Island Fruit Growers' Association, and that the details were worked out by the officers of my department at the request of the fruit growers' associations who desired to get a uniform standard.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the details of this measure had better be discussed in committee.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. I may say that I heartily appreciate the provision made in this Bill for a uniform box for the export of apples; and in answer to my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) I may say that there will not be any difficulty about getting the shippers to use boxes of practically uniform size. When apples are sold by the box in Great Britain, each box will naturally be expected to contain about the same quantity, and it will be in the interest of the shippers to use a box that will approach as nearly as possible to the size provided for in this Bill. Regarding the size that is suggested, my opinion, from experience in the handling of apples in boxes to a considerable extent, is that a better size would be a trifle shorter and a trifle wider, namely, twelve and a half inches wide by eighteen inches long rather than eleven by twenty. That would give practically the same space and contain the same quantity, and as near as possible represent a bushel. The boxes made in that way would be a little bit stronger with the same weight of lumber. In our experience of shipping in boxes, the desire is to get the lumber as light and also as strong as possible. I am not saying this so much in a spirit of criticism as for the purpose of giving my opinion after an experience in shipping many thousands of boxes, which I have done because I was unable to get sufficient barrels. We found that this size made a stronger and a better looking box and one in every respect more suitable than the size indicated in the Bill. Of course I know that the Fruit Grower's Association have suggested this size, which is largely owing to the fact of their having used this size, especially in the Niagara District. The firm which made this size of boxes sold them almost entirely in that district, and the shorter and wider box was not used there to any considerable extent, if at all. I merely throw this out as a suggestion, in case the hon. minister is not perfectly convinced that the size stated in the Bill is the right size. I think we should endeav-

our to have the best possible box because boxes are going to be used in the future much more than they were in the past. The difficulty in getting barrels and their increased cost is becoming a very important factor in the export trade of apples, and I believe that the day is coming when the boxes will be much more largely used. As yet the trade in England, especially in Liverpool, seems to prefer the barrel, but on the other hand, Glasgow and Hamburg seem to be much more ready to accept the box ; and I may say that this last season we got decidedly the best returns from the boxes we exported to Glasgow. I think it would be advisable to have the dimensions varied a trifle because then the box will be stronger. It is hardly necessary that I should enter into an explanation why it is stronger except that the shorter box does not bulge at the sides or the bottom and top so readily. I must congratulate the minister on the outworking of the Fruit Marks Act. With regard to the minimum size of the barrel and the working out of the Act touching the handling and packing of the fruit and its quality, it was a step in the right direction.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee on the resolution.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it the intention to make this provision regarding the boxes apply to fruit for sale in this country as well as for export ? The section reads 'Expose for sale or for export.'

Mr. FISHER. The clause as printed here in the resolution was intended to cover the same point as section 4 with regard to barrels. In section 4 the wording is a little different, and my hon. colleague the Minister of Justice says he would interpret it to mean only when packed for export, but subsection 3 is worded just the same as the resolution and what would apply to sales in Canada as well as for export.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister does not intend to do that.

Mr. FISHER. I am not quite prepared to say. The resolutions, as passed by the Fruit Grower's Association were intended to apply to the sale in Canada as well as to the sales for export.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be unjust.

Mr. FISHER. But I may say that the Act at present, so far as barrels are concerned, does not apply to sales in the country, but only for export. Under these circumstances, I think I must consider the matter asking the House to concur in that resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. I should think the minister might say at once that he would amend it so that it would not be open to that construction. Surely the minister is not going to incorporate in the law a provision which will prevent a farmer from taking apples in a box of any size or capacity up from his farm and selling them wherever he likes. What the minister means to say, I take it, is : Every person who offers for export, or who exposes for sale for export, or who packs for export, apples by the box otherwise than in accordance with the foregoing provisions.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. I would like to say a word with reference to the packing in boxes and the shape of the boxes. As a retailer of thirty-two years experience, I think I ought to know something about the selling of apples. When you sell apples by the barrel you have a great deal more difficulty than when you sell them by the box, for two reasons : Every consumer is not able to buy a barrel, but there are few who would not buy a half barrel or box. Another thing is that when a man buys a barrel of apples and puts it in his cellar, if it is warm there, the result probably is that before the barrel is half used the apples spoil with the heat, or shrink and become practically valueless. If the apples are packed in a box, you have a better package to sell and to expose for sale. As to the shape of the box, I think that the nearer you get to a cube the better. For example, everybody must have noticed—and every retail dealer knows—that formerly we bought most of our oranges from Mediterranean countries. They were packed in boxes, but the boxes were of miserable quality and not of good size. But when oranges began to come from California, we found them to reach this market in boxes of fine quality and uniform size, and nearly square so that they presented a good appearance when the cover was taken off and the fruit exposed in the window or on the shelf. The trade in oranges and lemons from Mediterranean countries has become almost extinct in this market. If any one will notice as he walks along Sparks Street or Bank Street and passes the windows of the retail grocers, he will see that nearly every one of the boxes containing oranges bears the name of Stewart, a packer in California who has made a world-wide reputation in the sale of oranges. If the box is longer than it is broad, there is a partition which divides it into two compartments each nearly cubical in form. If you take a box of prunes that comes from Oregon or California you will see that the same method is followed. The boxes are good, the packing neat and nice, and every box, when the cover is taken off and the fruit exposed in the window or on the shelf, makes a good appearance. If you can get apples packed in boxes, the nearer you can approach this size and style of box the better for the retail trade, and I believe, for the packer and the grower also. And if you fix a minimum size, I do not think there is any danger of the packer making a larger box—he is not given to that kind of

thing. I would like to have it understood that a uniform size should be established and, if that is done, the box should be nearer square than oblong.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend opposite (Mr. Sproule) has drawn my attention to the wording of this clause and I feel that that wording must be changed. But I would not venture, at the moment to propose the exact change to be made, therefore I think it would be better to ask the committee to rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again so that at a future sitting, I can bring in the wording properly drawn up.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before the motion is put, I would like to ask the minister when he will be likely to move the House again into committee on this resolution. Shall we have time to communicate with our constituents before that is done ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, I will not ask for committee again for a few days.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. minister (Sir William Mulock) say what business we shall take up to-morrow ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. To-morrow is a private members' day.

Mr. FOSTER. But, if we get through with private members' business ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If we get through with that, we shall probably go into supply, and, in that case, take up the estimates of the Minister of Public Works. There will be no objection, I suppose, to making some progress ?

Mr. FOSTER. On the same principle as the last day ?

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 9.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 8, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. H. GERVAIS (St. James, Montreal) moved that the first report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the official report of the Debates of this House during the present session, which is as follows :

Your committee recommend that their quorum be reduced from eight to five members.

be adopted.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the number of that committee ?

Mr. GERVAIS. Fifteen.

Mr. FOSTER. And you reduce the quorum to what ?

Mr. GERVAIS. To five.

Mr. FOSTER. Why ?

Mr. GERVAIS. I understand that this has been the rule for the last three years.

Motion agreed to.

CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 44) respecting certificates to masters and mates of ships. He said : Perhaps I should inform the House that this Bill is intended to take the place of the Bill (No. 3) which I introduced in the earlier part of the session, which now stands for a second reading. As there are objections to one clause of that Bill, I propose this as a substitute ; it is practically the same Bill with the objectionable clause removed. When the order for the second reading of Bill (No. 3) is reached I shall allow that order to drop.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

STAFF OF RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. How many persons are now upon the staff of the Railway Commission ?
2. What are their names, and what salary and allowance does each receive ?
3. How many persons now constitute the staff of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Commission ?
4. What are their names, and what salary and allowance does each receive ?
5. Who selects the engineers in charge of each of the surveys of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway in the district east of Winnipeg ?
6. Under whose direction and supervision are engineering parties made up and managed, and to whom do the engineers report ; and have any interim or other reports been received ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Twenty-one exclusive of the commissioners.

2. A. D. Cartwright, $3,000 per annum ; J. E. Duval, $2,200 per annum ; E. A. Primeau, $1,800 per annum ; James Hardwell, $3,500 per annum ; Geo. A. Mountain, $4,800 per annum ; A. G. Blair, jr., $2,500 per annum ; E. C. Lalonde, $2,200 per annum ; J. H. Tessier, $1,800 per annum ; T. L. Simmons, $1,800 per annum ; G. A. Brown, $2,000 per annum ; L. J. Lewis, $600 per annum ; B. Chevrier, $800 per annum ; L. M. Cameron, $550 per annum ; F. C. McGee, $800 per annum ; C. E. McManus, $800 per annum ; Jno. W. Thompson, $800 per annum ; H. W. Messenger, $900 per annum ; Norman Ham, $900 per annum ; T. Chandler, $700 per annum ; D. Langelier, $500 per annum ; Wm. Woodruff, $60 per month. No allowances are made except actual reasonable travelling expenses when travelling on government business.

3. Thirty exclusive of the commissioners.

4. H. D. Lumsden, $500 per month ; M. J. Butler, $375 per month ; A. W. H. Stimpson, $125 per month ; C. J. Jones, $80 per month ; Fred. Dillon, $80 per month ; A. L. Ogilvie, $150 per month ; R. L. Landry, $70 per month ; Alice Seed, $25 per month ; R. M. J. McGill, $125 per month ; Jos. Clement, $100 per month ; R. H. Lang, $60 per month ; H. A. Collins, $85 per month ; John Neighorn, $75 per month ; R. Ronan, $70 per month ; D. Lefebvre, $20 per month ; P. E. Ryan, $208.33 per month ; R. F. Uniacke, $150 per month ; Jos. H. Roy, $100 per month ; O. P. Schreiber, $60 per month ; Fred. McCourt, $70 per month ; Percy Wright, $30 per month ; F. W. White, $100 per month ; Geo. O'Reilly, $15 per week ; A. T. Gow, $150 per month ; W. R. Saults, $75 per month ; R. Lagimodiere, $60 per month ; A. Beaudry, $70 per month ; G. Heidmann, $80 per month ; P. Larocque, $70 per month ; John O'Malley, $50 per month. No allowances are made except actual reasonable travelling expenses when travelling on government business.

5. The engineers in charge of parties are appointed by the board upon the recommendation of the chief engineer.

6. The engineering parties were made up in the first place by the board, on the recommendation of the chief and district engineers, and changes in same are made upon the recommendation of the chief of parties and the district engineers and approved by the chief engineer. The engineers in charge of parties report to the district engineers, who report to the chief engineer, and he reports to the board. Interim reports are received from time to time from the parties in the field and district engineers.

INSPECTION OF FENCE WIRE.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

In view of the fact that much hardship and loss arises yearly to the farmers of Canada from the purchase of fraudulent and inferior wire for fencing, is it the intention of the government to institute such inspection of fence wire, whether made at home or abroad, as will safeguard the farmers from losses so arising ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) : If the hon. member for Prince were present, I would have to observe to him that this question is out of order, as it contains a statement of fact, which is contrary to the rules. However, I have no objection to answer the question, and to inform the hon. gentleman that it is not the intention of the government to appoint such an inspector.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. GERVAIS asked :

What is the total number of officers, civil engineers and other employees now engaged in the surveys of the Transcontinental Railway, and works connected therewith, under the Transcontinental Railway Construction Commission ?

2. What is the name and place of residence of each of the above persons at the time of appointment ?

3. What are the functions and salaries of each of the above ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) : As the answer to this question would be a very voluminous one, I would ask my hon. friend to put it in the form of a motion. It involves a list of the axemen, roadmen and all other employees all over the service.

CORNWALL CANAL DREDGING.

Mr. PRINGLE—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. To whom was the contract for dredging at the head of the Cornwall canal given ?
2. Were tenders called for ?
3. If so, in what manner ?
4. If by advertisement, in what papers ?
5. How many tendered for the work ?
6. Was the work given to the lowest tenderer?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. W. J. Poupore (Limited).
2. Yes.
3. By newspaper advertisement.
4. Montreal—'Herald,' 'Witness,' 'La Presse,' 'Le Canada ;'
Ottawa—'Free Press,' 'Danebrog,' 'Le Temps ;'
Cornwall—'Freeholder ;'
Morrisburg—'Herald ;'
Prescott—'Journal ;'
Kingston—'Canadian Freeman,' 'British Whig ;'
Toronto—'Globe,' 'Star,' 'News ;'
Peterboro—'Times.'
5. Five tenders were received.
6. The lowest tenderer having withdrawn, the contract was awarded to the next lowest.

MONTREAL HARBOUR SHEDS.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. Have any claims for extras been made by Messrs. P. Lyall & Sons in connection with their contract for the construction of two-story sheds in the port of Montreal ?
2. If so, what was the amount and the grounds alleged in each case ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) : I would ask my hon. friend to move for the papers, in order that he may get the information he wants.

PENNY BANKS.

Mr. HENDERSON—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. How many charters have been granted by the Governor in Council under the Penny Bank Act of 1903 ?
2. Have any of the said banks so chartered transmitted statements of their business to the Minister of Finance, under section 33 of the said Act ?
3. If any such statements have been sent, what are the names of the banks so reporting, and what is the name of the place where the chief office of each is situated ?

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

1. One.
2. The bank so chartered has not yet received the certificate of the Treasury Board permitting the institution to carry on business under the Act, and accordingly no statements under section 33 have been received.
3. Answered by 2.

COMMUNICATION WITH PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. When was the winter boat 'Stanley,' now in conjunction with the steamship 'Minto' attempting to maintain communication between Prince Edward Island, built, and how long has she been in the public service ?
2. To what extent has the 'Stanley' been weakened by time and contact with heavy ice.
3. Has she been strengthened ? If so, when, and in what respect ?
4. When was she inspected, and what was the report of the inspector ?
5. Has the government considered the necessity of building a new boat ? If so, would she be ready for service in the winter of 1905-6 ?

Hon. J. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) : In this case I think it would be better for the hon. gentleman to move for a return.

THE RAILWAY COMMISSION BOARD.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

1. What was the date of the first sitting of the Railway Commission Board ?
2. What amount has been paid in salaries to each commissioner ?
3. What amount has been paid to date in connection with the Railway Commission Board other than salaries ?
4. How many private secretaries are employed by the board, and what are the names, and the salary paid to each ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. The first public sitting of the Railway Commission Board was on the 9th of February, 1904.
2. Hon. A. G. Blair, $9,045.31 ; Hon. M. E. Bernier, $8,300.99 ; Mr James Mills, $8,300.99.
3. $37,965.55.
4. None.

I. C. R.—RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What are the total receipts and expenditures of the Intercolonial Railway, including all branches, for the current year up to December 31, 1904 ?
2. What amount has been expended on the Intercolonial Railway and its branches, including the purchase of railway lines, from capital account, for each year from 1896 to 1904, inclusive ? What amount since June 30th, 1904 ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Working expenses, $4,104,018.93 ; receipts, $3,621,263.91.

	Year.	Amount.
2.	1897	$ 145,142 00
	1898	252,367 20
	1899	1,081,929 94
	1900	1,796,348 29
	1901	3,633,836 57
	1902	4,621,841 05
	1903	2,254,266 68
	1904	1,880,856 60
	From June 30th, 1904 to December 31st 1904	733,221 29

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC COMMISSION—STAFF AND SALARIES.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What are the respective dates of appointments of the commissions and working staff of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Commission ?
2. What is the total amount expended thereon to December 31, 1904, under the heads, (a) salaries of commissioners ; (b) salaries of staff ; (c) expenses ; (d) rental of quarters ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways) : I shall have to ask the hon. gentleman to move for a return.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to make the motion now ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Give notice.

WORN SILVER COINS.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

Is it the intention of the government to take any steps in the near future towards calling in and redeeming at the face value worn silver coins ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) : This matter is under consideration.

EXPORT OF HAY.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. A. Martin—asked :

How many tons of hay were exported from the province of Quebec to Boston, U.S.A., for the months of October, November and December, 1904, respectively ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The customs returns of exports as compiled show the countries to which goods are exported from Canada, but do not show the ports of destination. I am therefore unable to answer the question just as the hon. gentleman asks it, but the answer which I am able to give him now will perhaps suit his purpose. The quantity of hay exported from the province of Quebec to the United States during the months of October, November, and December respectively was as follows : October, 3,927 tons ; November, 2,508 tons ; December, 4,327 tons.

MONTREAL HARBOUR SHEDS.

Mr. H. B. AMES (St. Antoine, Montreal) moved :

For copies of all correspondence exchanged since the 1st of October last between (a) P. W. St. George, government superintendent engineer, Montreal Harbour sheds, and the Honourable Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and between (b) the Honourable Minister or the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, regarding the plans, specifications or contracts for the new sheds in the port of Montreal.

He said: My object in asking for the correspondence is that its production may tend to reassure the commercial interests of Montreal and the country generally, which are much perturbed by certain disquieting rumours to the effect that the decision of the government in favour of two-story sheds may be changed. I hope that we shall have some explanation from the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine), on this occasion, of a reassuring character and that the correspondence, when produced, may be of such a nature as will lead us to conclude that the government will adhere to its intention, and the contracts be completed as given out. In order that hon. members may understand that it is not without some reason I have felt compelled to move for this correspondence, let me point out the reasons which have led us to think that possibly the government may be contemplating some changes regarding the construction of steel sheds in the port of Montreal. In answer to a question of mine put on January 25 in this House, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries said that, at his instance, Mr. P. W. St. George, the government engineer on the construction of sheds in the port of Montreal, had prepared independent plans, and that these had been submitted to the minister and were now under consideration. And we are able to obtain some idea as to the main feature of these plans from a statement made by Mr. Reford the other day at a meeting of the Harbour Board, when he asked that no further progress be made by that board because the government had under consideration certain other plans for one-story sheds. As reported in the Montreal 'Herald,' Mr. Reford said :

The Shipping Federation had appealed to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and Mr. St. George's plans for one-story sheds were being investigated.

Further, on November 15 last, the Harbour Commissioners received from the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries a letter from which I shall read the following extract :

I have the honour to forward herewith, copy of a letter received from the engineer appointed by this department to inspect the contract for the new harbour sheds, accompanied by memorandum and alternate plans, representing that the sheds now contracted for are not suitable for the requirements of the port and proposing some alterations therein ; and I am instructed by the minister to request you to lay the whole question before the Harbour Commission for their discussion and opinion.

And, as a further indication that there is an element of doubt in this matter, I would refer to a report of a recent meeting of the Harbour Commissioners at which the chief engineer of the port of Montreal stated that it would be hardly possible to have the first group of sheds, given out under the contract, completed by June 1, and that the second group could not possibly be finished in the time called for in the contract, namely, July 15, showing that in the fulfilment of the contract there was evident delay. And my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier(Mr. Monk) stated to this House a few days ago, he had reason to believe that that delay was owing to uncertainty as to whether the present plans would be continued or new plans adopted of an entirely different character.

These are the indications we have that the work of construction is at present being somewhat delayed in view of the uncertainty prevailing as to whether the original plans will be carried out in their entirety. I wish to more especially address my remarks to the members of the government, speaking as a representative of the commercial interests of Montreal. As such I sincerely trust that the government have no intention of reversing their previous decision. My right hon. friend, the first minister, will remember that when there was laid before this House on June 11, 1903, the estimate upon which this House voted $3,000,000 to be advanced to the Harbour Commissioners for the construction of steel sheds, it was distinctly specified that the sheds were to be two-story; and it was on that basis and on that estimate prepared by the Harbour Commissioners that this House concurred in the Bill empowering the government to advance

$3,000,000 to the Harbour Commissioners. The subsequent Act, 3 Edward VII., c. 36, distinctly stipulates that the estimates, plans and specifications should be submitted to the Governor in Council and that before the work could be gone on with the approval of the Governor in Council was necessary. The commissioners, realizing how necessary it was that they should show good reason for the plans they might approve, actually took the entire summer in their preparation. Their engineer was occupied four months preparing these plans. He had made extensive studies, travelled through a number of cities, and finally produced his plans of two-story sheds. These were considered by the Harbour Commissioners at the end of September last, at meetings to which all parties interested were invited to be present. There were present representatives of the shipping, the Board of Trade, the Chambre de Commerce, the Corn Exchange and the Cartage companies, and in fact all those particularly interested in the Port of Montreal. The Harbour Commissioners, in a number of successive sittings, gave these interested parties a full hearing and finally decided to recommend two-story steel sheds, and this recommendation was sent to the government on or about November 1. The government also took careful steps before giving the approval required by law. The Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries went to Montreal and sat with the Harbour Commissioners and heard all the interested parties. On a subsequent occasion the Prime Minister himself, and one of his colleagues were present at a meeting of the Harbour Commissioners and again heard the representations of the parties interested. After keeping these plans nearly two months in Ottawa, after having them inspected by the engineer of the Department of Marine and Fisheries and an engineer of the Department of Public Works, these plans, on recommendation made by the Ministers of Fisheries and Public Works, were finally approved by Order in Council dated December 21, 1903, and were duly signed and transmitted to the Harbour Commissioners. In due course the Commissioners called for tenders. It was stipulated in the Order in Council that the commissioners should not give out contracts without the approval of the Governor General in Council. Consequently when they decided to give a contract to Messrs. Peter Lyall & Co., it was sent to the government and ratified by it, so that the government stands absolutely pledged to the plan of two-story sheds. It was upon this basis that the money was voted, the Order in Council issued, and the contracts let for the 15 sheds to be finished at three different dates. It is therefore, to say the least, surprising that there should now be any question whatever as to whether these plans shall be adhered to. I wish to point out to the ministry that it will be a very serious matter for the Port of Montreal and the shipping interests generally if the plans should be abandoned and replaced by plans for single-story sheds.

It must be remembered that the space available in the port of Montreal is comparatively limited. The upper harbour of Montreal, where the great bulk of the commerce is done, lies between St. Mary's current and the foot of the rapids below the bridge. It is necessary that this space should be utilized to the fullest possible extent. One of the principal objects in adopting the two-story shed plan was that they might have, as it were, the double wharf space. Another advantage of the two-story sheds is that they will be able to keep the through freight and the package freight separate. The through freight is increasing in volume every year. The railway companies demand and require practically the entire surface of the wharf for their business. And it is proposed that the package freight shall be handled on the second story, leaving the first to the railways. There will be no clashing of interests, while there will be a saving of time, and a reduction to the minimum of danger to life and property. It is necessary to point out that the whole tendency throughout the large ports of the world is in the direction of two-story and even three-story sheds. I could name a dozen or fifteen of the large ports that have been equipped with two-story sheds and some even with those of three stories. And if the port of Montreal were restricted to sheds of one-story it would certainly greatly diminish its power to handle its incoming and outgoing freight. So, I sincerely trust the government will not go back on its previous decision. I admit that the plan of two-story sheds is not absolutely acceptable to all concerned. Some companies that have small ships coming to the port of Montreal, and some cartage companies that are afraid of the incline, prefer the one-story shed. But I would point out the fact that the tendency in the port of Montreal is to have larger ships year by year coming to do the business. In 1894 the average vessel that came to Montreal was 1,500 net tons; in 1900, the average 2,000 net tons, and in 1904, 2,400 net tons. So, you will see there has been an increase within the decade of 60 per cent in the net tonnage of the freight-carrying vessels. The average tonnage of an Allan liner is 6,645 tons gross; of a Dominion liner 7,117 gross, on the line that runs from Liverpool to Glasgow and 5,000 on the Antwerp line; of the Canadian Pacific Railway liners 7,060 gross, and of the Reford liners 2,400 net or about 3,700 or 3,800 gross. I would point out that most of the objections to the two-story shed and most of the arguments in favour of the single-story shed come from those who are interested in the smaller boats. But there is ample provision for these boats in other portions of the harbour, and there is no need why they should claim to remain in that portion of the harbour

where two-story sheds should be built. And so I have moved for the return in the hope that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine), speaking for the government, may take occasion to allay the anxiety that prevails amongst the commercial elements of the city of Montreal as to the possible change of front on the part of the government with reference to the two-story sheds in that port. I move for it also in the hope that, when this correspondence is brought down, we may find that this which I have cited simply means that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Prefontaine), with his usual courtesy, has opened a discussion with the interested parties, but with no intention whatever of changing the original decision at which the government has arrived.

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I have much pleasure in stating at once that there is no objection whatever to the production of the papers. They will be laid on the table without delay. As regards the anxiety of which the hon. member (Mr. Ames) has spoken as existing among the business people of Montreal, I must admit that there is such anxiety. But it exists not on account of the one-story sheds but on account of the two-story sheds. That is the position in which the question stands at this moment. So far as the department is concerned, we approved of the two-story shed after a good deal of consideration by the different bodies of Montreal and by the Minister of Public Works as well as by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. But it was discovered afterwards that the effect of having two-stories would not be to give the satisfaction that the shipping conference expected from this work. The shipping conference really represents the maritime interests of the port of Montreal. They unanimously began an agitation to have the plans remodelled. Their difficulty was that there were too many columns in the first story of the sheds and that these columns were too near together. They were set at about 15 feet centres. It was thought that the lower story or at least a part of it, would be practically useless by reason of the presence of these columns. The question of modifying the plans was referred to me as minister responsible for the execution of these works, of course, under the superintendence of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal. I referred the question to the engineer in charge appointed by the government. He had many conferences with the shipping federation, and he came to the conclusion that if the plans of two-story sheds were maintained, the difficulty caused by the too numerous columns could not be avoided, and there should be one-story sheds at least on those piers which were supposed to be used by the largest steamship companies. Mr. St. George prepared plans therefore, and showed that with the one-story shed and the absence of columns he could get more space than with the two-story sheds. So, I might say with good reason that it is not a change of front on the part of anybody, but simply a change of the inside disposition of the sheds. As I am not an engineer, and am not supposed to know these things, I referred the whole matter not only to the shipping federation but to the Harbour Commissioners. That was as far back as November or December last. The construction has gone on since that time. The question has been decided whether the sheds are to be two-story or one-story. But the Harbour Commissioners have acknowledged through their chief engineer, that these columns which were supposed to be absolutely necessary to carry the second story are not necessary at all or at least one-third of them. On consulting a competent architect they have been given this advice. This consultation was by the Harbour Commissioners themselves. They did not consult the superintending engineer of the government, but consulted Mr. Marchand, a young architect of great talent, one who has had a great deal of experience and who is now directing the construction of some of the most important buildings in Montreal. The result was that I had a communication this morning from the Harbour Commissioners themselves, asking for a change of plan as regards the columns of the first story, which would involve a cost of $35,000, thereby admitting that the plans first made out were not what they should have been. I may repeat that this is not a question of two stories or of one story ; it makes practically no difference to the marine and shipping interests of Montreal whether there is one story or two stories. But they want one of the stories at least to be useful for the heavy freight they desire to bring into Montreal.

Now, as regards the assertion made by the hon. gentleman that it was only the owners of small steamers who were opposing the two story plan, quite the contrary is the fact. They want to get the most space possible in the first story, and if it was found impossible to do away with some of the pillars, then they want the shed to be reduced to one story. Others, including all the owners of the large steamers, are really discouraged, and the correspondence will show they stated in the most formal way that if the first story were to be constructed in that way it would be perfectly useless, and they would be driven from the port of Montreal. In face of such representations I think we were perfectly right in trying to conciliate the opposing views and bring them to an understanding. I must say that the shipping conference, when they approved of the original plan, did not notice, for one reason or another, how disadvantageous would be the first story with columns of about 15 feet centre. Of course if that objection had been discovered sooner, this discussion about taking away

some of the columns would not have arisen. I am quite sure that the question will be settled satisfactorily to the business men in Montreal and to the shipping federation especially, composed of those who are particularly interested in having the sheds made in such a way as to prove most advantageous to the port of Montreal.

The papers and all the correspondence will be laid before the House. But I am quite sure this is not the last time this subject will come before the House at the present session, because other measures will be brought down which will permit a full discussion of the whole question. It is not an ordinary question. When I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that this question has been agitating the business men of Montreal for the last ten years, it is not strange that some difficulties and some misunderstandings should have arisen regarding the construction of these sheds. There will probably be some difficulty until they are finished, which will not be for three or four years. But I do not think that anything has been done by the Harbour Commissioners or their officers, or by the government, in any way to jeopardize the usefulness and advantages to be derived from the construction of these sheds.

Motion agreed to.

CUSTOMS RULINGS RE DUMPING CLAUSES.

Mr. KEMP moved :

For copies of all circulars or instructions, regulations and rulings made by the Customs Department, together with any Orders in Council, relating to section 19 and subsections thereto of the Act to amend the Customs Tariff, 1897, assented to August 10th, 1904, commonly known as the ' dumping clause.'

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I suppose the hon. gentleman does not mean all the rulings, but only the general rulings under which the decisions are given.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—TRAIN SERVICE, N.S.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson), if he were here, a telegram which I received a few moments ago from a gentleman whom I well know :

Springhill Junction, N.S., Feb. 8, 1905.

Three trains stalled here for over 12 hours many passengers without food, please bring matter up in parliament.

I have discharged the gentleman's request by bringing the matter to the attention of the government. I had a somewhat similar experience myself, but I did not suppose it could be controlled, because the storm was very severe at the time. I trust the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will bring the matter to the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals. will send him over the telegram.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has read a telegram in reference to the stalling of trains at Springhill. I may say that about one o'clock I received a telegram from a gentleman signing himself R. A. Mcntyre, stating in effect what is contained in the telegram sent to my hon. friend. He states here that several trains were stalled and he wishes provision made for feeding the passengers. I communicated at once with Mr. Pottinger, who is in the city, and in reply to the message he says :

I have telegraphed down for an explanation. It was probably due to a severe storm that we had on both Prince Edward Island and the mainland, as you will see by two telegrams inclosed. Will let you have further particulars as soon as I can get them.

One of the telegrams to Mr. Pottinger is as follows :

Snow storm with high wind set in at Halifax last night. No. 70 stuck at Rockingham ; D. A. R. special hauled out, arrived Richmond five twenty. Special with cattle and meats for mail steamer stuck at Rockingham, reached Halifax seven forty. Steamer waited. Halifax yard badly blocked. Nothing could be done after two o'clock. Took three engines to take cattle to Deepwater.

The superintendent of the Prince Edward Island Railway telegraphed Mr. Pottinger to this effect that :

The storm of last night is still raging ; is extremely severe. All trains tied up till storm abates. We anticipate much trouble to clear the track.

The difficulty seems to have come upon them suddenly. Mr. Pottinger has wired to Springhill Junction in respect to looking after the passengers. My attention only having been called to it at one o'clock I could do nothing in the matter, but I have taken these steps since that time.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). I would like to direct the attention of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to question number 5 on the order paper :

1. Have any claims for extras been made by Messrs. P. Lyall & Sons in connection with their contract for the construction of two-story sheds in the port of Montreal ?

2. If so, what was the amount and the grounds alleged in each case ?

3. Were the said claims admitted and approved by the Harbour Commissioners and by the Chief Engineer ?

4. Were the said claims recommended for payment by the government superintendent engineer for the Montreal Harbour sheds ?

5. Were the said claims in dispute submitted to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ? If so, what amount did he award to the contractor in each case ?

The right hon. gentleman asked my hon. friend who moved it (Mr. Ames) to make a motion for a return. If the Prime Minister will examine the question, he will see that nearly every one of the inquiries can be answered by yes or no, except the one involving the grounds alleged in each case.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The hon. gentleman will see that everything depends upon the inquiry number 2 concerning the amount and the grounds alleged. Therefore the report of the engineer and the correspondence will be necessary. There are different grounds, and there is a report upon each.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Copies of all forms and instructions issued to the returning officers in the several provinces and territories for use in the recent geneneral election for the House of Commons.—Mr. Barker.

Copy of the voters' lists for the constituency of Macdonald, supplied to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery prior to the general elections of 1904. Also for copies of the voters' lists supplied by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to the returning officer for Macdonald constituency for the same elections. And for copies of voters' lists supplied to the various deputy returning officers by the returning officer in the constituency of Macdonald.—Mr. Staples.

RESIGNATION OF MR. BLAIR.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. Prime Minister or the hon. Minister of Justice promised, the other day, to lay on the table the telegram and letter of resignation of Mr. Blair, as chairman of the commission.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The resignation of Mr. Blair ?

Mr. FOSTER. The telegram and letter of resignation of the chairman of the commission.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has moved for an order for it and the whole correspondence will be brought down. I expect to have it to-morrow.

COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND MAINLAND.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN (Queen's, P. E. I.) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to call the right hon. Prime Minister's attention to a question which I referred to the other day ; that is in regard to the present communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. The steamers have stopped. The communication is now had between the Capes and by sailing boats. When the boats reached Cape Tormentine there is not such a thing as a special train to carry the mails and passengers to Sackville. This has been a grievance in the province for years. The boats are necessarily irregular at the Capes because the crossing at the Capes depends on the state of the wind and of the ice. When they reach Cape Tormentine the regular train generally has left, and the passengers and mails have to be detained there for twenty-four hours in some cases, merely because the government has not thought proper to put a special train on between Cape Tormentine and Sackville. The expenditure in that direction would not be very large. It is only during a short period that it would be necessary, but the inconvenience and loss sustained by the people of Prince Edward Island every year is a very serious matter. While I tell the right hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Postmaster General that in the reading room we find the last papers there a week behind time they will understand how inconvenient the situation is. I have a telegram to-day to ask to bring this question to the attention of the Postmaster General every day until we get a remedy. I hope this duty will not be imposed on me for any length of time.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—STATION AGENT AT FREDERICTON.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are taken up I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) when we might expect the correspondence to be brought down in regard to the dismissal of Odbur White from the position of station master on the Intercolonial Railway at Fredericton. I moved for this correspondence on Thursday, January 26. At that time I understood the hon. minister to state that there was only one letter received from Mr. White and the minister's reply, and I would like to know from the hon. minister when we might expect these papers.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON. I trust that the impatience of my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) will be satisfied very soon. For some reason or other the papers only came under my notice yesterday, and this morning I gave instructions to have them copied at once so that we may expect an immediate return. I am also searching to see whether there are any other letters or any references to the matter in any letters which have from time to time been received from the officers of the Intercolonial Railway in connection with railway matters generally.

RUMOURED APPOINTMENT OF HON. S. N. PARENT TO TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to ask a question of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I would not like to increase his troubles particularly since that painful amputation in Ontario of his right arm, but another one of his limbs is very much attacked just now in the province of Quebec, and there are many rumours floating around, one of them to the effect that one of the ministers of the Crown has gone to Quebec to try and patch up the trouble. In support of that rumour this statement has appeared in some of the papers and it has been said since then on high authority that:

The Hon. S. N. Parent, Premier of Quebec, will shortly accept a seat on the National Transcontinental Railway Construction Commission. At present he represents the government on the Grand Trunk Pacific directorate.

There was an idea prevailing in the city of Montreal this morning from the reports I have received, that a solemn promise was made by the present government, if not personally by the right hon. Prime Minister himself, that if Mr. Parent tries to fix up his government for the session he will be appointed to the construction commission when the session is over, and that the premier will then be succeeded by Mr. Gouin. I do not know if my question can be answered now, but if it could it would do a great deal to alleviate the trouble that seems to exist in the minds of certain people around the city of Montreal.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). It would be uncharitable of me were I not to alleviate the heroic statements that oppress my hon. friend at this moment. His arm seems to be sound and all right.

Mr. BERGERON. I have lost nothing yet.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The trouble seems to be elsewhere. I have no objection to say to my hon. friend that there has been no promise made by the government in any way whatever.

ICE JAM IN THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER (Dundas). Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to again refer to a matter which I took the liberty of referring to on Monday, January 30, and to again call the attention of the government to the ice jam in the St. Lawrence near Woodland in the county of Stormont. The jam extends from that town westward for about seven miles, completely fills up the open current and the water has risen to such an extent that it has driven people from their habitations and that they have been obliged to remove their cattle from their stables although the banks are high. The water at Morrisburg which is 12 miles from the commencement of the ice bridge is within 16 or 18 inches of running over the lock gates, up current. I call the attention of the government to this condition of things hoping that they will see fit to send some expert there to see whether it will be possible to alleviate the difficulty. The officials who are there, no matter what their ability might be, have no appliances to deal with the situation, and it seems to me that the matter is so serious and threatens such danger to a considerable number of people living adjacent to the river, that some cognizance should be taken of the condition of affairs; the winter is so cold and the ice bridge has formed so early in the winter that it is a very serious matter, because if this weather continues much longer it will prove disastrous. During the past 18 years there have been four ice bridges formed in the river. The ice bridge 18 years ago did a good deal of damage, but the difference between the previous ice bridge and the present is that the previous bridges formed later in the year, and the spring coming shortly afterwards broke them up. But this bridge has formed six weeks earlier than in previous years and it is certainly a very serious condition of things. The people are very much alarmed at the conditions and are looking to the government for some cognizance to be taken of the conditions. I hope the Minister of Railways and Canals will send an expert to see if something cannot be done. I know that it is a difficult matter to deal with and I understand from those who have had some experience that it is not possible to dynamite the ice owing to the formation of what is called anchor ice, the ice and the snow particularly going under the surface forms a bottom that is not solid enough to permit the use of dynamite. But I think the government should take some action.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). The difficulty referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Broder) has certainly been receiving the attention of the officers of the Department of Railways and Canals. The chief engineer, at the very outset, took steps to remedy as far as possible any difficulty that might arise. He has, however, brought to my attention a question as to whether the difficulty is not due very largely to those who have developed water-powers along the canal. There is a suspicion among the officials of the department that possibly if the power developers were to take proper steps—and of course it would put them to some expense—the difficulty might very largely be obviated. How far this may be true I know not, but it is thought that possibly a good deal of the difficulty arises from that cause. Whatever the difficulties may be, they are receiving the attention of the chief engineer, and

the department is attempting to do whatever lies within their scope. Injuries to the canal and to adjacent properties are being guarded against as far as possible.

Mr. BRODER. I think the difficulty is not caused by any people having to do with the water-powers. From what I learn from local people the ice forms in the bay, and then, when a wind storm blows from the east for any length of time, it lowers the water in the bay by a foot or two and the ice breaks loose from the bay, swings around, catches on the opposite side and the bridge is formed in that way. I was told by a gentleman in the locality that he was told by a man in the employ of the American company developing power at Messina, on the opposite shore, that they cut the ice loose and floated it out to avoid trouble. I am telling this only on the authority of a reliable man who had it from a man who said that he was engaged in the work. If this statement is true it is a matter that no one but the government can deal with. Those who know the situation say that if piers were built in the bay to hold the ice and prevent it from floating out, the dangers would be altogether avoided. It seems to me that the engineers of the department could easily look into that matter although it is a question that would be of an international character, because the bay is on American soil.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (North Victoria). I had the honour last session, and I think a previous session also, of drawing the attention of the first minister to the fact that owing to the cutting of the Hay Lake channel approaching Sault Ste. Marie, the water in the natural international channel has been lowered two feet and the water on the sills of the canal had been lowered to the same degree. The government last session, promised to take action in the matter. Has anything been done ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have appointed an international commission composed of American and Canadian engineers to investigate the matter.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The Chicago Drainage canal too ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Everything connected with international waters. It is a question very much larger than my hon. friend's question implies.

LABOUR UNION LABELS.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 10) respecting Labour Union Labels—Mr. Ralph Smith.

On section 1.

Mr. HAGGART. The expression 'Labour Union' means every association of labourmen and women ? Does this labour union require to be registered, incorporated or anything of that kind ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. No. There is no provision at all for the incorporation of trades unions in this country. They can register under the Trades Unions Act, as they can in England.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I had not the advantage of being present when this Bill received its second reading ; but I think it would be desirable to have some intimation from the Prime Minister as to the view the government takes of the Bill. It is one involving rather important provisions, and I would like to bring to his attention what, of course, is already familiar to him, that on all important matters of legislation, it is not only the duty of the government to have a policy, but in modern constitutional practice it is the duty of the government to originate such legislation and place it before the House. In 'Anson on the Law and Custom of the Constitution,' second edition, at page 139, it is laid down that 'every important measure of legislation is now brought forward upon the responsibility of the cabinet.' In 'Todd's Parliamentary Government in England,' second volume, at page 367, the practice is also laid down as follows:—

> By modern constitutional practice, ministers of the Crown are held responsible for recommending to parliament whatsoever laws are required to advance the national welfare, or to promote the political or social interest of any class or interest in the commonwealth.

Further on it is said :

> But it has only been by degrees, and principally since the passing of the Reform Acts of 1832, that it has come to be an established principle, that all important Acts of legislation should be originated, and their passage through parliament facilitated, by the advisers of the Crown.

Again, on the same page :

> But the growing interest which, of late years, has been exhibited by the constituent bodies upon all public questions, and the consequent necessity for systematic and enlightened legislation for the improvement of our political and social institutions, and for the amelioration of the laws, in accordance with the wants of an advancing civilization, together with the difficulty experienced by private members in carrying bills through parliament, have led to the imposition of additional burthens upon the ministers of the Crown, by requiring them to prepare and submit to parliament whatever measures of this description may be needed for the public good ; and also to take the lead in advising parliament to amend or reject all crude, imperfect, or otherwise objectionable measures which may at any time be introduced by private members.

Further on :

> Bearing this in mind, it must be admitted that the rule that all great and important public measures should emanate from the executive has of late years obtained increasing acceptance.

I make these references, which are no doubt quite familiar to the right hon. gentle-

man, not so much for the purpose of emphasizing the point which I might make, that a measure of this great importance ought to be introduced, if at all, and put through parliament by the government, but more especially for the purpose of pressing the somewhat subordinate point, that when a measure of this kind is introduced by a private member—a measure which has already on at least one occasion, if not two, passed the House of Commons and been defeated in the upper chamber—we should at least have some declaration of the policy of the government in order that we may have the benefit of the experience and wisdom of the gentlemen who sit on the treasury benches in regard to a measure of so much very great importance.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no exception to take to the principle which has been enunciated by my hon. friend, that all important measures in this age should be introduced and carried on the initiative of the government, the government taking the responsibility of them. But there are measures which may be of importance to some persons, but which the government do not feel called upon to take charge of, because they do not, as a government, share the views held by the supporters of those measures. As to this measure, while the government recognizes its importance, it is not one of those on which they feel called upon to take the initiative or to introduce as a ministerial measure. As to the second principle laid down by my hon. friend, that when a measure of this importance is introduced the government should state what their policy is upon it, I have to observe that measures are often introduced into this House on which the government, as a government, does not feel called upon to exercise any action of their own. There may be measures, as often happens, on which members of the government have independent opinions ; some may favour the measure and others may not. Of course, if the measure is of such importance that public opinion absolutely requires the government to take action upon it, the government must take the responsibility of accepting or refusing to accept the measure. As to this particular measure, the course of the government is perfectly clear, because it does not come before the House for the first time. If my recollection is right, it comes for the third time, certainly for the second, and it has been passed by this House before under exactly similar circumstances to those under which it now comes before it ; that is to say, introduced by a private member. On this measure the government do not feel called upon to take action, but they leave it to each individual member to deal with according to his own judgment.

Mr. SPROULE. That seems a very extraordinary course for a government to take, because the government must be responsible for every measure that passes this House. They are there for that purpose. The very fact that a measure is allowed to pass the House is an evidence that the government are in favour of the principle of the measure. That is the only interpretation that could be reasonably put upon the government's action. If the government are not in favour of the principle of the measure, they may allow it to pass if they have not the moral courage to say so, and then have it killed in the Senate. If the government are in favour of the principle of this measure under these circumstances, the government are responsible for the measure, because they certainly could bring the upper and lower Houses into accord, or else they ought to abandon it. So that the government must be equally responsible for the measure, whether it goes through or is killed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the government must be held responsible for the measure, I suppose it must ; I cannot help that. My hon. friend says we are responsible. I have no objection to my hon. friend saying so ; that is his right ; but even if it be the right of my hon. friend to think that we are derelict in our duty in not accepting or rejecting this measure, that is a point on which I must take issue with him. But I have to say to my hon. friend, whether he thinks we are wanting in moral courage or not, that we are disposed not to affirm this measure or to oppose it, but to say to those who support us generally that on this question we have no advice to offer them. If my hon. friend says that in taking that position we are wanting in moral courage, we cannot help that ; but he has to show his moral courage by saying whether he will support or oppose this measure.

Mr. SPROULE. I am quite sure that if the responsibility rested here, the leader of the opposition and his followers would be prepared to do so.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They have the opportunity now. The opposition have opposed more than one measure brought in by the government.

Mr. HENDERSON. I must confess that I am more surprised than I ever was——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think so.

Mr. HENDERSON—at anything, by what I have heard from the right hon. First Minister. We have now arrived at the stage where a government with a large following behind them are afraid to say that they have a mind of their own. They dare not express their opinion ; they dare not tell their followers what is right and what is wrong ; they leave the question to be decided by them. I think it is a well recognized principle of legislation that the government should have a policy, not only on every Bill that

comes before this House, but on every resolution, and they should be prepared to stand up and declare what that policy is, for the guidance of the members of this House. How is the House to know what the government desire? The government is the body that is responsible for the legislation of the country. Surely the first minister is not going to allow this Bill to pass without indicating in some way whether he thinks this legislation should or should not pass. To my mind it would be a most extraordinary condition—an entirely new condition of things in this House. We do look for something with more backbone in it than a simple declaration from the government that, although they are responsible they do not propose to state what their opinion is.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am very sorry, Mr. Speaker, that I have fallen so low in my friend's estimation. I am not surprised, however; and, even at the risk of losing still more of such good opinion of the government as he may have—it is not very much I admit—I have to say to my hon. friend that, on this occasion I will not give him any advice. In the first place, I am sure, that, if we were to give him advice he would not follow it. And in the second place, I understand him too well; I am too old a bird to be caught by such chaff as that. I can only tell him that the government will do on this occasion as it did before and leave the matter to the members of the House, to be dealt with as they please.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) forgets that he created, at large expense to the country, a Labour Department; and alongside of him sits the Minister of Labour (Sir William Mulock), here is a question of great importance to the working classes of this country and to the labour unions. They come here to-day with a proposition which they think is in their interest; and we are only within our rights in asking the Minister of Labour to state the policy of the government in regard to this Bill. If they believe in responsible government which they have always put forward in theory, but avoided in practice, the Minister of Labour is bound to state the policy of the government in regard to this question which is of such great importance to so large a portion of the community.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I suppose my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in a mild way is endorsing the doctrine enunciated by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) when he suggested that measures of importance should originate with the government. If we were to follow the view of the leader of the opposition, what would become of the functions of such hon. members as my hon. friend from South York? There is one of his measures on the paper to-day—there is one every day. And if we proposed to assist the judgment of the House and to determine the question by the will of the majority no one would be louder in denunciation of our course than would the hon. gentleman himself. We propose to leave the House greater liberty. We want to have the benefit of the unbiased opinion of every hon. member in the House on measures of this character. As the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has said this is not a measure on which public opinion is divided. None of the members of this House, I presume, have mandates from their constituents as to how they shall vote upon questions of this kind. From time to time questions arise after the election of a new parliament upon which no previous public opinion has been expressed, and it has ever been the practice of parliament to allow freedom of action to individual members on questions of this kind. This is the first time since I entered parliament when any government has been asked not to allow liberty to members in reference to a measure of this kind. And, in deference to the liberty of the hon. member for South York, I must stand in defence of the old practise.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The rule laid down by Todd in another portion of the work which I have just quoted covers the point just adverted to by the Postmaster General:

> By modern practice, no sooner does a great question become practical or a small question great, than the House demands that it shall be 'taken up' by the government. Nor is this from laziness or indifference. It is felt, with a wise instinct, that only thus can such questions in general acquire the momentum necessary to propel them to their goal, with the unity of purpose which alone can uphold their efficiency and preserve their contistency of character.

In England, where this doctrine is carried out, private members are not debarred from introducing measures of great importance. If a measure of great importance is introduced by a private member and attracts the attention of parliament and the country, it is the practice there for the government, if they approve the policy embodied in the legislation, to take it up as a government measure and in that way procure its enactment. And my hon. friend from South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) suggests that that is especially the case where the measure referred to has already received the sanction of the House of Commons, as this measure has, I believe, on two occasions.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Some person must determine the importance of the measure. Who shall determine it? It cannot be the opposition that shall determine whether or not the government shall regard the measure as of sufficient importance to declare its policy upon it. The government must determine that question. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) quotes the hon.

member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) as saying that because this measure has twice received the practically unanimous approval of this House, we should therefore make it a party question here. If there were force in that observation there would be no necessity for the government to guide the opinion of the House, for the House has already twice expressed its opinion. The House appears to have an opinion ; it is not drifting ; it is not at the mercy of every wind. Its opinion has been crystallized in a Bill passed by the House on two occasions.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman (Sir William Mulock) forgets that, this measure having been blocked by the Senate, another constitutional question arises. An irresponsible portion of this parliament sees fit, against the declared policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite to block popular legislation. Gentlemen opposite are on record as being against any such interference with legislation ; in fact they are the gentlemen who made reform of the Senate one of the planks of their platform. They say this measure has twice been passed in this House with practically unanimous approval. That means that it had the approval of these hon. gentlemen themselves. Therefore, it is incumbent upon them, I take it, to find out why this legislation, which has received the endorsement of this House does not go through the other branch of the legislature. As to what the Minister of Labour (Sir William Mulock) has said in regard to my position—that, if the government were forced to take up the questions that I have taken up in the House, I would not get a hearing—I would say that private members have to bring these proposals forward because the government refuses to do it. The only way to bring these ideas before the public and make them grow in the public mind is for private members to bring them forward. So, his argument is not apposite to the question before the House. Again I say, it is the duty of the Minister of Labour to tell the labour organizations of this country—a very large and respected element in the community—what is the opinion of the government in regard to this question and why, when the House of Commons favour such a proposition we cannot secure the endorsation of the other branch of parliament.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) can readily obtain the opinion of any member of this House on this proposition ; he can exercise his right to challenge a vote upon it. We do not propose to deprive him of his rights and take away his occupation by adopting the suggestion of the hon. leader of the opposition.

On section 2,

2. Every labour union which before the passing of this Act, has adopted or used, or which hereafter adopts or uses a label to designate, make known or distinguish any goods, wares, merchandise or other product of labour as having been made, manufactured, produced, prepared, packed, handled or put on sale by such labour union, or by a member or members thereof, may register such label in the Department of Agriculture, by leaving two copies, counterparts or facsimiles thereof with the minister, or his deputy, along with one application for the registration of the label, and by filing therewith a declaration made by the president, secretary or other officer of such labour union, specifying the name of the labour union on behalf of which label is being registered, the class of merchandise and a description of the goods to which it has been or is intended to be appropriated, and stating that, to the best of his knowledge, information and belief, the labour union on behalf of which the application for registration is being made has the right to the use of the same, that no other person, firm, labour union, association or corporation has the right to such use, either in the identical form or in any such near resemblance thereto as may be calculated to deceive, and that the facsimiles or counterparts are true and correct ; and, thereafter such labour union shall have the exclusive right to use such label for the purpose aforesaid.

Mr. HAGGART. You are giving an entity to some labour union and to the chairman or somebody else connected with it, who have no existence in law. I understood the hon. gentleman, when he introduced the Bill, to make the statement that the secretary or president of a labour union in Great Britain, although it is not registered at all, has the rights he is asking for here.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. That is what I understand.

Mr. HAGGART. Has the Minister of Justice looked into the question ? You are here giving a legal entity to a party who cannot be sued and against whom you can have no claims for damages.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes you can.

Mr. HAGGART. I thought that the finding of the courts in the old country declaring that these unions could be sued and made liable was considered an extraordinary thing and struck terror into the labour unions. But in England they are registered and here there is no registration.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. It has been clearly proven in the old country that the unions, whether registered or not, are liable in law. In the Taff Vale case, a decision was given against a union which had no incorporation and was not registered at all, and three weeks ago, a judgment was given in British Columbia against the Rossland Miners' Union, a non-incorporated body, and the whole of its assets were taken under that judgment. We have any number of instances, especially in the old country, of individual members of unions being liable for any breach of law.

Mr. OSLER. What were the assets of the Rossland Mining Company ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. They had a large amount in the bank and a very valuable hall.

Mr. OSLER. I understand that it was an American Association, and that the funds were sent at once across the line, and the judgment was of no value whatever.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. The union was simply affiliated with an American union, but its funds and property were appropriated as a result of that judgment.

Mr. HAGGART. Read clause ten :

Nothing in this Act contained shall enable any suit, action, garnishee, interpleader or other proceedings to be brought, had or maintained against the labour union, except for the purposes of this Act.

Thus in case this Act might give them an entity, they are made exempt by clause 10. What has the Minister of Justice to say to that ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. When that clause is reached, we will consider it.

Mr. HAGGART. We are dealing with it now in connection with the clause before us.

Mr. OSLER. The hon. member for Nanaimo stated the other day, without any reservation, that a similar law has been in operation in England, during twelve years.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. They can register in England under the Copyright Act. That is the only difference.

Mr. OSLER. I would like to have the opinion of the Minister of Justice as to whether that is an essential difference or not.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I must confess that I have looked only somewhat hastily over the Bill, and should be glad indeed if the promoter would point to me any similar legislation in any country. There is no such legislation that I know of anywhere, and there are some provisions which it will be my duty to oppose when we reach them.

Mr. OSLER. I have been trying to find out in the library the Acts referred to as being in operation in England or in the United States, and have not been able to find any. He told us that exactly similar legislation has been passed in no less than 31 states of the Union. If this statement be accurate, it would facilitate the passage of this Bill for us to have copies of these Acts. I have not been able to find any nor have I been able to find any one who can tell me where to get them.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I reiterate the statement I made, that there are provisions in the English Copyright Act for the Registration of Labour Unions, and that this Bill has been copied from a similar measure which is in operation in 31 states of the Union. The lawyer responsible for the Trades Congress of Canada copied this Bill from a similar one in operation in these 31 states, and I should think it would be an easy matter to find them.

Mr. OSLER. Could the hon. gentleman give the year they were passed ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. No, I took my statement from the lawyer who drafted the Bill.

Mr. OSLER. I am not asking this because I oppose the Bill, but because I have very great difficulty in forming an opinion. The leading manufacturers are so strongly against it, that one can hardly believe that they would take the position they do unless they had some very good grounds. On the other hand, the trades unions are just as strong in its favour. I would be very much relieved if I could find that a similar Bill has been in operation in Great Britain for 12 years and is now in operation in 31 states in the Union and that there is no great outcry against it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is under a general provision of the English Copyright Act that similar rights are conferred upon labour unions.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Yes, a provision in the English Copyright Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the hon. gentleman at hand the particular provision in that Act?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. No. As I have already said, I introduced this Bill entirely relying on the statements made and the information given by the lawyer who had it in hand. But it would be an easy matter to find that out. I think it was in 1892 that the unions of England asked the British parliament to make the registration of labels possible, and an amendment for that purpose was made to the Copyright Act.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand the object of this legislation is to guarantee that the goods are union made goods, are of good material, and of good workmanship.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. That is the object.

Mr. INGRAM. A document has been put into my hands—and I suppose other hon. gentlemen have received it, relating to this matter. As the House is aware, it is a common thing when legislation of any kind is introduced that may be objectionable in some quarter, and that occurs almost every session, for the interested parties who oppose the legislation to furnish the members with information to be used against such legislation. Now this document has been sent to me, signed by the officers of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, incorporated. They represent in this document

that certain advertisements have appeared in the Toronto 'World' March 24, 26 and 30 last. In looking over those advertisements I noticed that the men are asking for a label to be put on goods that are of good workmanship, and good material, in respect to which union wages are being paid. Now, I have looked over the Toronto 'World' of those three dates, and I do not find any such advertisement in it. I want therefore to say that if the Manufacturers' Association has placed this document in the hands of members for the purpose of influencing them against this so-called objectionable legislation, and has done it under a false statement, then I say this House should censure the Manufacturers' Association. On other occasions I have read documents furnished to members of this House which were not correct statements of facts in regard to legislation. I think hon. gentlemen on both sides should frown down conduct of that kind. So far as this Bill is concerned, I know it has passed the House on previous occasions; and while I am willing to support any reasonable legislation on behalf of organized labour, at the same time I believe that labour unions should be just as responsible for their conduct as are manufacturing institutions whose goods they propose to put the union label on.

An hon. member has this moment drawn my attention to the fact that in the Toronto 'World' on April 2, there does appear in fact an advertisement such as mentioned by the Manufacturers' Association. Therefore, I withdraw my first statement, and acknowledge that they were justified in issuing this document.

I was saying that if the labour unions throughout the country want this kind of legislation they should be registered, they should be incorporated, so that they may become responsible for any agreement or arrangement they may make with the manufacturers. Unless they are prepared to assume their fair share of responsibility, they ought not to ask for unreasonable legislation. If they are willing to do that, then I see no reason why they should not be granted legislation giving them the right on certain terms to use the union label, which would be a guarantee to the consumers that whatever articles bore that label were of good workmanship and material, and of first class quality.

On section 4,—cancellation of label—transfer of right to label.

Mr. OSLER. This gives the right to a labour union to have their label cancelled at almost any time. It seems to me this will produce complications when a union becomes merged with another.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. The intention of the section is to provide that any union that has been using a label may become affiliated with another union of the same craft. But I would like to remind the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) that this label will not be used, as the hon. gentleman will see by another section of the Bill, without the consent of the manufacturers. In the discussion of this Bill we are acting on the assumption that the label can be used against the wish of the manufacturer when we are making it impossible to compel the use of the label against the wish of the manufacturer. The Bill does not oblige the manufacturer to use it, so that whatever changes occur in the operation of the label the union must have the consent of the manufacturer. Without that consent he can simply refuse to put the label on the article.

On section 5,

The exclusive right acquired for a label, when registered, shall be valid for the term of twenty-five years, but may be renewed before the expiration of the said term, by the labour union which has registered the same or by its transferee, for another term of twenty-five years, and so on from time to time; but every such renewal shall be registered before the expiration of the current term of twenty-five years.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I notice that the hon. gentleman who is supposed to look after the interests of justice in this House and to see that legislation is properly controlled is absent.

Mr. HYMAN. My hon. friend the Ministre of Justice went to the library for the purpose of looking up the Acts to which reference has been made.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Then the Bill had better stand. The Bill should not be passed in his absence.

Mr. OSLER. Would it not be well to postpone the discussion of this Bill? If we have evidence that this Bill is in operation in Great Britain, and in thirty-one states, and if we can compare the clauses that will facilitate the passage of the Bill enormously, and I think it will be a satisfaction to a great many hon. members of this House if we can have that information before we discuss the Bill.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. If there were no such law in England or in the United States, I would like the committee to supoprt this principle apart from whether or not there are any precedents in existence. If the thing is right why should we not pass it? If it is reasonable why should we not pass it? What does the Bill ask for? Certain manufacturers who are using the label of the labour union are asking this House to register the label so that they may be protected in the use of it from manufacturers as well as labour unions. If the manufacturer sees fit to work with the labour union and he places the union label on his manufactured articles, what objection can there be to that? If this Bill made any

compulsory provision for the use of this label I could understand the objection, but there is no such compulsion. It cannot be operated unless the manufacturer agrees and the moment he disagrees with anything that is done by the union he can discontinue the use of the label. The manufacturer who is working with the members of the union is asking for this. If the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) had been present when I explained the provisions of the Bill, he would have known that eighty or ninety of the manufacturers of this country have asked for the recognition of the Union Label.

Mr. OSLER. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, when he introduced this Bill, made this statement:

> In asking for this legislation, we are not asking for anything new. Only after very serious consideration would I bring before this House any proposition for which no precedent could be given. This legislation was passed in England twelve years ago. In that country, the unions connected with any manufacturing interest can create a design, have it registered as a trades union label under the Copyright Act. And I have here a list of the states of the neighbouring union in which this principle of the union label is established by law, and in that list are the names of no less than thirty-one states.

When the hon. member introduced this Bill one of the chief reasons he gave for it was that he had a precedent, which was well established in Great Britain and the United States. Now, he says that it does not matter whether that is the fact or not. I say it matters to this extent that if we have the evidence that this Act has been in operation in Great Britain for 12 years and in 31 states for various periods, we have very good grounds for assuming that there is no fear such as the manufacturers express that the Act is going to seriously affect their business. I for one would be very much more able to make up my mind in connection with this Bill if the Acts to which the hon. member referred were laid before the House before the Bill was discussed.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I would again, in so far as I am concerned, say that I believe the principle is right and I ask the House to pass the Bill. I do not rely upon the fact that this legislation may be operating in other places. I think it is a reasonable thing, and if it is right I ask the House to pass the legislation. It has passed the House twice before in the hands of a private member.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I was very much struck with the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has introduced this Bill (Mr. Smith). He pointed out several times that he cannot see how there can be any objection to this Bill because it is not compulsory for any manufacturer to place this label upon his goods. That, to my mind, shows that the hon. gentleman has not the faintest conception of what the main design of his own Bill is, because nobody but himself thinks that is a matter of the slightest importance. The point is not that this label is to be put on the manufacturer's goods without his consent. I am not aware that any manufacturer is going to complain because this label is put on his goods. The difficulty is that the label is to be kept off his goods. I think the hon. gentleman entirely misunderstands the objection there is to this Bill. But, the objection shortly is that it hardly seems fair that an unincorporated body assuming no responsibility whatever should be given what every hon. member of the House must know is a most powerful means of boycotting. It is wholly apart from the question for the hon. member to state that the manufacturer is not compelled to place this label on his output. The object is to protect the manufacturer so that he will not be injured by the label not being put on his goods.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I would like to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) if one manufacturer agrees that the label shall be placed on his goods what objection any other manufacturer can have?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I can quite understand the circumstances under which one manufacturer perhaps wisely has occasion to have the labour union in his factory, because he will be entitled to have the union label on his goods, while another man might be paying just as good wages, employing just as many and as worthy men as those who belong to the union. But, they do not belong to the union and he cannot have this label put on his goods. Are we going to say that you shall boycott this manufacturer without any possibility of redress since there is no organized incorporated body from which he can obtain damages?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Will the hon. gentleman tell us what injury will be done to the manufacturer who is not operating the label by the fact that it is operated by another manufacturer?

Mr. NORTHRUP. It again seems to me that the hon. gentleman is wholly ignoring the gravest objection to his own Bill. Nobody complains in the slightest that under the provisions of this Bill the label has to be put on some manufacturer's goods without his consent. Let them placard the goods from top to bottom if they like. The other class now that we refer to, the class of manufacturers who cannot get the label on their goods, and I think the hon. gentleman can see that if one manufacturer has this label on his goods and another cannot get that label on his goods, although he may have as good men and have as many hands, paying them as high wages, because his hands do not happen to belong to the labour union one man has an advantage that another has

not. One man can be injured by not being allowed by law to use the union label, and if he can, there should be some correlative of responsibility on the part of those who are placed in a position to inflict this injury upon him.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I cannot understand how it is that a manufacturer cannot have that label on his goods. If he is paying the same wages, as my hon. friend says he is, why can he not have the label on his goods ?

Mr. NORTHRUP. Because my hon. friend provides by this Bill that three or four individuals who form themselves into a Union can get a label that nobody else can use.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. My hon. friend must remember that if this manufacturer is running his business in a manner satisfactory to his men he will have no difficulty in getting his men to combine for the purpose of creating a design, and having a registered label. What is to prevent it ?

Mr. INGRAM. Supposing the label is given to the manufacturer to use on condition that he carries out a certain agreement or arrangement ; then something turns up and he violates the agreement and justly so perhaps because the workmen may not have carried out their part of the contract. The label is withdrawn from him and the very moment the label is withdrawn from the manufacturer, then the boycott is instituted and it injures the manufacturer. That is where the injustice comes in, in the legislation proposed. Both workmen and manufacturers must be reasonable, and where there is a responsibility each party should bear their fair share of responsibility in order to have the Act work smoothly. Does the Act ensure that ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. There is nothing to prevent a boycott now. If a combination of men working with the manufacturer authorize him to use a label now without it being possible to register the label, they can withdraw the use of that label if they see fit. What is to prevent them ? Nothing in the Bill will make it more possible than at present. How can they boycott them ? They can advertise that the goods have not been made by union labour, and if the public sentiment of this country will induce people to refuse to purchase goods because they are not made by union labour that is evidence that the sentiment is in favour of trades unions. This is only a moral influence. Every day we see in advertisements : ' These goods are made by white labour,' or ' by union labour.' What objection can there be to that ? It is a simple principle. One man says : I agree to supply the conditions of employment asked by the trades unions. The union says in reply : We have a design and label and will place it on the articles you produce because the conditions of employment are satisfactory. If the employer supplies the conditions he will have no difficulty in getting the benefit of the label.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I think possibly that by discussing this matter we can agree. We both recognize that a boycott is perfectly possible, we all recognize that they have existed that they do exist and will probably exist in the future. My hon. friend however, wants to invent new machinery to make a boycott as simple and practicable as possible. There are some who think that a boycott is not in the best interests of the country and is not the best form of modern commercial and industrial warfare. Those of us who represent the people of Canada, the overwhelming majority of whom do not belong to unions, think that a boycott being undesirable, it is our duty not to take any steps to make this undesirable method of carrying on an industrial dispute any easier. My hon. friend (Mr. Smith) is right from his point of view in making it as easy as possible ; those of us who do not believe with him are reasonable in declining to assist to set up conditions under which those who desire to establish a boycott can do so as effectually and as harmlessly to themselves as possible.

Mr. CALDWELL. The manufacturer is not afraid to grant his men a right in the way of a label, but he is afraid that by granting anything of this kind he may give to his employees a monopoly or a weapon that they may hold over him. The manufacturer is not afraid to grant to his workers fair play, but sometimes an irresponsible body is not very thoughtful when it comes to strikes and things of that kind. Take a manufacturer who is manufacturing a good article. His people insist upon his putting on their label ; he may grant that request but when he has marketed his goods and his goods are finding a ready sale, then the employees may say, for some reason : We will remove that label unless you grant us some particular point upon which we have disagreed. That label may have become identified with that particular line of goods and it might be a great hardship to the manufacturer to have that label removed, and yet of course the Bill says that the manufacturer may use his own judgment as to whether he shall have the union label or not. The manufacturer is not afraid to grant a label, but he is afraid of that label being used to injure him. The union is not a responsible body while he is responsible.

Mr. INGRAM. If the manufacturer had violated any agreement then probably he should suffer for the violation of that agreement. I would go so far as to say that, but the withdrawal of the label from his goods, particularly if they are established in the market with the label attached would be sufficient to injure him if nothing more, because those who have been in the habit of buying goods with that label might with-

draw their patronage when the label is withdrawn from the goods. So far as the Manufacturers' Association and the workmen are concerned, I am one of those who believe that the workman has a right to sell his labour at as high a price as he can get. He has a right to ask for reasonable protection through legislation just as much as the manufacturer has. I do not know of any greater monopoly than the legal profession; they are surrounded by every possible safeguard.

An hon. MEMBER. What of the doctors?

Mr. INGRAM. There is some justification for the doctors, because life and death are involved, but our legal gentleman are pretty well guarded and they can fairly well boycott the public generally. I do not think they ought to be too particular about passing a little legislation to help the workingman. I think that this Bill should be put in such a shape that it cannot be used for an unreasonable boycott, or a means of unreasonably boycotting a manufacturer who is endeavouring to do what is right.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. What would the hon. gentleman propose as an amendment?

Mr. INGRAM. I would not like to propose an amendment as I am not handling the Bill.

Mr. HAGGART. I would suggest that the union should be incorporated.

Mr. INGRAM. Perhaps it might be well to require that the union be registered and then incorporated so that it would become responsible for any action that might be taken. I think that would be one strong step towards meeting the objections of those who are opposed to the legislation.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to ask the promoter of the Bill what effect this would have on the position of the manufacturers and workmen in the constituency which I represent. We have in East Lambton some fifteen manufactories employing about 400 workmen. There is not a labour union or a branch of the labour union in the constituency to my knowledge. The hon. gentleman has admitted that there are boycotts, that railroad men connected with unions in distributing goods throughout the country have instituted boycotts, and that in other ways the goods manufactured by any firm might be boycotted. I would ask the hon. member what effect this Bill would have upon the position of the labouring men and manufacturers who are not connected with a labour union in any way?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. They would be in exactly the same position as they are in now. The union is operated at the present time very extensively in this country and the hon. gentleman admits that there is no such thing as a boycott.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman who is promoting this Bill has told us that legislation of this character exists in thirty-one states of the American union. Would he be good enough to supplement that information by informing the House how long it has existed in these states and what the effect of its operation has been, whether or not any of the evils which have been referred to to-day have been found to prevail in consequence of this? I think information of that kind would be very useful to us.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I understand that union labels in these states have been operating for some years, and none of the unions are registered. Of course, there is very strong opposition to the existence of the union label in the United States, just as there is in this country, on the part of the manufacturers and other employers; but I have heard of no complaint about the label itself. It is considered a legitimate measure of defence on the part of the unions. Hon. gentlemen talk about a boycott. It is true, a labour union may boycott; but no labour union in any country has ever been in a position to boycott to the same extent that an employer has. There is nothing to prevent an employer in this country saying to his workman, 'I will not employ you, because you belong to a labour union.' Why should not the labour unionist, in the same way, if he has sufficient influence to bring to bear on his employer, say to him, 'We will insist on your employing none but union men?' I stand for neither of these positions. I may say that I am in favour of the incorporation of labour unions. I recognize that if they are to have the strength they ought to have, they must be intelligent and responsible bodies. I pressed this view before the unions, but they are afraid of incorporation. They have not confidence in the judges of the country. Probably that feeling emanates from the United States. But that is the feeling of the labour men—that they cannot get justice at the hands of the judges, and therefore they are not in favour of incorporation. But, speaking for myself, I would make provision in any Bill of this kind for the incorporation of trade unions. I believe in making them responsible. I believe in making it unlawful for them to interfere with any employer because he chooses to employ non-union men. I believe in all this; but there is nothing at all in this Bill that will bring about a condition of boycott that does not exist to-day, and there is nothing in the laws of this country that will prevent an employer creating a boycott as is done in hundreds of cases, by saying to the men, 'I refuse to employ you because you are a member of a trades union.' My hon. friend has nothing to say about that, although it is a very serious boycott to a man who has to depend on his labour to live, to be turned out of a factory.

Mr. BERGERON. There may be a reason for that.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. There may be, and there may be a reason for a labour union boycotting a manufacturer; but my hon. friend does not recognize that. To prevent a boycott in any position in life is impossible. Why should not I, who am working for one man, say to my friend who is working for another, 'There are better conditions existing where I labour than where you are; why don't you get together and organize, and create in your factory the same conditions that exist in mine?' Is it not legitimate to use a moral influence on the community in order to bring about an organization that will result in proper and reasonable conditions for these men? Can there be any objection to that? I cannot see any. I cannot see that this Bill places any power in the hands of the labour unions that they have not already. They simply say, 'Certain manufacturers agree with us to use a label on their goods, and we want that to be registered so as to prevent fraud by others using it who have no right to do so.'

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Do I understand my hon. friend to say that he is prepared to amend this Bill to make it applicable only to labour unions which are properly incorporated under the law?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I say that I am in favour of that, but I have explained that the influences pressing for this legislation are not favourable to it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It would remove some of our difficulties if it were made applicable only to incorporated unions.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Will the hon. gentleman say that he would support the Bill if that provision were made?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not said so far that I oppose it. I am seeking for light.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Would the members of this House say that they would approve of this Bill if it were made applicable only to incorporated unions?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It seems to me that that would materially alter the feeling of the House towards it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Would it not follow that manufacturers' associations would also have to incorporate themselves? As I regard the agitation, honours to-day are even. The employers are moving along their particular line and the unions along theirs. Each makes a move, the one to check the other; but out of it all great benefit will come both to the employers and to the men employed. I have no objection to this. It all tends to hasten the day when labour disputes will be settled by arbitration rather than by legislation or by strikes. If this move on the part of the unions is legalized, there will be another move made by the employers, and if the unions must be registered, so must be the employers, so that both parties will be responsible for what they do. We must handle these questions, but we ought to do so in the light that arbitration and conciliation is the goal towards which we are moving for the settlement of labour disputes, rather than these special cases of a move from one side and a counter move from the other. I would like to see the fullest consideration given to the Bill, and the side of the men receive fair consideration as well as the side of the employers.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Is it not a striking commentary on this Bill that the hon. gentleman who has introduced it has just told the committee that he is supporting a measure of which he does not approve?—that he would personally like to see eliminated from it the objectionable feature which is exciting adverse comment on both sides of the House; but that he feels compelled, under the pressure which he has referred to, to press a measure of which he does not approve? Would it not be possible to let this Bill stand until he consults the forces behind him, to see if it cannot be so amended as to meet the views of both sides of the House and his own views? Then he would be in a position to say, 'This is a Bill which I think ought to be passed,' and would have more right to press for it than he has to-day.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I am surprised at the position taken by the hon. gentleman. What is he here for? to represent his own views or the views of his constituents? Every member of this House has his own individual opinion, but he is here to support the opinion of his constituents, and not his individual opinion. That is exactly what I said. I tried to influence the national unions of this country in favour of the incorporation of trades unions, and I have said that I would support that, but they would not support it. But am I to abandon this measure because they do not do everything I want on this question? I do not think that would be a reasonable position.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I must say that I do not quite see the force of the legal profession, every one of whom has a label upon himself, and belongs to the closest corporation I know of, opposing others who wish to be labelled. In every province they have their trades unions and their trade labels. If a man should attempt to practise the profession of law and not wear the union label, they immediately boycott him and he is put out of business by the law itself.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. He cannot get a living.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. No, he cannot. It is trades unionism up to the hilt. The lawyers all hang out the union shingle. Even when they die or marry, we have a notice in the paper that Mr. So-and-So, of Osgoode Hall, has died or has married. Even the dentists and horse doctors and the cow doctors of this country have all got the trade label, and I have no hesitation in saying that what is fair for one is fair for another. If the workingmen want some measure of this kind, provided it is fair legislation and treats everybody equitably, I do not see any reason why they should not have it.

Mr. NORTHRUP. For once the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) has given expression to some views which are somewhat in accord with those held by most members of this House. The only reason I can find for my hon. friend giving expression to those views is that he has not the faintest idea of what he is talking about. If he had for a moment stopped to consider what he was about to say and really grasped the ideas he was giving expression to, he would have probably hesitated and begun to doubt whether he was really speaking words of wisdom. Every member on this side will agree with every word he has said in so far as he has pointed out the advantage of protection, by means of incorporation or otherwise, of the various branches of industry, Lawyers, doctors, dentists, even undertakers, have seen the wisdom of protection, and we would all like to see the trades unions recognize the advantage of protection in some way by means of incorporation. My hon. friend has rather cast a slur upon the learned professions for having done what they had a perfect right to do, and at the same time he would have the trades unions deprive themselves of the advantages which the learned professions would be only too glad to extend to them. There is not a lawyer in the country who would not do everything he could to assist the trades unions to become incorporated within the shortest delay possible ; and when my hon. friend next endeavours to draw distinctions between one class and another, he should try and understand where to draw the line of distinction and to remember that protection will be a benefit to all, and if these other branches are more fortunate than some it is because they have recognized fully the benefits to be derived from protection.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. My hon. friend on my left did not make that statement some time ago, but, on the contrary, opposed the Bill on principle, without any reference whatever to the subject of incorporation. He said that there was a bad principle in this Bill, but now he is hedging and taking refuge, and says that the principle is all right, only it ought to be applied to incorporated companies.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I did not say the principle was all right—not at all.

Mr. INGRAM. Some years ago the government issued a commission to inquire into the sweat shops, and found a very serious condition of things existing. Certain manufacturers, who wanted to take an unfair advantage of their competitors, housed poor men and women in miserable shops without sanitary conditions in order that they might get cheap labour, and these cheap goods were put on the market to compete with those of respectable manufacturers who paid good wages and employed their work people in decent shops. The result of that commission was a decision to put a stop to competition of that character by legislation which would protect the working classes by compelling the manufacturers to give them decent places to work in and decent wages. That is the main object of any legislation of the kind now proposed. No manufacturer who wants to do a fair and legitimate business will encourage the sweat shops which were proven to have existed to a great extent in this country. It is in the interests of every decent respectable citizen to have that kind of thing changed, and any legislation which will do away with it, and which will not work injustice to any respectable manufacturer, the House should be willing to pass.

Mr. CLARE. I happen to be one of the manufacturers who employ considerable union labour. In my business I have never had any difficulties with my men and the union with which we do business. I think that the manufacturers and the labouring classes would improve their positions very materially if they would try and come together. We would then not have measures of this kind on our statutes, but as things are it is probably necessary that we should have them. I understand from the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill that the position of the men is going to be exactly the same if this Bill is passed as it is at present ; but there is one objection to which I wish to refer, and that is the objection pointed out by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram). Suppose a manufacturer of iron goods incorporates the union label in the pattern as part of it instead of pasting it on. To do that puts him to considerable expense, and should there be afterwards any difficulty between him and the union, he may have a large stock of goods on hand which will have to be destroyed. There should be some provision to get over a difficulty of that kind.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. That is a matter entirely of agreement between the manufacturer and the union, and it would be the business of the manufacturer to provide against any contingency of that kind before agreeing to use the label.

Mr. OSLER. I think if the hon. member for Nanaimo would consent to a clause providing for incorporation of these unions, that

would cover almost entirely the objections to the Bill. There may be other objections which the manufacturers could point out, and which would necessitate the Bill being very carefully drafted. Personally, I would like very much to see an Act passed which would work as well as apparently does the English Act; and if the hon. member is willing to add a clause to the effect that the unions shall be incorporated, that will do away with the objections generally expressed to the measure.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is this not the place for the Minister of Labour (Sir William Mulock) to come in and show us a way out of the difficulty? He has the assistance of his deputy minister, who has made a special study of all these questions and is ready to advise him, and of a staff of officers who are skilled in unravelling these labour tangles; but instead of the Minister of Labour leading the House on questions of this kind, as he should, he sits there dumb as an oyster——

Mr. FOSTER. And not nearly as tasty.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Surely he can advise his supporter from Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) how to get out of this difficulty. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) has suggested that a little consideration and a little conciliation applied to the problem would immediately smooth the way—and no one is so competent in the matter of conciliation as the distinguished member for North York and Minister of Labour (Sir William Mulock). Surely, after what has been said, we shall hear from him.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. What is the difficulty?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. A. Johnston) has his senses and can hear what is said. I cannot furnish him what he ought to supply for himself.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am afraid my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) is the last person in this House to admit that any person could advise as to what course he should pursue here. I, therefore, would not venture to take such a liberty with him. He knows the situation of the Bill before the House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ralph Smith) who is in charge of it has moved the Bill. If any hon. gentleman desires to amend it, there is opportunity to do so. It is not a government question. Every hon. member is at liberty to advance his views, and you, Mr. Chairman, I am sure are only waiting to receive amendments. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has been first on one side of the question and then on the other, and now he is trying to get out of his difficulty by dragging me in to do his work. I cannot so invade the hon. gentleman's preserve.

Mr. OSLER.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation). Mr. Chairman, no privilege can be granted but to a person who exists physically or morally. The trades-unions cannot be sued unless they are incorporated. It has been so decided by the Ontario courts in a case of 'The Metallic Roofing Company of Canada v. Local Union No. 30, Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, 5, O. L. R., 424 (D.C.)' It was held that:—

> The right to maintain an action or the liability to be sued can only be by or against persons as individuals, or as a corporation or a partnership, or where individuals are carrying on business in a name other than their own, or where they have been given the capacity to own property and to act by agents. A local union of workmen, a purely voluntary association, without such capacity, are not liable to be sued; and a writ served upon the agent was therefore set aside. Taff Vale R. W. Co. vs. Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants, 1901, A. C. 426, distinguished. Where it clearly appears that the association sued is not an entity, which may be sued by the name it bears, it is more convenient to set aside the service of writ on a motion made therefore than to allow the case to proceed at the trial with a certainty of its ultimate dismissal.

The same decision was rendered in the case of 'Krug Furniture Company vs. Berlin Union of Amalgamated Wood Workers, 5, O. L. R., 463, Meredith, J.' The judgment was the same, that is to the effect that a trades-union could not be sued if it were not incorporated; that the members should be proceeded against individually, and the action should be dismissed if it had been taken against the association.

The question has been decided also in England, by the Appeal Court in 1901, in a case of 'Linaker vs. Pilcher and others,' reported in volume '84, Law Times Reports,' new series, page 421. In this case the action was held valid because it had been entered against the trustees of the trades-union, but notwithstanding that decision the courts in the province of Ontario have persisted in dismissing the law suits brought against the non-incorporated trades-unions.

There is no doubt but that is the law in the province of Quebec.

I would favour the idea of granting rights to the trades-unions provided these associations exist legally. I think it would be absurd to confer such privileges upon an indeterminate class of men. The exercise of a privilege requires that a person should exist physically and morally. For those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I move in amendment, seconded by Mr. Leblanc, that the following words: 'duly incorporated,' be added after subsection (a) of section first.

It is easy for the trades-unions to obtain incorporation; we have a law to that effect; it is chapter 131 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. According to that law trades-unions may be brought into legal existence without any heavy costs. Why should they

not submit to the law as the other public bodies do ?

My honourable friend from York (Mr. Maclean) has told us that the lawyers, for instance, enjoyed certain rights and privileges. This is very true, but the lawyers have a law which has brought them into legal existence as a body. I am in favour of the workmen, and I wish their unions nothing but prosperity. I recognize the fact that the workmen compose amongst our people a class which is numerous and worthy of protection. Yet, if we are to protect their rights, it is necessary that the unions which they form should have a judicial standing, and I propose this amendment in order that the rights which this parliament is about to confer upon them may have their full effect.

Mr. Chairman, as I have just stated in French, I am favourable to the principle of this measure. But, if we are going to grant a privilege, we must grant it to somebody, to some person who exists physically or morally. If you do not grant it to an individual, you must grant it to a corporation, to a body that will exercise the rights granted and that can be brought before the courts in case of any question arising as to the exercise of that right. It has been decided in Ontario, in the case I have just quoted, that the trades unions cannot be brought before the courts—you must sue the members individually. It has been decided in England that if they have trustees that may be sued. It is very easy for the trades unions to be incorporated under the Federal Statute chapter 131. Incorporation does not cost much, and I do not see why we should not decide that this privilege of using a Union label shall be given to some person or corporation, instead of giving it to all workers. If we give it in this general way, we do not know who will be the proprietors. That is why I move as an amendment to add the words 'duly incorporated' after the words 'working women' in the second line of subsection (a). I think that, with such an amendment no objection could be raised to the Bill ; because, when the labour unions are incorporated they will be entitled to their distinctive mark just as any other corporation is. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has said that all the high classes have privileges. That is true. But these classes are incorporated. The lawyers have privileges, but, they have duties also ; and they enjoy these privileges because they are incorporated. And by this amendment I ask that if the workingmen are to receive these privileges they shall also be incorporated. We must recognize their right, but we must follow the ordinary rule of law.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would like to ask the learned and hon. member (Mr. L. P. Demers) a question. He says that the lawyers are incorporated and are responsible. Will he say that if a person feels aggrieved by a lawyer he has any recourse against the corporation to which that lawyer belongs ? I think not.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. That is no answer. The legal corporations have duties and privileges. They can be sued before the courts, but an incorporated union can not.

Amendment (Mr. L. P. Demers) agreed to.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If the committee intend to adopt the amendment suggested by my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. L. P. Demers), a very superficial examination of the Bill will show that it will be necessary to amend several sections to make them conform to the amendment.

Mr. AMES. As I understand it the interpretation clause is amended and that where 'labour union' is mentioned subsequently in the Bill it means an incorporated Labour union.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not understand that these words should be inserted just where the hon. member for St. John and Iberville proposes. If these words are to be added, in order to give them proper significance, they should be just before the word 'association.' If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ralph Smith) who is in charge of the Bill intends to assent to this amendment it seems to me a little more consideration might be given to the exact form of the amendment to carry out the idea that has been suggested.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I do not agree with the amendment at all ; but that is not the question. If this House will not pass this Bill without the amendment, then I want the Bill with the amendment. If it comes to a vote, I will vote against it. But if the House will pass the Bill with that amendment, then I want that amendment.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think it is desirable that we should have time to consider the effect of this amendment on the other clauses of the Bill. In the first place, we ought to try to give effect to the evident intention of the House. I think, therefore, the wiser course would be for the hon. member to move that the committee rise.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—I. C. R. TRAIN SERVICE, NOVA SCOTIA.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). I have received some information with respect to the question raised by the leader of the opposition

(Mr. R. L. Borden), and I feel it is but due to the Intercolonial management that I should give the information.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Have the passengers been fed yet ?

Mr. EMMERSON. At the time the telegram came, the train was in Moncton where the passengers could readily get fed. Perhaps the difficulty was that some of them did not want to purchase a meal. This telegram is dated Moncton, February 8, and is addressed to Mr. Pottinger :

The storm which set in night before last at Halifax extended yesterday as far as St. John and Newcastle, it is now about over west of Moncton, but continues east and is particularly bad east of Springhill. Number 34——

which is the through express from Montreal east.

——which left here 14 o'clock yesterday and numbers 2, St. John to Halifax, and 26, C. P. R., now stuck at Springhill. 84, Moncton to Springhill local, with two engines from here yesterday evening, now stuck at Evans. 33, through express west, left here last night about two hours late, and is doing fairly well. 10, night express from St. John last night, 2 and 34 arrived here about noon, 10 and 2 cancelled and transferred to 34, being held. 9, night express, Halifax to St. John, with two engines stuck one mile west of Londonderry ; 1, 3 and 4 cancelled. Apple train stuck all night at Windsor Junction, steamer waiting this train, will leave Windsor Junction about noon. Halifax yard is in very bad shape. All cars have to be moved one by one, a consolidated and five shunting engines working trying to get 20, now at Point Tupper, through. 19 cancelled.

I may say to my hon. friend that the gentleman who sent the telegram, a Halifax gentleman I believe, had reached Moncton, and no doubt had had a good meal before we heard of his telegram in this House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am very glad he has progressed so far. I did not mention the matter by way of criticism of the Intercolonial, as I stated I had had a somewhat similar experience, which I had found under the circumstances to be unavoidable.

Motion agreed to, House adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 9, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE GRAND TRUNK AND CANADA ATLANTIC RAILWAYS.

Mr. EDWARD M. MACDONALD (Pictou) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 45) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Mr. EMMERSON.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Explain.

Mr. MACDONALD. The purpose of this Bill is to authorize the Grand Trunk Railway Company to acquire bonds and preference and common shares of the Canada Atlantic Railway Company, and to hold the same, either by themselves as a company or in the names of trustees, also to provide that the company may guarantee the payment of the principal and interest of the bonds so acquired, and to be held by them, not exceeding the amount of £3,292,200 sterling.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would like to ask the hon. member whether it is a fact or not that the Grand Trunk has acquired the Canada Atlantic ?

Mr. MACDONALD. I am not in a position to say anything further than what is proposed by the Bill, which is an empowering one ; and what is proposed will appear in its various provisions.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 46) respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. MACDONALD. This Bill proposes to repeal section 3 of chapter 90 of 1903, and empowers the company to issue bonds to the amount of £3,292,200, to be secured by mortgage on the company's property. There are provisions securing the bondholders under previous mortgages, and the rights of all parties holding previous mortgage rights are protected.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 47) respecting the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

QUESTIONS.

MILITARY BUILDINGS AT FREDERICTON.

Mr. CROCKET asked :

1. Were tenders called for the construction of the stables on the officers' barrack grounds at Fredericton, N.B., referred to on page V—62 of the Auditor General's Report ?
2. If so, what publication was made of the call, what tenders were received, and what were their respective amounts ?
3. Were tenders called for the construction of the sergeant-major's quarters at Fredericton, N.B., referred to on the same page of the Auditor General's Report ?
4. If so, what publication was made of the call, what tenders were received, and what were their respective amounts ?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works):

1. Yes.

2. The call for tenders was published in five newspapers. One tender only was received, that of C. J. B. Simmons for $2,210.
3. Yes.
4. The call for tenders was published in five newspapers. One tender only was received, that of C. J. B. Simmons for $2,118.

Mr. CROCKET asked :

1. When was the contract let for the rebuilding of the drill hall at Fredericton, N.B.; to whom was it let ; and at what price ?
2. Were tenders called for ? If so, what publication was made of the call, what tenders were received, and what were their respective amounts ?
3. What date does the contract fix for the completion of the work ?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. Contract signed on the 7th December, 1904. Awarded to C. J. B. Simmons. Amount of contract, $12,955.
2. Yes, the call for tenders was published in fifteen newspapers. Four tenders were received, namely :—C. J. B. Simmons, $12,955 ; Willard Kitchen, $13,387.74 ; John Maxwell and Chas. A. Hall, $14,000 ; J. D. McLaughlin, $15,300.
3. November 15th, 1905.

FREE MAIL DELIVERY.

Mr. URIAH WILSON asked :

1. What is the total cost of free mail delivery in towns and cities of Canada where such system is utilized ?
2. Does the Post Office Department keep any record of the number of letters, newspapers, parcels, &c., so delivered ?
3. If so, how many of each such were delivered ?
4. If not, what is the estimated number of each, the estimate to be taken from the usual process of enumeration by the Post Office Department ?
5. What is the estimated cost per letter, per paper, per parcel, &c., delivered in the above towns and cities ?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General) :

1. Salaries of letter carriers..	$415,241 42
Cost of uniforms, &c.. ..	17,253 69
Conveyance of letter carriers by street railway..	10,253 14
Total..	$432,748 25

2. No.
3. Answered by No. 2.
4 and 5. The department is not in a position to furnish an estimate in reply to these inquiries.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC ROUTE.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE asked :

1. Has the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company proposed or submitted to the government any plan of the route of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway west of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba ?
2. If so, has such plan been approved by the government, or disproved, wholly or in part ? If disproved, for what reason ?
3. Does the line proposed or submitted as aforesaid run to the north or to the south of the Canadian Northern Railway, in the province of Manitoba ; and within what distance of said railway ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. No.
2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

SCHOOL LANDS SOLD.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. How many acres of school lands have been sold at public auction in the provisional districts of Alberta, Assiniboia and Saskatchewan, respectively, by the government, from the 1st January, 1900, to the 31st December, 1905 ?
2. What were the highest and lowest prices obtained per acre ?
3. What was the average price per acre obtained in each provisional district ?

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

1. Alberta, 304 acres (1 sale).
Assiniboia, 143,431·65 acres.
Saskatchewan, 237·53 acres.

ALBERTA.

2. 1 sale, $19 per acre.

ASSINIBOIA.

Highest price, $37.50.
Lowest price, $7.20.

SASKATCHEWAN.

Highest price, $107.
Lowest price, $40.

3. Alberta, $19.
Assiniboia, $9.69.
Saskatchewan, $86.54.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY EXEMPTION.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. Have any steps been taken by the government, in pursance of the resolution of April 2nd, 1901, to obtain an authoritative interpretation of the meaning of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract in relation to the exemption of the lands of that company from taxation in the Northwest Territories ?
2. If so, what is the present state of any legal proceedings that may have been entered upon ?
3. Has any decision been given as to the right of boards of school trustees and of municipalities to collect taxes on these lands from the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) : By arrangement, three test cases were brought—two by municipalities and one by the school district of Springdale—against the Canadian Pacific Railway in a Manitoba court. These were decided in favour of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but an appeal was taken to the Court of Appeals in Manitoba. Two of the appeals were successful, and one unsuccessful, and the cases were taken to the Supreme

Court of Canada where they are now pending. If my hon. friend wishes to pursue his inquiry further, I have with me the printed factums of the appeals to the Supreme Court which he may look over if he desires.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When is it expected the appeals will be heard ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They were heard at the last sitting of the court, and I expect judgment in about a fortnight.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Annual report of the Department of Public Works for the year ending 30th June, 1904.—Mr. Hyman.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE.

Mr. DANIEL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, would the Rt. hon. First Minister tell us when we shall have the preliminary report of the Transportation Committee ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It will be brought down very shortly.

SAFETY OF SHIPS.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 21) to amend the Act respecting the safety of ships—Mr. Sinclair.

On section 1,

1. Subsection 1 of section 7 of chapter 77 of the Revised Statutes, intituled An Act respecting the safety of ships and the prevention of accidents on board thereof, as amended by section 1 of chapter 63 of the statutes of 1903, is amended by striking out the words ' or in any covered space not included in the cubical contents forming the registered tonnage ' in lines 11 and 12 of the said subsection.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The purpose of the Bill is to enable sheltered deck vessels or steamers to carry timber between the main and the sheltered deck. At present they are prohibited doing so between the 12th October and 16th March. They are allowed to do so in the summer season, and I can see no good reason why they should not be permitted to fill in this space with lumber in the winter season also. The law requires of course that a ship shall not be overloaded, but the Plimsoll mark regulates that. Other descriptions of cargo are allowed between the main and the sheltered deck, but not timber, and my object is to allow the same privilege to shippers of lumber. This space consists of about eight or nine feet according to the construction of the vessel, and under the law vessels are allowed to carry only three feet of timber so that there are five feet not occupied at all. It would not in any way interfere with the navigation of the vessel or increase the danger to the crew if the whole space were filled up.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is a little difficult to hear what the hon. gentleman has said.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I did not gather exactly what is the space to which he referred. And before he concludes his explanation, I would like to know what was the reason of the legislation in the first instance—whether or not the amendment which the hon. gentleman now proposes is in any way inconsistent with any provisions of the Imperial statutes applying to ships generally throughout the empire. I would also remark that it seems to me desirable, when a Bill of this character is proceeded with, that we should have the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in his place to give the subject his consideration. I know there has been a good deal of discussion of matters of this kind in the maritime provinces ; and while, I do not profess to have very much knowledge of the reasons pro and con, I know that there has been a difference of opinion in some quarters.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) was not in his place when I introduced the Bill. I explained that it was necessary to get the consent of the Board of Trade of England in order to have this Bill become law in Canada. I understand that the policy of the government is not to make any changes in this law unless concurred in by the Board of Trade. I laid the matter before the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and communication is now being had with the Board of Trade, to see if the proposal is satisfactory to them. I do not propose to push the Bill through its final stages until word has been received on the subject, but I would ask the House to put it through the preliminary stages, so that if the consent of the Board of Trade is obtained it can be pushed through this session. The shelter deck is a growth. It was first a roof over the deck to carry cattle. Then the roof was extended the whole length of the deck, and finally the sides were built up with the ordinary steel frame and plank, and the whole became part of the ship as much as any other part. But the law remained the same, prohibiting the carrying of timber, except to the height of three feet on the main deck. What I propose is to permit that timber be carried between the main and shelter decks, that is, eight feet above the main deck. There is no reason why it should not be allowed, especially as we permit the ship to carry cattle and other things during the winter season. There is nothing about deals or lumber to make them dangerous to carry during the winter season. We allow the ship to be filled with apples or cheese or other products, but we do not allow it to carry deals or boards except under these restrictions. It pays a certain class of ships out of business in Canada for part of the year. These vessels in the North Atlantic trade, when October 12 comes, have to go out of business because they are not allowed to carry deals in this space.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there any Imperial statute with the terms of which this inactment is inconsistent ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. The Imperial statute is the same as our own which we are attempting to amend. If the amendment carried here, I presume the amendment will be made in England similar to this.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). In the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) I may explain that this matter has engaged his attention. But, as stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) it is not intended to push this Bill to a finish unless we know whether or not it is approved by the Board of Trade of England. I believe the Bill will meet with universal favour and will be a help to navigation. Still, my hon. friend only proposes to take it through committee and then let it stand until we have an answer from England.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am inclined to think it would be better to let the Bill remain in committee until we receive the information from England. I do not think that will delay it at all.

Progress reported.

CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES.

On the order :

Second reading of Bill (No. 3) to amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships.—Mr. Lancaster.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am willing to drop that order, because I introduced a Bill yesterday to take its place.

Mr. SPEAKER. Dropped.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

On the order :

Second reading of Bill (No. 23) to amend the provisions of the Criminal Code, 1892, with respect to common bawdy houses.—Mr. Bole.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to this amendment, if he has not already considered the subject. I presume that all the members of the House wish to confine the amendments of Acts to as narrow limits as possible. I do not wish to enter into a long discussion of the legal aspect of this matter, but I have collected authorities bearing upon it, and I think that it would be better to allow the Bill to stand. I would be very glad to submit to the Minister of Justice the authorities to which my attention has been directed, that he may see whether the amendment is necessary. My own opinion is that it is not necessary. Our Act differs from the English Act in that it defines what constitutes this class of offence. This is not a convenient time to go into the discussion. If the minister agrees with me this Bill might be allowed to stand.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands.

EARNINGS OF THE CANADA EASTERN RAILWAY.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, N.B.) moved:

For copies of all correspondence had between the government, or any department or member thereof, and the Alexander Gibson Railway and Manufacturing Company, or any other corporation or corporations, or person or persons, not included in the return brought down on the twenty-ninth day of July, 1904, in reference to the purchase and taking over by the government of the Canada Eastern Railway ; and of all other papers in the possession of the government, or any department thereof, not included in the said return of July, 1904, in reference to the purchase and taking over of the said railway, and the cost thereof. And also for a return showing, (1) the number of officials and employees in the service of the said railway at the time of its transfer to the government, with their names and their respective salaries or wages ; (2) the number of officials and employees now in the service of the said railway, with their names and their respective salaries or wages ; (3) the cost of the operation of the said railway from the date of its transfer to the government until the first day of February, 1905, and the gross earnings of the said railway during the same period.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). There is no objection to the motion, but the information asked for in the last line with respect to the gross earnings of that railway during the past year it would be impossible to give, because it is all part of one system. The motion should be amended.

Mr. CROCKET. Do I understand the minister to say that it is impossible to give the House a statement of the gross earnings of the road from the time it was taken over until February 1?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is impossible for this reason, that the separate earnings of that portion of the Intercolonial are not made the subject matter of bookkeeping, any more than the earnings of that portion of the road between Newcastle and Campbellton is kept separate. The earnings of any portion are included in the earnings of the whole, and it would be difficult, as I understand the bookkeeping of the Intercolonial, to make such a return.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. Then they have a system of bookkeeping on the Intercolonial if the statement of the minister is correct, which is entirely different from that of any other railway in the world.

Mr. EMMERSON. It was the one established by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart), I think.

Mr. HAGGART. No. I have not the slightest doubt that the information could

be obtained, notwithstanding the statement of the minister. There is no railroad having a proper system of bookkeeping with respect to which he cannot get information concerning a part of it, whether of a station or of any other portion of the road; the minister can get all the earnings if he takes the trouble and orders it to be done. It is absurd to say that on an important line of railway which was taken over by the Intercolonial, a branch line virtually of the Intercolonial, there is no separate account kept of the receipts and expenditures of that branch line. There ought to be in the first place a separate account kept of that portion of the road; if such separate account is not kept its bookkeeping is different from that of any other railroad in the country. On the Intercolonial you can find out the receipts and expenditures of any portion of it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I think the minister is surely in error in stating that these earnings cannot be returned. Surely that branch line must make returns to the Audit Department every few days, although they may be included in the total returns of the Intercolonial. Then let him ask his Audit Department to furnish him separate returns for this branch line, and it can be done in twenty minutes, returns from every station on that road. All he would have to do would be to take the through-freight and the local freight, by collecting the mileage on the through-freight he could apportion in a very short time the earnings derived from the branch.

Mr. EMMERSON. It would be an easy matter to give the freights collected at any particular station on that portion of the Intercolonial, as it would be easy to give the amounts collected on either incoming or outgoing freights at any station on the Intercolonial. But while it might be possible to do that, and figure out on the mileage basis as compared with the whole, the proportionate amount that would be due, that would take some time. I do not think the accounts are kept separate. Of course there is no objection to the return, but it would be a work of time to get that done. This matter I think has been before the House before in connection with that portion of the Intercolonial between Lévis and Ste. Rosalie, or Montreal, and it has been stated time and again that under the bookkeeping on the Intercolonial, which is similar, as I understand it, to the bookkeeping on the other Canadian systems, there is no separate account kept of the earnings on any single portion.

Mr. SAM. BARKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) can do this, he can give absolutely the earnings on the purely local traffic. It would not be a matter of great labour to the department to take the through-traffic for this very small business that has been going on, apparently, on this road, and divide it upon the mileage basis upon the main line of the Intercolonial. I think he will find that the Audit Department of his road will do that in a very short time. As it is important that we should know at this stage of the history of the road acquired by the government just what it is doing, I think the House ought to require this return.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand that the minister (Mr. Emmerson), though he did state at first that it was impossible to collect the information, he afterwards qualified it. I think perhaps he is inclined to exaggerate the difficulty a little, and that it would be better that the motion should be passed in its present form.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am quite willing.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Return showing the number of box and flat cars added to the equipment of the Intercolonial Railway for each year from 1900 to 1904, inclusive; the total number on January 1, 1900, and on January 1, 1904, respectively; and the number in use on roads off the Intercolonial Railway on January 1, 1900 and 1904, respectively.—Mr. Foster.

Return showing the number of inspectors or other persons employed to attend to the enforcement of the Fruit Marks Act of 1901. The names of the said inspectors or other persons, and the salaries paid to each, respectively. The total amount paid to said persons on account of salaries up to the 1st of January, 1905. Also the amount paid to said persons for travelling and other expenses up to 1st January, 1905.—Mr. Taylor.

PACKING AND SALE OF CERTAIN COMMODITIES.

House again in committee to consider certain proposed resolutions respecting the packing and sale of apples.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). This resolution was before the Committee of the Whole a few days ago, and I think the principle was fully accepted by the House. There was, however, a doubt expressed as to whether the size of the apple box herein defined should apply only to the export trade or to internal commerce as well. I asked the committee to rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again, for the purpose of finding out exactly what was the desire of the fruit men in this respect, and also how other parts of the Act were likely to affect them. I find that the size described for the barrels, which is already defined in the Act, is for export, and I also find that while a large number of the fruit men would be very glad to have this box defined for the internal trade also, the majority of them I think desire to take only one step at a time,

and to define the size only for the export trade. My own view is that if it is applied to the export trade, practically, the boxes made will be made for the interior trade also and they may be adopted if they wish. If anybody chooses for his own purposes to use boxes for the internal trade he can do so. Under these circumstances I wish. to amend the resolution so as to make it perfectly and absolutely clear that it applies only to the export trade, and I think that can be done by making some slight amendment in the first line of subsection 2 which reads thus :

Every person who offers or exposes for sale, or who packs for export, &c.

I think by striking out the comma after the word ' sale,' striking out the word ' who ' and inserting a comma after the word ' packs,' the object will be accomplished. It will then read thus :

Every person who offers or exposes for sale or packs, for export, apples, &c.

I think that will make it perfectly clear that it applies only to the export trade. The rest of the resolution indicates that it applies to the export trade only. I am informed that another amendment would be desirable. A good many people have already ordered boxes and they are being made to-day by the box-makers for the current season. The contracts have been entered into and I think under these circumstances it would be well to add a clause to this resolution saying that it shall only come into effect on, say, the first of July, 1906 instead of coming into effect on the passage of the Act. That would give full warning and give an opportunity both to the packers and to the box-makers to adapt themselves and the conditions of their trade to the provisions of the Act as thus amended. I would therefore propose that a new clause should be added as follows :

The provisions herein contained shall come into force on the 1st July, 1906.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the hon. minister if boxes of the dimensions mentioned in the hon. gentleman's resolution are used by other countries exporting apples to England and to what extent ?

Mr. FISHER. In reply to my hon. friend I would say that there are other countries which define the size of their boxes. I might say that Tasmanian apples, which are very largely used in England and which come into competition with our own apples, are packed in boxes of this size, and that this size has been found the most convenient for the trade in England. Our people have thought that by adopting the same size their apples would appeal more to the market in England than if they had a different size. This size has been found acceptable to the British trade. It is a size which has been used in British Columbia for many years and to-day a great many of the packers in Ontario, at least, are using it. The fruit growers' associations of Ontario, the maritime provinces and Quebec have passed resolutions in favour of this size.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would not think that the amendment proposed by the hon. Minister of Agriculture to subsection 2 of section 4a would alter the clause very much. I would like to have the opinion of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice as to the effect of striking out the comma. It is proposed to amend this section by striking out a comma in one place, inserting it in another and eliminating the word ' who.'

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture showed me his suggestion immediately before the resolution was called and I did not have time to consider it very carefully, but so far as a resolution of this kind is concerned I must confess that I like to have time to think what I am going to do. I would not like to commit myself.

Mr. SPROULE. It does not seem to differ very much from that which was originally proposed. It certainly is confusing. It would not be easily understood by the common people. Surely if we can use the English language in a manner to be understood we had better do so rather than to leave the section in this ambiguous form.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to ask my hon. friends opposite whether they consider that the section as proposed with this amendment is not clearly understood.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would think there is a great doubt about it. I think there would be exactly the same doubt as there is at present. I do not think the proposed amendment alters the legal sense at all. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice will tell the hon. Minister of Agriculture that punctuation according to most legal authorities is not regarded at all in the interpretation of statutes. There may be some few cases in which it has been taken into consideration as a final resort, but it is very easy to make this plain without resorting to any such expedient. You can simply add a clause stating that it is not intended to apply to apples offered for sale in Canada. It is perfectly easy to make it plain and there is no reason why it should remain ambiguous.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It was at one time considered unwise to use any punctuation at all, the idea being to begin a document and go right through without any punctuation whatever, but if my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture desires to restrict the application of that clause to sales for export we might allow the resolution to pass with the understanding that the committee shall consider an amendment to that effect.

Mr. BARKER. I am not quite sure whether I know what the hon. minister is trying to do, but I would suggest these words instead of commas:

Every person who packs and offers or exposes for sale and export, &c.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why do you want the word 'sale' in at all?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot see myself the slightest doubt as to the meaning of the words proposed. What my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) proposes is simply a different form of saying the same thing, as I understand it. I cannot see that there can be the slightest doubt as to the meaning of the words I have proposed. Sec. 4a says:

When apples are packed in Canada for export for sale by the box, &c.

The words are not exactly the same but they mean distinctly that it is only for export, and the words that I have suggested in clause b would indicate clearly that the clause as amended should only apply to the export trade. If there is any doubt about the matter or any doubt as to the wording then certainly the clause had better stand entirely as it is and we will have the law clerk of the House, or some person who is authorized to draw such clauses, draw a clause to carry out our meaning.

Mr. MONK. Who has asked for this legislation?

Mr. FISHER. It has been asked for by the fruit growers' associations throughout the whole of Canada practically.

Mr. MONK. I object for my part to legislation of this kind as being altogether too paternal, and I have no doubt whatever that it will cause serious inconvenience, at any rate, in the province of Quebec and on the island of Montreal where there is an immense production of apples.

The committee will remark that this Bill comes into force only on July 1, 1906. Who knows but that the conditions of trade will be completely altered then, and so that boxes two or three inches larger will be better suited for the British trade? I believe it is much better for a matter of this kind to be settled entirely by the usages and by the requirements of trade which are of a continually changing character. We are not going to export apples to England only; we may export apples to other countries where such a box as that defined in this resolution may not be a suitable box at all, and in that case the exporter will be absolutely bound by these regulations respecting the export to England. What certainty have we that within a year, apples packed differently in boxes of a different design, will not have a better sale than those packed in the box clearly defined in this resolution. I do not think this is a matter for legislation, with all due respect to the Fruit Growers' Association, and I think it would cause serious inconvenience to a large number of people who pack apples for export on the Island of Montreal and who will find it difficult to conform to these regulations. One of the causes given by Edwin Williams in his book on the degeneration of British trade, for that misfortune is that the English manufacturer would not conform to the requirements of the markets in the different countries with which he traded, either in the packing of goods, the making out of accounts or in the different usages of trade in the different countries. It strikes me that my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) is here laying down a hard and fast rule for the export of apples to England. The matter would be regulated by the requirements of the trade; if the apple exporter knows that a box of the dimensions mentioned is the most suitable for the export of apples to England, he will conform to that legislation without the Dominion legislature interfering in these details.

Mr. FISHER. I appreciate what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) has said, but I must tell him and tell the committee that the idea which he has promulgated here is directly contrary to what has been the growing and strong opinion of the trade. The trade, not only the apple growers but the men who pack the apples, have found it necessary to define as clearly as may be the dimensions of the packages which they use. The Act that we propose to amend already contains a provision which defines the smallest barrel of apples which will be allowed in the trade. That Act was passed by this House deliberately after discussion, and on the demand of the apple trade, so that no smaller barrel than that particularly defined could be used. The same demand has occurred in regard to the boxes, because to-day and for some years past the box has been growing in favour as a measure or receptacle for the export trade of apples. The same requirement is needed in regard to boxes as has been adopted in regard to barrels. My hon. friend says that he wishes the usage to control the size of the box. Usage has in days gone by controlled it in regard to the barrel. Canadian apples were shipped in barrels of all sizes, and the result was that the trade in England when they ordered a thousand or 2,000 barrels of Canadian apples did not at all know how many pounds or bushels of apples they were going to get. That was one of the difficulties they had to contend with in handling Canadian apples. They expressed their dissatisfaction with that condition of affairs, and the people engaged in the trade here recognized that it was to the advantage of the Canadian trade to have a defined package so that the purchaser would know as nearly as possible what he was getting, or at any rate would know

that he was not getting less than a defined amount, and they asked that the size of the barrels should be defined. I wish to point out here that this is not an exact size but a minimum size. That is the case in regard to barrels in the Act of 1901, sec. 4, which we are about to amend. The trade has been labouring under great disadvantages by reason of the varied sizes of packages, and the trade has the minimum size defined with regard to the barrel. In the last few years the trade has found that the box is a more profitable package to use than the barrel, but the box has varying sizes. The people of Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario, and British Columbia who have been sending apples in boxes have been using different sizes of boxes. They found that the particular box here defined was the one that was closest to the general use and that it was the best average of all those that were in use. It was also the box that was already in use in British Columbia and largely in use in Ontario. It was the box that was already in use by our chief rivals in the English apple trade, the Tasmanian shippers. The trade therefore decided, after careful consideration and discussion, and recommended by formal resolution, that this particular size of box should be adopted, and that resolution has been embodied in the proposed legislation. I am only proposing this at the formal request of the people concerned and I think it is well that parliament should try to carry out that request. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) says that this may interfere with some people in the Island of Montreal. I may say that the fruit growers of the Island of Montreal are largely members of the Fruit Growers' Association of the province of Quebec. I could name a number of men there who are members of that association, and I have no reason to suppose that they were not quite in sympathy with the resolution passed by the Fruit Growers' Association of Quebec, asking that this should be done. Certainly if they were not in sympathy they did not go far enough to challenge the resolution because it was passed, as I understand, unanimously. Under these circumstances I feel that I am not only justified but called upon in the interests of the trade to propose a definition of the size of the box, the definition herein contained as the result of a long and full discussion. It has been adopted in the nature of a compromise, as being the box that comes nearest to all the different varieties of boxes that have been used in the past. My reason for postponing the coming into force of this amendment is simply because I am told that certain box manufacturers have already made a considerable number of the boxes for next year and a considerable number of packers have on hand boxes which they ordered for last year's crop, but which in consequence of the crop not being so large as was expected they now have on hand, and they would like to use these boxes for their next year's crop, whereas if this amendment came into force, they would not be able to use those boxes. I think that is a concession to the condition of the trade which we ought to make. But my hon. friend evidently does not understand the situation when he expresses the view that we should not to-day legislate for a box for a year hence. One of the most important things in the trade is that the packers, box-makers and fruit growers should know some little time before hand the kind of boxes they are going to use.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is this box intended to approximate in size to the bushed measure ?

Mr. FISHER. It is believed by those who have measured it carefully that three of these boxes will contain exactly the same amount of fruit as the barrel which is defined in the other part of this Act.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would say to the minister that I do not intend to enter into a discussion as to whether this is the proper size for a box or not ; but I would remind him that only the day before yesterday he told us that we would have time to communicate with our constituents on this matter, and now he has suddenly and, I think, rather unfairly sprung this on the committee. I wrote immediately to a party from whom I knew I would get reliable information, but no opportunity has been given me to get that information. I think the hon. gentleman should not press this matter so hastily. He tells us that the fruit-growers have approved of this. Well, I would like to have the opinion of the fruit-growers in the county which I have the honour to represent. I know that they have an association to deal with all matters of this kind. I do not propose to oppose the measure as it stands, because I might make a mistake ; but I would like to know that their views are fully represented in it, or they may differ from other associations from whom the minister has received information. I trust that he will not press the matter to a final issue until we have had an opportunity of hearing from those whom we represent.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. minister is doing in this box legislation exactly what he did in the barrel legislation. In the barrel legislation he specified a minimum size, and it works like this. The cartage and the freight are exactly the same for the larger as for the smaller barrel, and when the apples are placed on the market the larger barrel has an advantage over the smaller. The reason the minimum barrel was adopted was that the manufacturers of barrels made that size and did not wish to change their machinery. The hon. gentleman is

pursuing a similar course with respect to the boxes. There will be two or three sizes, and the same difficulty will be experienced. Why should there not be uniform barrels and uniform boxes, so that all parties would be placed on the same footing when entering the British market?

Mr. FISHER. I beg to thank the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) for reminding me that he desired the other night to have this matter left over until he could communicate with his constituents. I had forgotten that for the moment, and I have no hesitation at all in acceding to the request that the resolutions should not be proceeded with now, and that abundant opportunity be given to all to hear from their constituents or from any others interested in the matter. At the same time, if any one wishes to make any further suggestions. I shall only be too glad to hear them before the committee rises.

Mr. MONK. I wish to make this suggestion. It is possible that the Fruit-Growers' Association may have passed a resolution recommending that boxes of this size be used, and I understand that it is a matter of importance to my hon. friend to communicate the views of the association, which can be done easily through the newspapers or otherwise, to parties engaged in the export of apples. But has the association actually gone so far as to demand that a law should be passed defining the size of these boxes? Since my hon. friend has consented to put off the consideration of this measure, I would ask him if he would have any objection to lay on the table of the House the communications of the Fruit Growers' Association?

Mr. OSLER. Are all the apples shipped in the same sized boxes?

Mr. FISHER. No. At the present time there is no standard box. The consequence is that there is some variety in the sizes of the boxes used. The fruit-growers and the shippers have asked that we should, as far as possible, define a minimum box, so that they would not be getting smaller boxes.

Mr. OSLER. That would mean that there would be boxes of different sizes?

Mr. FISHER. We expect, and it has been the result in the case of the barrel, that when a minimum is fixed, the box or barrel makers will take that as their standard, so that in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred that will be the size used. At the same time, if anybody chooses to use a larger box or barrel, he can do so.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to draw the minister's attention to a statement that was made by the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) when this matter was under consideration before. He said that the question whether barrels or boxes were the best had been considered by a commission which had been appointed in the United States, and that the report of the commission was in favour of barrels for export rather than boxes. Might I ask the hon. minister if he would be good enough to look into that, and bring before the House whatever information he can obtain on that point?

Mr. CHISHOLM. In the county which I have the honour to represent a great many apples go to waste every year, because the growers pick the apples and leave them on the ground in piles awaiting the buyers who are to classify them and put them into barrels. It has been very difficult to get barrels, and the result has been that many apples have been frozen on the ground. The farmers could make the boxes themselves and avoid delay and loss caused by waiting for barrels. It is important that this question of boxes should be settled as soon as possible. I am satisfied that many thouands of dollars' worth of apples were lost in the county I represent last year, because the farmers were not able to take care of them themselves. And I would suggest that more fruit inspectors be sent out to instruct the farmers in this matter. I would further like to suggest that some arrangement be made as soon as possible to avoid such an enormous loss. If our farmers had an idea of the size and the kind of boxes required, they would no doubt be in a position shortly to make the boxes themselves, and it would be well to have a standard box, not merely for export, but also for our internal trade, for we have a great market in our own country, especially in the Northwest.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I am very glad to hear the remarks of the hon. gentleman. The difficulty of getting boxes and barrels in certain seasons depends largely upon the size of the crop. When there is a very large crop, the box and barrel makers are not always able to meet the demand. Unfortunately the apple crop varies very much from year to year. In some years we have an enormous crop and in other years a much smaller crop, and our box and barrel makers are at a loss to know what stock to prepare in advance, as of course they do not care to have a large quantity left on their hands at the end of the season. As regards what my hon. friend says about teaching the farmers how to pack, my department has already taken steps in that direction. For two or three years back we have had at the exhibitions, where we could reach the fruit growing sections, an expert actually doing the work of packing apples so as to illustrate the best method. That was done in connection with the demonstration of the Fruit Marks Act, so as to teach the people how to pack the apples themselves under that Act and the best way of handling their fruit. As regards the packing

by the farmers themselves instead of selling to packers, that is a matter of trade and commerce with which I do not think the department ought to interfere. All we can do is give the people information and let them judge for themselves how they should conduct their own business.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would like to point out that when there is a large stock you can easily make boxes, but not barrels. The last year or two, the packers could not get barrels on account of the difficulty of splitting staves and drying them, but boxes can be made almost while the apples are being handled.

Mr. FISHER. All the more reason for the change.

RAILWAY ACT.

Bill (No. 36) to amend the Railway Act, 1903—Mr. Fitzpatrick—read the second time.

Mr. SPEAKER. When shall the House go into committee ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I am quite willing that we should go into committee now provided that the Minister of Justice will give one or two days' notice of the third reading, as I have two or three amendments to propose.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What my hon. friend really wishes, I presume, is to move, by way of amendment, the different clauses of the Bill now in his name on the order paper.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think it would be advisable to thresh them out in committee. There are some features in one of the clauses of his Bill which I think ought to be discussed.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I am not quite ready to go on now, but will be on Tuesday.

REVISION OF THE STATUTES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Justice what the present position is of the revision of the statutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is nearing completion, and there is an item in the estimates which I have kept over so as to be in a position to give some explanation to the House. I am waiting to get a report from the commissioners and my expectation is that the work will be practically completed this session.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. What statutes are comprised in the revision ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. All the statutes to the present year, and it is intended to ask leave to include the statutes of this session.

DRAWBACKS ON RAW MATERIALS IN THE UNITED STATES TARIFF—SUPPLY.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). I wish to draw the attention of the government to an economic revolution, as it is described in 'Le Canada,' which has taken place in the United States and greatly affects our country. That revolution is in connection with the recent change made in the United States regarding drawbacks. In the 'New York Tribune' of Sunday, February 5, there is a special from Washington dated February 4, which says :

> Free hides, wool, lumber, in a word free raw and partially manufactured materials of every sort and description are now at the disposal of American manufacturers engaged in the export trade, as the result of the far-reaching drawback decision of Attorney General Moody, the text of which was published in the 'Tribune' of February 3rd.

I want to read one or two clauses from the decision. The Attorney General of the United States has given this opinion :

> In my opinion, where it is proposed to export a product manufactured in the United States from a combination of domestic material and foreign material which has paid duty, and the customs officials can identify the foreign material and can ascertain to their satisfaction, by the evidence of books of account or otherwise, the quantity or measure of the foreign material actually present in the completed article, the exporter is entitled to receive a drawback of ninety-nine per cent of the duties paid upon the imported material thus ascertained to be actually present in the completed article.

And, as I have read, this is now held in Washington to apply to every article imported into the United States for use in the production of goods to be exported. In other words, a great revolution has taken place in the trade of that country, which vitally concerns the people of Canada. And to make still clearer what the American government is aiming at, I wish to read a speech of the late Mr. McKinley that was quoted by the Attorney General of the United States and on which this recent order is based. I may say, also, that this is a reversal of two previous decisions, and is now considered to be final. The speech of Mr. McKinley in 1890 was, in part, as follows :

> The Bill proposes that the American citizen may import any product he desires, manufacture it into the finished article, using in part, if necessary, in such manufacture, domestic materials, and when the completed product is entered for export, refunds to him within one per cent of all the duty he paid upon his imported materials. That is, we give to the capital and the labour of this country substantial free trade in all foreign materials for use in the

markets of the world. We do not require that the product shall be made wholly of the foreign material. Already under special provisions of laws and regulations of the Treasury Department, parts of the finished product made here and attached to the finished article does not deprive the exporter of his drawback. We have extended this provision, and in every way possible liberalized it, so that the domestic and foreign product can be combined, and still allow to the exporter ninety-nine per cent upon the duty he pays upon his foreign material intended for export; which is, in effect, what free traders, and our political opponents are clamouring for, namely free raw material for the foreign trade. And if you are desirous of seeing what you can do in the way of entering the foreign market, here is the opportunity for you.

It completely, if the provision be adopted, disposes of what has sometimes seemed to be an almost unanswerable argument that has been presented by our friends on the other side—that if we only had free raw material we could go out and capture the markets of the world. We give them now within one per cent of free raw material, and invite them to go and capture the markets of the world.

Mr. Springer—Will the gentleman permit me to ask if that also applies to wool?

Mr. McKinley—Yes; it applies to anything which they choose to import for purposes of manufacture.

Here, then, is the completion of the policy as outlined by Mr. McKinley in 1890, when the tariff was revised. And it has now been sustained by the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States and put in execution by the Secretary of the Treasury. He has issued an order, dated February 4, addressed to all collectors of customs instructing them that the opinion of the Attorney General is authorized by the Treasury, and that this drawback of 99 per cent is to go into effect immediately. As I have just said this is a great revolution. The object, as Mr. McKinley pointed out, is to capture all the foreign trade of the world. That this is a matter immediately affecting Canada is proven by the fact that the decision was given in connection with the drawback on an article imported into the United States from Canada—our wheat known as No. 1 hard. The object of the legislation as applied to that article is to allow the American millers to bring in Canadian wheat from our Northwest on the payment of a duty of 25 per cent per bushel, use it in their mills, mix it with the wheat of the United States and export the product, receiving a drawback of 99 per cent of the duty that had been paid. And what Secretary Shaw, of the Roosevelt cabinet said on that point is as follows:

It is, of course, impossible to say now just what effect this drawback ruling will have, but it will probably result in the consumption of several thousand, or perhaps several hundred thousand bushels of our domestic wheat in foreign markets that would otherwise have been thrown upon our own markets at a reduced price or not sold at all. I think it is safe to say that more than $100,000,000 worth of our foreign trade to-day depends upon drawbacks for its being.

He gives an illustration bearing out this idea by showing that by reason of a drawback the American manufacturers are in a position to capture the locomotive trade of the world and that as a matter of fact, they are capturing it to-day. The correspondent of the 'Tribune' who is very well informed—and he is evidently inspired because the 'Tribune' is the official organ of the administration—goes on to say:

The officials of the Treasury Department do not believe that the drawback allowed on Canadian hard wheat will cause any reduction of the customs revenue. None of that cereal is being imported now, they say——

——I dispute that, by the way——

——and the only effect that can be brought about will be the increased sale of American soft wheat, which goes into the manufacture of exported flour. The best of the domestic wheat remains in this country and will stay here, drawback or no drawback. The cheaper grades are used with the Canadian wheat to make the flour that is demanded by the foreign trade. Heretofore these grades have not found a ready market in this country, for unless they are mixed with hard wheat they do not make a good bread-making flour.

The wheat raisers of the Northwest are raising some objection to a reduction in the price of the better grades of grain, and it is conceded that they have some grounds for this apprehension. But the amount of hard wheat raised on this side of the border is small, when compared with the output of the soft grain fields, and the interests benefited by the allowance are believed to be tremendously larger than those injured. The most strenuous objectors to the drawback ruling will be the millers of the Dominion of Canada. Their flour, which is now shipped to Liverpool, London, Glasgow and the other great markets of the United Kingdom, will soon meet a vigorous rival in the product that will be ground by the mills of Minneapolis, St. Paul, Chicago, St. Louis and other cities. If the American millers take away a good proportion of the trade now held by the Canadian manufacturers through the operation of the drawback concession, it may have a serious effect on the labour problem of the Dominion. If these labour interests are strong enough, it is suggested by the Treasury Department officials an effort may be made to pass an export tax law for Canada. Nothing short of such a drastic measure could interfere with the new flour trade American mills hope to acquire across the Atlantic.

Now, the trend of opinion in the United States is all in the direction of taking away from Canada the export market that we now have for our hard wheat. Our hard wheat is the best in the world. The Americans on the contrary produce any amount of wheat of lower grade. They are not in a position to export that wheat unless they can get the Canadian wheat to mix with it. But, getting the Canadian wheat, as they now propose to get it, they intend to take away the market we now have. We have a splendid and growing trade in our hard wheat and

the flour produced from it. Canadian mills are doing a large and growing trade. Canadian railways are carrying the product of this wheat for export, and Canadian transportation interests get the benefit of all freight and other charges. And Canadian workmen get all the work in connection with it. And yet we read that the policy of the American government and the American millers is to take our wheat into their country, grind it there and export it, thus depriving us of the export trade we have, depriving our railways of the business of transporting it and our men of the wages to be earned in grinding and handling it. And they say that there is but one thing that will stop them from doing this, and that is what they call a drastic measure, namely that Canada may put on an export duty in the case of such wheat.

The other day in Montreal, at a meeting of the Board of Trade, Mr. Meighen, who is president of that body, made a statement dealing with this very question. He said there was a danger of Canada losing this trade, and he went so far as to say that he was in favour of an export duty on Canadian wheat—not so wide as had been proposed, but certainly an export duty on Canadian wheat that was to be used to be mixed with American wheat in order that a market might be found for low grade American wheat. Now is it not a matter of national policy, a matter of extreme national peril that the government ought to consider—and it is for this reason that I direct to it the attention of the House.

Now I am not afraid to say—I am speaking altogether for myself—that I am ready to declare myself in favour of an export duty on wheat going out of this country to be ground in the United States. I think I can give good reasons for it. First of all, the work ought to be kept in this country. In the next place, I contend that if you grind Canadian wheat in Canadian mills you get the offal, as it is called, for use in Canada for feeding cattle. If the wheat is exported the offal goes abroad and never comes back, but when you grind the grain in the country and sell the bran and shorts to Canadian farmers, it is used in our own country for feed and manure, and add to the productiveness of the land, and in every way the Canadian is benefited. But if you send the raw product away the country is being depleted of its natural wealth, the productiveness of the land is being reduced, and the Canadian Northwest will be brought to the condition in which we find many of the northwestern states of the United States to-day, they are unable to produce hard wheat, and I contend that is largely due to the fact that the raw products have been sent out of that country, and no return has been made to the land to maintain its productiveness. A minister of the present government who was in the Northwest recently said, not long ago when he came back, that the impression made upon him by his visit was that an enormous effort will have to be made by the people there if they wish to maintain the fertility of their soil, and to control the wheat market. It has been found now that the wheat belt keeps moving north, keeps moving backwards, and the day may come when we will not have enough hard wheat of our own to mix with our own cheaper varieties. Therefore, not only is it in the interest of the Canadian workingmen and Canadian capital invested in mills, but it is in the interest of the farmer in our Northwest, that something should be done to secure the grinding of our own wheat in our own mills. I say now, notwithstanding what has been argued by some, that the Canadian farmer in the Northwest will benefit by this drawback. Perhaps for a time he will get a higher price for his product, but I contend that in the long run it will be found to be an injury. That western country is for the benefit of all Canada, and every wheat raiser in the Northwest must desire to see eastern Canada built up by these mills, and eastern workingmen kept busy, and that business may be found for our railways.

But the principle of an export duty is not confined to wheat, it touches upon and concerns a large number of other articles. For instance, we have in the province of Ontario the greatest supply of nickle ore in the world. To-day a large number of men are employed in developing those ores; but by reason of our present laws, and in line with the policy of the American government, we are allowing that nickle matte, that is to say, the article which has undergone the first process to be exported to the United States and refined in that country, so that for one dollar that we pay in wages here to Canadian workmen, twenty dollars are paid in wages to the United States workmen. I do not think that is in the interest of this country, and if an export duty on that nickle matte going out of this country would keep it here so that it should be refined in Canada, I think it ought to be done. Then with regard to our pulp wood, we are exporting to-day enormous quantities to the United States to be used in paper mills there, and enormous quantities are sent to the old country. Now an export duty on pulp wood would keep that industry in this country.

The Minister of Agriculture said the other day that he desired to see the cattle embargo removed from our cattle in the old country. I disagree with him there, because his policy is to have the lean cattle of Canada go into the British market. But farming is taking a new turn in these days. A good farmer does not seek simply to raise grain and sell it, but if he is wise he will raise grain and feed it to his cattle and sell only the finished product. If he is wise, the farmer, instead of selling the milk

from his cows, will use separators and make the butter himself and use the skim-milk for feeding pigs and hens, and thereby increase his profit. The same principle runs through many other industries; and the whole tendency is to produce the finished products in this country, even on the farm. If we in Canada can produce some finished product on a farm which will bring a higher price and furnish more labour for Canadians, we ought to do it.

Now we come to another thing. I was reading this morning a little pamphlet of Mr. Nicholl's, of Toronto, who deals with the great development of the water-powers of Niagara. Under the law of the province of Ontario, those who are about to turn out this enormous development of electrical energy at the falls, are free to export fifty per cent of their product to the United States; so that power generated on the Canadian side of the falls, is by law, as it stands to-day, to be exported into the United States, there to be used to build up immense industrial concerns. An export duty on electrical energy would prevent that. This is another instance of the new policy of encouraging commerce that has been adopted by the United States government. I say the time has come when we as Canadians, especially since we have embarked upon the national policy, ought to keep our own markets for our own manufacturers, and our own work for our own work people. We may be forced by reason of this new policy in the United States to adopt, and extensively to adopt, the principle of export duties. It has been applied with marvellous success in the province of Ontario with regard to saw-logs. Not long ago we exported all our saw-logs, we rafted them across the lake to mills in Michigan, where they were cut up and where American workmen, and American machinery and American capital found large profits. But by reason of an agitation carried on in that province a change was made, and a law was passed that all the saw-logs cut off the Crown lands must be manufactured into lumber in Canadian mills.

Proposals of that kind are being made from day to day. The people are thinking about these things and to give the government some idea of what is going on and to enable the people of the country who are interested in this new legislation in the United States to express their views I am directing attention to it to-day. The government have told the country that they are about to appoint a commission on tariff questions. I hope the powers of that commission will be wide enough to enable them to investigate matters of this kind and to go into the question of how far this new doctrine of drawbacks in the United States will affect Canadian trade. I think when they find out how extensive it is they will be very much interested. Even the shoe trade will be interested because the Americans have made this rule so wide that not only the leather but the shoes made from the leather of imported hides are entitled to this drawback. Woollens made in the United States from imported wool are entitled to this drawback and will come into competition with Canadian woollens. This goes all through the export trade, and therefore when the government go into this question they will find that they will not only have to take up the question of tariff revision having regard to the duties imposed under the Customs Act, but they will have to take up the question in connection with drawbacks and probably the only way to meet this new system of drawbacks in the United States is to have recourse to an export duty. One argument I have read during the last few days against the imposition of an export duty is this. In London, England, they are putting up the largest mills in the world for the grinding of flour out of Canadian wheat, and I have been asked: Would you put an export duty on wheat that goes over to the old country to be ground in London? I would. Large mills would be worth just as much to the mother country and to Canada if they were located on the Lake of the Woods. If we can grind our own wheat in our own country and give work to Canadian workmen retaining the shorts and the bran for feeding Canadian cattle we ought to do so. We can do that without injuring the farmers in the Northwest Territories a single bit. I know that the great cry will be that you are going to injure the Canadian farmer in the Northwest. But, in bringing up the question as I do here to-day, those who represent that country and that interest will have an opportunity either now or later on to discuss the question and to present their views. I believe that the Canadian public will demand that in order to preserve our export trade and to hold our own against this new and revolutionizing policy of the United States we shall do something in this country and do it very shortly. It is simply to bring the question before the government and before the people that I take this opportunity of introducing it to the House. I would have given notice of it but I only got hold of the Montreal paper a few minutes ago with that heading on it. I am speaking altogether from my own point of view, but from a close study of the way trade is moving in this country and in other directions it is constantly coming home to us that the people of the United States, the millers, and manufacturers of the United States, assisted by a most active and progressive government and a government that is protectionist up to the hilt, have brought about a revolution in trade matters that is of the most vital interest to the people of this country.

Mr. G. H. PERLEY (Argenteuil). Mr. Speaker, without going into the merits of

the question raised by my hon. friend for South York (Mr. Maclean), I wish to correct one statement which he made and which I would not like to have appear on 'Hansard.' That is that the province of Ontario put an export duty on saw-logs. That was not a correct statement of the facts, as the province of Ontario has no power to impose an export duty. What the province of Ontario did was to put into its regulations that saw-logs cut on the Crown domain must be manufactured in the province of Ontario. Of course, a private individual who has some timber on his own land can cut that timber and export it if he sees fit. I would like to make this explanation because in the United States the question was raised as to whether this was an export duty within the meaning of the law over there.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It must have been a slip of the tongue because my own understanding of the matter is exactly in accordance with the statement of my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley). It was an Act of the Ontario legislature in connection with the licensing of the cutting of timber on Crown lands, but it had the desired effect.

POLITICAL CRISIS IN QUEBEC.

Mr. J. E. E. LEONARD (Laval). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, the press of this country has published, for the last few days, all sorts of rumours to the effect that a crisis is preying upon the Quebec cabinet and that three of the ministers have resigned.

'Le Journal' of this morning announces that the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue has been charged by the prime minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to go down to Quebec with a message of peace. Here is what the paper says:—

> Quebec, February 8.—Hon. L. Brodeur, Minister of Inland Revenue, and Senator Dandurand have arrived at Quebec this morning with a message of peace, which they brought from Ottawa, on the part of the federal government. As representing the Ottawa government, Messrs. Brodeur and Dandurand have had a conference with Hon. Messrs. Gouin and Turgeon, on the one hand, and Hon. Messrs. McCorkill and Archambault representing the prime minister, Mr. Parent, on the other hand.
>
> Hon. Mr. Brodeur delivered his message on the part of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his colleagues of the ministry, a message in which a program for reconciliation had been traced.

I am sorry the prime minister is not at his seat at this moment, but perhaps the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) is aware of what is going on. I would be much pleased—and so would many a member of this House—to hear from the honourable minister as to whether Hon. Mr. Brodeur has been charged by the government or by the prime minister to go and settle the difficulty which prevails in Quebec since a few days, and as to whether the government has received any communication from the Minister of Inland Revenue on this subject.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. (Translation). Forsooth, my hon. friend understands how desirous I would be to satisfy his curiosity. Unfortunately, Hon. Mr. Brodeur is now absent from the House. I have every reason to believe that he will be here tonight. Should my hon. friend be willing to repeat his question, I think the Minister of Inland Revenue would be in a position to give him an answer.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation). Has he been charged to go to Quebec and deliver a message of peace ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. (Translation). My hon. friend will get an answer directly from the minister who is concerned in this, and not through the newspaper fuss, which he deems so important.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is agreeable we will take up the Trade and Commerce estimates—steamship subsidies.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought it was understood that we should go on with the estimates of the Public Works Department. It is very inconvenient, as the hon. minister will see, when we have an idea that he is going on with certain estimates to be launched into something else.

Mr. PATERSON. If you are ready to go on with the Public Works estimates all right. I thought you were waiting for the report.

Mr. FOSTER. We are ready to go on, as I intimated, on the same conditions as those under which we proceeded before if it is quite agreeable to the hon. Acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman). His report came down to-day.

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works). Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. So that relieves the situation as his report is down.

Victoria Memorial Museum and other buildings, $250,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This vote of $250,000 is to make provision towards the erection of the Victoria Memorial Museum. The contract has been let; the building is being erected on what is known in Ottawa as the Stewart property, which was acquired about two years ago for the purpose of this memorial. The building is intended to be used for the Geological, Natural History and Fishery Exhibits which are in

the possession of the government and for the Art Gallery. These different collections are now stored in different places entirely unsuitable and inadequate for the purpose. The contract has been let to Mr. George Goodwin, Ottawa, for $950,000. The estimated cost in addition to that of the building is for heating, $50,000 ; electric wiring and fixtures, $60,000 ; fittings and furnishings, about $100,000, with the usual allowance for contingencies bringing up the total estimate made by the architect to about $1,250,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Before we proceed with the discussion of a Public Works item, I would ask the minister if there is no report of his department later than the one which I hold which is only up to June 30, 1903 ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have here a report which was laid on the table of the House this afternoon which is up to June 30, 1904. I shall be happy to send it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAIN. When will this building be completed ?

Mr. HYMAN. The time given for the completion of the building is four years.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the hon. gentleman not regard this as a large amount of money ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. BLAIN. I mean to be expended in this way ; it is a much larger amount than was proposed when the plans were first prepared. Were the plans completed altogether by the architect of the department ?

Mr. HYMAN. The plans were made by the department.

Mr. SPROULE. How many tenders were there, and will the minister give us the different tenders ?

Mr. HYMAN. There were five tenders for the building running from $950.000 to $1,349,500. The tenders were as follows :

Geo. Goodwin, $950,000 (accepted).
M. Connolly, $1,157,955.
Holbrook & Sutherland, J. C. Low, $1,239,000.
Stuart & O'Leary, $1,319,314.
Sullivan & Langdon, $1,349,500.

Mr. SPROULE. It was awarded to the lowest tenderer then ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Was there not some delay or difficulty as to the signing of the contract with Mr. Goodwin ? How was that finally arranged ?

Mr. HYMAN. There was delay in the signing of the contract, but there was no arrangement made. Mr. Goodwin was notified by the department immediately that the contract had been awarded to him by Order in Council, and for some time he did not sign the contract. No arrangement was come to and no change was made in the contract.

Mr. INGRAM. When this item was brought up on the 24th of March, 1904, it was stated that a part of the vote was for the purpose of a fireproof office and other buildings. How have they progressed, these offices and other buildings that the item of $170,000 was supposed to partly cover ?

Mr. HYMAN. I presume that was for the archives building which was passed the other day and which I explained fully then. It is being built on the property owned by the government just in rear of the Printing Bureau.

Mr. INGRAM. Of this vote of $170,000 of which $73,500 was paid for the Stewart estate, the balance was said to be for the fireproof office. There was no explanation as to where it was to be located and we have heard nothing of that since. Now there is no part of this money that hon. gentleman speaks of, this $950,000, to go for offices, it is simply for the Victoria Memorial Museum.

Mr. HYMAN. The first item in this vote, Dominion Archives Building, is for a fireproof building. It is in another part of the same vote.

Mr. INGRAM. What connection had it with this vote in 1904 ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is all in one item, item 115.

Mr. INGRAM. So that item, 115, covers them both ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, this is only a part of the item.

Mr. FOSTER. What kind of a building is this to be, what material, &c. I think that with a building of that size and costing this amount we should have the plans before us so that we might understand something of the proposed building. It seems a little blind really to go into an expenditure of over a million without seeing the plans. Although I am not an expert and although many others on this side may not be experts, still it is always a fair thing to ask that the profile of the building or something that will give an idea of what it is proposed to build, should be before the House.

Mr. HYMAN. I shall be very glad to lay a plan on the table. I think I have a picture of the building that possibly would give more information than anything else that could be laid before the House. I shall place it on the table to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. Now as to the material and the general character of the building.

Mr. HYMAN. The building is designed to be 420 feet long. The main building will

be 219 feet long by 53 feet deep, and there will be a wing at either end 54 feet by 143 feet 6 inches. There will be a tower rising 58 feet. The building is to be four stories with a basement and subbasement except the tower which of course has an additional story and an additional elevation. The general height from the ground line will be 106 feet, and from the ground line to the top of the tower, 220 feet. The walls are to be of stone. The intention is to use Nepean stone, like that in the Parliament buildings, with brown stone facings. The roof is to be of non-combustible materials.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the building to be fire-proof ?

Mr. HYMAN. Practically fire-proof. The floors will all be of cement.

Mr. INGRAM. How does it come that the hon. gentleman has made a change in the size of the building ? When the item was first brought in, the statement made by the minister was that the main building was to be 208 feet long and the wings 126 feet.

Mr. HYMAN. At that time I presume the whole plan of the building was not prepared.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the general plan of the inside ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is very hard to describe it.

Mr. FOSTER. That illustrates why we should have the plans and profiles here at the time the vote is going through.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman understands that it is impossible to bring all the plans of the building here.

Mr. FOSTER. We ought to have something. The House does not know anything about it. It is all right in the noddle of the architect and in the mind of the minister, but neither should expect the House to vote such a large sum of money without seeing any plan or profile. Useful suggestions might sometimes be made by members of the House. At any rate, the House is voting the money, and we would like to see, as nearly as we can, an outline of what is proposed by the government.

Mr. HYMAN. The eastern wing from basement to attic is to be occupied by the fisheries museum and the art gallery ; the amphitheatre by the furnace room in the basement, the lecture hall and gallery above, and the geological survey library at the top. Exclusive of the tower, main hall and amphitheatre, the building is to be divided as follows : The basement and second floor into offices, and the ground, first and third floors each into four large museum rooms.

Mr. FOSTER. The offices are for what ?

Mr. HYMAN. The geological survey. I will bring down to-morrow an outline of the building, which will give practically all the information desired.

Mr. FOSTER. Is provision made for storing everything that we have in the old museum ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I imagine that the amount we have stored now, however large it is, is not all that we shall have to provide for in the future years. The collections are every year being added to, so that I should imagine that the provision for extra store room ought to be very considerable.

Mr. HYMAN. The department in considering that question took this into consideration, that having the new building, and having all the specimens properly stored, the increase would possibly be larger than it is at present, and therefore we have allowed room for storing everything that we possess at the present time and room for practically as much more.

Mr. FOSTER. What floor space would be taken by the present collections, distributed on the new plan ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have not exactly the number of square feet of floor space of the building.

Mr. FOSTER. How was the purchase of this land made—through an agent ?

Mr. HYMAN. I understand that it was purchased at auction, at a Master in Chancery sale.

Mr. FOSTER. Then there was no commission to be paid ?

Mr. HYMAN. There was one commission to Taggart.

Mr. FOSTER. Why was there a commission ?

Mr. HYMAN. He was to be paid a commission for obtaining a site.

Mr. FOSTER. Who paid the commission? Did it come out of the purchase price, or was it in addition to the purchase price ?

Mr. HYMAN. I suppose to all intents and purposes we paid it, although when the property was put into Chancery the price placed upon it was $75,000, and the department bought the property for enough less to pay the commission.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it the general practice of the department in getting sites for public buildings to employ a broker and pay him a commission ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is, in a great many instances, and the sites have to be got in that way. During the short time I have been in the department I have found great dif-

ficulty in obtaining sites. The very moment that it is known that the government are after a site, an attempt is made to advance the price. So that we must of necessity employ an agent to obtain options. I acknowledge that in certain instances which have come before me the commisison has appeared to be large; but it must be remembered that by using the services of an agent the department has purchased the property at considerably less than it would probably otherwise have done. I have endeavoured in these matters to deal with an agent as an ordinary business man would.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that is reasonable in most cases, and probably the minister gets the properties much cheaper by employing an agent, provided he does not let it be known before his agent gets to work that he is after the property. I imagine that information of that kind soon filters out in a city like Ottawa, and that those who have properties that are eligible, soon find out that the government are in the market and look upon the agents as emissaries of the government. What other sites were under consideration and were other options got?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not know that we went to the extent of getting any other options but there were several sites discussed. One is the property which the government have since acquired for the mint—the proposed extension down Mackenzie avenue. There was also a property of Bronsons' facing on the driveway, under consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. The face of the building will be right at the foot of the street?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, the building is being placed so that Metcalfe street will strike the front of it.

Mr. BLAIN. Here is a contract for $950,000 and the total cost, when completed, will be $1,250,000. That means that the minister will deal with six or seven contractors before he is through with the building. The electric lighting is estimated to cost about $50,000, and he will receive tenders for that. Would it not be much better for him to have a plan made out comprising everything and call tenders for the building and equipment complete rather than deal with a number of separate contractors? One advertisement could be sent throughout the country to cover the whole matter. Such an advertisement would reach more people and bring out more tenders, and the sub-contractors would have to deal with the original contractors instead of with the government.

Mr. HYMAN. That would not be possible. The heating and electric lighting work may not be proceeded with for several years. It is not the policy of the department to call for tenders for the heating until the building is practically roofed in, and I do not think that any one would care to tender for the electric lighting contract when the work could not be begun for at least two years from the date of the tender. No one would care to discount the labour market and the market for material so far ahead.

Mr. BLAIN. When my hon. friend estimated that the lighting would cost about $50,000, he must have made some calculations on which to base that estimate. And as regards looking into the future, he must realize that if the building will be four or five years in construction, the contractor will have to look considerably ahead just as would the contractor for the lighting. If a contractor can look ahead in the case of a contract reaching to the amount of $950,000, surely he can look ahead in the case of a contract amounting to only $50,000. The usual way of letting contracts for buildings generally throughout the country is to ask one man or firm to contract for the whole thing and let the party putting up the building deal with only one contractor. It would be a saving to the public treasury if the hon. gentleman would adopt the up-to-date policy rather than the antiquated policy in the erection of public buildings.

Mr. LENNOX. In saying that it is not advisable to commit the government to prices as regards the electric lighting. Has the hon. minister regard to the possibility that there may be a change in the conditions within two years?

Mr. HYMAN. I said it would be almost impossible, when it would take four years to complete the building, to enter now into contracts in detail for the heating, lighting and electric work. There is a vast difference between entering into a contract for the construction of a building and into comtracts for heating and lighting. The contractor for the construction will buy immediately all the material he requires and can fix immediately his prices for almost everything, but he would not care to lay in to-day a stock in hand for heating and electric lighting which he would only require to use four years hence. I have had considerable experience in my own private business in the construction of buildings, and I cannot recall one single instance in which I called for a tender for everything in the one contract. The usual course is to ask for tenders for the building and then, when the building is nearing completion, to call for tenders for the equipment.

Mr. LENNOX. There may be a good deal in what the minister says but the department should be consistent. I understood him to say that owing to possibly changed conditions, it would be inadvisable for the department to commit itself to fixed prices now.

Mr. HYMAN. I said nothing of the kind. What I said was that a contractor would hesitate making a contract two years ahead at fixed prices.

Mr. LENNOX. If the hon. gentleman means anything, he must mean that by committing ourselves at this time we would have to pay higher prices because in four years hence the conditions may be changed and the contractor, if called upon to fix prices to-day, and take chances on the future, he would make them higher than he otherwise would. So, by delaying and by watching the position and taking advantage of the improvements in electrical appliances in the meantime, we should get more satisfactory conditions and lower prices. That may be true; it very likely is true. But, if it is true, I call the attention of the minister to the position taken by some other members of the cabinet, notably in the M. P. Davis contract. In that case, though electricity was more in its infancy—if we may use that term—than it is to-day, and though changing conditions were likely to lower prices, the government gave a contract to run for eighty-four years. What was good in one case ought to be good in another. And if the government is right in the present instance, they must have been far wrong in the case of the Davis contract. I will not go into that, but merely cite it as an illustration. I may have occasion to give the government the pleasure, as I did last session, of hearing me on that subject.

Mr. BLAIN. As to the question whether the policy the minister adopts is the up-to-date one or not, I would simply call his attention to the fact that in the most recent and up-to-date buildings in Montreal the contract was let, not only for the building, but for the lighting and heating at one time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Which was that?

Mr. BLAIN. The Board of Trade building.

Mr. MONK. They are all that way.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No. What about the Canadian Pacific station?

Mr. MONK. Exactly the same way.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not at all. I know something about that.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that the government erected some steel sheds in the city of Montreal at a cost of some $3,000,000. May I ask if these were not let under one contract to be completed for occupation?

Mr. MONK. Of course; to Mr. Peter Lyall.

Mr. BLAIN. As to the time to arrange for the lighting and heating equipment for a building costing a million and a quarter of dollars, every one knows that the proper time is when the building is being constructed—that is the cheapest way to do it, and it is the way followed by those who are up-to-date. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to let a contract for a building at $950,000, and say: After that is done we will put in further advertisements and call in other friends and give them a contract for the electric lighting. When that is done they will call in other supporters and give them a contract for the heating. And so on. I suppose that is very good political policy, but I do not think it is a policy that will commend itself to the people of this country, nor do I think it a policy that will protect the public treasury.

Mr. HYMAN. As to the contract for the sheds, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) knows as well as I do that that contract was let by the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal. I presume the hon. gentleman desires to be fair, and, that being the case, he will admit that the question of providing electric light for a lot of iron sheds is entirely different from the lighting of a building of the character of that we are now discussing. As to what the hon. gentleman says about calling in a lot of friends of the government, he knows perfectly well that, in items such as this, the whole thing is done by tender. He knows it is all open to public competition, tenders being called for by advertisement in the public press. The whole question is one in which I must be guided by the opinion of the chief architect of the department. He has had experience, and he tells me that the plan we have adopted of calling for the main tenders first and the others afterwards is distinctly in the public interest. It is clear I could not refuse to follow the advice of the chief architect in such matters unless I had very strong evidence that he was wrong.

Mr. INGRAM. That is not the point that we want to get at—or that I want to get at, at least. Session after session we are asked to vote sums on the strength of statements which afterwards turn out to be incorrect, and the House is led to vote sums which, if hon. members were made aware of all that was involved, probably would not be voted. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland), whom the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) succeeded, pledged himself and the department that in all cases of new work he would place before the House the estimated cost, so that the House might know the total of the sums it would be called upon to vote for the service. But I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hyman) to say that he does not intend to carry out that undertaking, but will leave the matter open, so that he can come down year after year and ask for any sums he may think well in order to carry on works that have been begun. I object to that way of doing business, and I think we have good reason to object. This is the first session of a new parliament, and we should understand what the course of the government is going to be in

this matter. During the recent Dominion election a really alarming state of affairs developed. We found Liberal candidates declaring that they had secured large sums of money to be expended in the constituencies for which they sought to be elected. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hyman) himself was a sinner in that respect. My opponent was able to tell me and the people that he had secured several thousands of dollars for public works in the constituency. Having the estimates before me, and having studied them pretty carefully, I found no mention of such votes. Yet this candidate could have the presumption to say that he had secured thousands to be expended in that constituency. We want that all stopped. When a public work is proposed, we want to know what is the estimated cost, in order that we may vote the money intelligently, and in order that the public may judge intelligently the votes we give. I see some hon. gentlemen on the other side who, when they sat on this side and when we were in power, condemned in the strongest language the very things that they approve of to-day. The hon. minister has competent engineers and other officials to advise him and to give him information. He should give us estimates that will guide us in judging of the reasonableness of the votes he asks us to give. The course that is now followed has been pursued for years, and it is time that it should be changed.

Mr. HYMAN. I have no fault to find with a good many of the remarks which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) has made. But he is entirely wrong—though I am sure he does not wish to be unfair—when he suggests that I have refused information or have failed to give estimates of the expected cost of any public work. When the vote was first called for I gave the estimate of the total cost of this building when completed. I gave it in detail. I am carrying out—I remember well the complaint that he refers to made by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Sutherland)—and I am endeavouring to carry out that very principle. I told the House that the contract for the building was $950,000. I gave the House, in the first place, the detailed estimate of the cost prepared by the architect of the department. It is estimated the heating will cost $50,000. What more information can I give the House ? The plans and details for heating have not been made at the present time, but the estimate has been made by an experienced officer of the department. It is estimated that the electric wiring and fixtures will cost $60,000 ; fittings and furniture, $100,000 ; which, together with the usual contingencies, will make the total cost of the building $1,275,000. I am sure the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) does not wish to be unfair, he cannot charge me with keeping back any information I have. This information has been handed to me by the officers of the department. The contract is made in the regular way, and what more can be expected ? In regard to the hon. gentleman's remarks as to what may have been stated by candidates in the election contest, I do not suppose that he means to hold the government responsible for all the remarks made in the heat of the election contest, either in the press or on the platform.

Mr. INGRAM. The titular minister deliberately told the House last year that in performing any new work, he would place an estimate before this House of the cost of the work, that is, what he pledged himself to do. Do I understand the acting minister pledges himself that he will continue that policy?

Mr. HYMAN. As long as I am permitted to remain in the Public Works Department I shall always be glad to give the House the fullest information I possess in regard to any work that is proposed. The hon. gentleman will understand that these things are to a large extent in the hands of the officers of the department. But I do not propose to ask the House to vote any money without giving to the fullest extent the estimates of the necessary work as made by officers of the department. If it is afterwards found that an estimate has to be exceeded, I shall give an explanation of the reasons. The hon. gentleman will understand that it frequently happens that when an estimate has been made as carefully as possible, it has been found necessary afterwards to change the work in some manner which may affect the original estimate. That occurs in the Public Works Department almost daily, that we have found it impossible to carry out a work for an amount which the officers estimated in the first place.

Mr. INGRAM. If the statement made by the absent minister had been borne out today by the acting minister, we would have no reason to complain. When the titular minister introduced this item in the first place, he said that there would be a frontage of 280 feet, and that the two wings would be 126 feet in length. He said that he had not charged his memory with all the plans, but he intended to lay the plans on the table, but he did not do it. That showed that the plans were in existence at the time, and he knew what the measurements were. So we find that before the department has decided upon what they really intend to build they come down here and make a loose statement that is not borne out by the actual facts in the contract submitted to the House.

Mr. HYMAN. There may be some misapprehension. As a matter of fact this building, as shown by the plans which the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster)

has in his hands, is one main and two wings. The main part of the building is 219 feet, and the two wings are to be added to that length. I have no doubt the Minister of Public Works, in giving the dimensions of the building, possibly gave only the width of the main building.

Mr. BERGERON. What is to be done with the building which is presently known as the Geological Survey building ?

Mr. HYMAN. We will not require to decide that question for three or four years.

Mr. FOSTER. On the question of contingencies and superintendence, for which there is an estimate of $40,000, how much of that is for contingencies and how much for superintendence? Could he give a little more detailed statement as to the expenditure of that $40,000.

Mr. HYMAN. No, I have not those details. But it has been the custom in the department for many years to add to the cost a certain percentage for contingencies.

Mr. FOSTER. What division is made of that ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have no division made of that. In this case there is an officer of the department who has general supervision of the work. It is a very large building, and his time will be charged to that particular work, to contingencies.

Mr. FOSTER. That system is still kept up?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the purchase price realized at auction for the property?

Mr. HYMAN. $73,250.

Mr. FOSTER. I see by the Auditor General's Report that a commission of two and a half per cent was paid by the government.

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. So there was no deduction from the price paid to the vendor, but the commission was paid by the government ?

Western departmental block—addition, $85,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is a vote for the purpose of erecting a building to connect the Department of Customs in the western block with the Department of Inland Revenue. I think most of the members of the committee know the situation of the Customs wing, and it is intended to create offices by connecting these two wings, and it will also add materially to the appearance of the block. There is now a courtyard there used for storage purposes, but when the connection is made it will leave this store room and add materially to the appearance of the building. It will make practically four sides to the building instead of three. The plans are being prepared but they are not ready yet. I hope to be able to advertise for tenders at an early date. The estimated cost of the buildings proper is $90,000, heating, $8,000; electric wiring and fixtures, $5,000; fittings, furniture and contingencies, $12,000, about $115,000 altogether. The building will be used for general government offices. The Department of Inland Revenue has been complaining for a long time that many of their valuable instruments are not properly housed. Instead of renting other buildings the intention of the government is to endeavour to complete this in time so that it can be used by that department. And, the Department of Public Works will also avail themselves of a portion of this building. There has never been any proper draughting room for the officers in the department and it was thought better to provide sufficient accommodation for these two departments.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How many offices will this give ?

Mr. HYMAN. The intention is to extend the present wing and the dimensions of the extension will be 83 x 36. There has been no decision arrived at as to the exact division of these offices.

Mr. FOSTER. How many stories will there be ?

Mr. HYMAN. Three stories available for offices. The intention is to use the whole of the top flat as a draughting room for the Public Works Department. At the present time a part of the staff is on the top flat and a part in the cellar. The light is very bad and it is almost impossible for the staff to properly do the work they are called upon to do. The intention is to have one draughting room covering the whole area of this building.

Mr. FOSTER. I infer from what the hon. minister says that after that $115,000 is expended—and it is a large amount of money—the new space that is created in that building will be all taken up by the present officers of two of the departments and the work which they are carrying on.

Mr. HYMAN. Practically, I said that.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what practically will be the case. Then it will not relieve the congestion and it will not make any less the rentals necessary for the work of the departments as they are now being carried on in rented buildings in Ottawa. The point I wish to get at is that after you expend $115,000 you do not seem to relieve any of the congestion that is now attempted to be relieved by the renting of buildings outside, but immediately the two older departments simply swarm and fill up all this

new space. Of course, the officers of the department ought to have sufficient room in which to fairly carry out their work, but it seems to me that an expenditure of $115,000 ought to do something more than merely enable more conveniences to be given to the work of two departments. One of these departments is not a very largely growing department. The Inland Revenue Department is a routine department very largely, and I do not suppose that it is increasing its staff or requires to increase its space very much. The Department of Public Works is employing a large number of people, there is no doubt about that, but the hon. minister knows—if he does not know it now he will find it out—that whenever new space is allowed there is a scramble in the department for every man to get double room or treble room or more if he can get it. That is going to absorb all this space. I hope the hon. minister will see that a sufficient amount of pressure is brought to bear to prevent the number of offices from expanding unnecessarily and to get out of this large expenditure some relief for the congestion outside. It is a matter that almost startles a man who has been out of the House for four or five years. When we were here we used to do some renting and a certain amount of money was paid outside for rented buildings. To-day one can hardly walk about any street without stumbling upon some place which bears upon it the impress of a public department, and we are paying an immense amount of money for the rent of these buildings. If these departments are permanent, then it would be much better for the government to incur the initial expense of building for the permanent work of these departments than to pay through the nose expensive rentals in different parts of the city. Besides that you would get your people more closely together, more under your supervision and their work would go on better under these circumstances than when they are distributed all through the city. While you use a certain amount of the space in this way it seems to me that with three or four stories and an expenditure of $115,000 you ought to take care of some of the men who are now dispersed in rented buildings throughout different parts of the city. Have the Department of Public Works and the Department of Inland Revenue any outside rentals ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not mean outside warehouses, but I mean buildings for departmental or staff work.

Mr. HYMAN. The Georgian Bay canal survey work is not being done in the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, that is rather special work.

Mr. HYMAN. I do not know if the Department of Public Works has anything else outside except the workhouse.

Mr. TAYLOR. How about the Department of Inland Revenue ?

Mr. HYMAN. I think the Inland Revenue Department have.

Mr. FOSTER. Will this extension allow of these offices being brought in ?

Mr. HYMAN. I am afraid I cannot promise the whole. The main difficulty in connection with the Department of Inland Revenue, is that they have a large number of instruments which are supposed to be in use in the department, but they have not been able to use them up to the present time because of the congested quarters in which these instruments are placed. The expenditure is a large one, I am prepared to admit, for the small amount of room that is being provided, but unfortunately in making this expenditure we have to take into consideration the order of things which at present exists. We must use the same material, we must follow the same method of construction as that which was followed in the old building, and that is a very expensive piece of construction. In addition to the two departments I named I forgot to mention that it is intended to provide some extra room for the Customs Department. I would ask the committee to bear in mind that while we are not really housing any of the outside departments, we are preventing the renting of any other outside buildings by providing for the officials of these three departments. I know, as far as the Department of Public Works is concerned, that in their present crowded state it is almost impossible for the officials of the department to properly perform their work. They are crowded in every nook and corner of the building and I am in hopes that when we get the draughting room away we will be able to give some part of the department room in which they can perform their work properly.

Mr. FOSTER. In providing this new building will the improved system be carried out there of having your officers not working in separate rooms but working in large rooms where they can work with the greatest economy of space and where they are under supervision ?

Mr. HYMAN. In this particular case those going into the top flat of this building will all be in one room and it is our desire to carry out that practice as far as possible. The way in which the old buildings are laid out, I think, is ridiculous. We find branches of departments in which men who are doing the same work are housed in some corner or in separate rooms. My own idea is that large rooms should be provided so that proper supervision may be had over the clerks and more businesslike methods may

prevail in the departments. As to the wider question of housing the whole of the public service and providing for the departments that are in outside buildings I hope to be able to lay a good deal of information on that subject before the House at a later date. As far as I am concerned if I have anything to do with the construction of a new building for that purpose the very plan which the hon. gentleman suggests will certainly be carried out in its entirety. I feel that better work could be got from the officers of the departments and that better supervision could be maintained if they were housed in the way that the hon. gentleman suggests instead of men being stowed away in every nook and corner of the buildings.

Mr. FOSTER. One more suggestion and I shall have finished my criticism on this point. There are two methods of procedure, one is to build larger and perhaps add at the same time to your force, but space could also be greatly economized by dispensing with the supernumerary and useless workers. Has the minister really put his business mind to a thorough revision of the working economy of the staff, officers and workers in the Public Works department? I do not want to make any rash assertion, but I venture to say that if the minister were conducting a business of his own and if he had to live on the margin of his profit and went into the matter in a business way he would so arrange the work there that it could be effectually carried on with a far less number of staff and workers than it is now carried on in the department. That may be true in regard to most of the departments. The old system of having them cooped up in separate rooms lends itself to a poor method of work, so far as results are concerned, but along with his extension of space I hope the minister will put some of his business energy into a revision of the staff to see that none but those who are actually necessary are there and that every man who is there is doing his fair share of work. I do not say that slightingly of the civil service, but at the same time where you have hundreds and thousands of men employed it sometimes happens that you have more labour than can be wisely or economically employed, so that by a little pruning the space may be economized.

Mr. HYMAN. I must remind my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) that the work of the Public Works Department is very onerous, and that the increase in the number of clerks does not at all correspond with the increase in the work. I am endeavouring to exercise whatever supervision is possible.

Mr. HAGGART. It is not possible for me to be here to-night, and as we are within two items of the vote for the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Ship Canal, on which there will be considerable discussion, I would ask if the minister would fix a day on which we can discuss it?

Mr. HYMAN. I would be glad to adopt the suggestion. Would Tuesday do?

Mr. HAGGART. Any day as long as we understand it.

Mr. HYMAN. I suppose that any day will do so long as I give a day's notice?

Mr. HAGGART. Certainly.

At Six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Quebec harbour improvements, $157,000.

Mr. BERGERON. How does the Quebec Harbour Commission stand with the government now?

Mr. HYMAN. This work is not being done by the Harbour Commission, but by the department.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it not about time that the government took hold of all these works? I see by the orders before us that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries wants to put a stop to the existing conditions in the harbour of Montreal, so that the works will be carried on by the minister who is directly responsible to parliament. I understand that in Quebec the commission is completely behind, and I think there should also be a change there. It is entirely wrong for us to spend money with nobody responsible for it. Where is the line of demarcation between what the government spends and what the Quebec Harbour Commisison spends in the same harbour?

Mr. HYMAN. I am unable to draw the exact line of demarcation. I see no reason why the harbours of Montreal and Quebec should be singled out and dealt with in a different way from other harbours. It may be in the interest of the public that another policy should be adopted. That is a pretty large question, on which there might be a profitable discussion; but I do not suppose there is any desire to discuss it in this particular item.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the particular work for which we are voting this money?

Mr. HYMAN. This is for an enlargement of the Louise embankment at Quebec. It is a work that has been going on for two or three years. It is intended more particularly to increase the accommodation for the landing of ocean steamers, and we are waiting for the completion of this work in order to put up proper sheds to provide the necessary accommodation. If the hon. gentleman saw the condition of affairs that I saw at Quebec at the time I visited the harbour, he would realize the necessity for this work. There

were landed no less than three large boat loads of immigrants, some of whom were practically without accommodation, and it was impossible for the officers of the department to handle them properly. I am sure this work is an absolute necessity.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand that it is a work which under ordinary circumstances should be done by the Quebec Harbour Commission.

Mr. HYMAN. I presume that the government undertook to do the work themselves instead of advancing the money to the Harbour Commission.

Mr. BERGERON. When this work is completed, will the government collect the dues, or will the Harbour Commission collect them ?

Mr. HYMAN. I am not prepared to discuss that question. I presume that the hon. gentleman understands that the Department of Public Works has nothing to do with the collection of dues. The moment this work is completed it is transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. BERGERON. What will the whole work cost when it is finished ?

Mr. HYMAN. $400,000 odd.

Mr. BERGERON. We are spending practically half a million dollars on this work when we have at Quebec a commission which is supposed to collect dues and which is not paying interest on the money which the government has lent it. We have two masters in the harbour of Quebec, and all the money comes from the treasury of Canada. This is a state of things which I am sure cannot last very long. We cannot discuss the principle of the matter on this item, but I want to raise my voice against such a state of things.

Mr. MONK. Has the hon. minister a copy of the Order in Council changing the attributions of the Department of Public Works and passing a portion of them over to the Department of Marine and Fisheries ? Is not the harbour of Quebec included in the works which have been handed over to the Department of Marine and Fisheries ?

Mr. HYMAN. The harbour of Quebec has always been under the Marine and Fisheries Department. But the contract for the actual building of the wharf comes under the Public Works Department. Notwithstanding that these works are in the harbour, they have not been transferred from the Public Works Department to the Marine and Fisheries Department. The contracts having been let under the Public Works Department the work has continued under their charge.

Mr. MONK. But there are works executed by the government and there are works executed by the Harbour Board. In Montreal we have a large wharf at the end of St. Mary's current within the jurisdiction of the Montreal Harbour Board. Under the changes recently made those works are under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) is in error. Those works are still under the control of the Public Works Department. When the transfer was made, existing works—that is, works under contract, including this work and the work in Montreal to which he refers—were left with the Public Works Department until completion, when they will be placed under the Marine and Fisheries Department.

Mr. MONK. The River St. Lawrence channel was transferred ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. MONK. When this work in Quebec is handed over by the Public Works Department, will it be under control of the Marine and Fisheries Department, or under the control of the Quebec Harbour Board?

Mr. HYMAN. That, I presume would be a matter of policy with the Marine and Fisheries Department. We transfer it to that department.

Mr. MONK. The hon. minister does not happen to have any copy of the Order in Council?

Mr. HYMAN. No, but I remember the terms very well. I am sure these works were especially excepted under the transfer.

Mr. FOSTER. How much has been expended on this work and during what years?

Mr. HYMAN. The total is $195,000 for the years 1902-3, 1903-4 and 1904-5.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister a plan of the Quebec harbour with the works under the Harbour Commissioner and showing the work now being carried on?

Mr. HYMAN. I have not the plan here, but I shall be glad to lay it on the table, if the hon. gentleman desires it. He will understand that it is practically impossible to bring the plans for all these works; they are too bulky.

Mr. FOSTER. I know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hyman) is kindness itself in telling us what he will do at some time in the future. But this is a very peculiar—what shall I call it?—mix up. We have a Harbour Commission in Quebec with its jurisdiction and its duties. We have given it advances of money which have been expended by that commission under its powers. Those advances amount to some three millions, I think.

Mr. HYMAN. Five millions in round numbers.

Mr. FOSTER. Five millions of money has been advanced to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners on which, if I am correctly informed, not a cent of interest has ever been paid. And after all this money has been spent, the government jumps into the puddle and commences work within the area covered by the Harbour Commission's jurisdiction, constructs a work there and hands it over to the Marine and Fisheries Department. Who has the administration of Quebec harbour now ?

Mr. HYMAN. The commissioners.

Mr. FOSTER. The commissioners make the rules, take care of the shipping, collect the dues, and with the money, pay their officials and their help. Then—for what reason I do not know—but probably the government stood aghast at the amount of the advances that had been made to the Quebec Harbour Commission and did not wish to make another advance of half a million to be spent by their commissioners—the government makes an appropriation and carries out an enlargement of the harbour with the public funds but with no charge against the Harbour Commission. It seems to me that before this was decided upon, the time had come for the government to consider its whole policy with regard to the harbour and the commission. Is this a bankrupt commission? Though it has paid nothing, is there no hope that it can pay anything. Sometimes it is good business policy to make advances to complete a work with the hope that out of the trade it developes you may get not only interest on the last advance but interest on previous advances as well. There may have been reasons why this money should have been advanced, but one would naturally suppose that it ought to be expended under the Harbour Commissioners, who had made the expenditures so far, and ought to know better than any one else what parts of the harbour needed improvement and how the money should be applied. In that way the work would have been carried on with continuity and uniformity. But this course that has been followed is evidently an expedient to relieve the Harbour Commission—or the conscience of the government I do not know which. Instead of making any decision they defer even an examination of the question and carry out a policy which is mere patch-work. It is not a uniform and consistent policy by any means. Its lack of uniformity and consistency is all the greater when contrasted with the treatment of the harbour of Montreal, the harbour of Toronto, the harbour of St. John, the harbour of Halifax or any other harbour that I know of in the Dominion. Half a million is being expended and we are now asked to vote a couple of hundred thousand. I think the minister should have had plans here so that we might understand what is being done in its relation to previous improvements of the harbour. I confess I cannot from memory understand the geographical situation, nor can I understand how it joins with or will affect previous works in the harbour. But the minister ought to have those things here. We have been very lenient with him in allowing those things to go on without the plans. I do not want to be unreasonable, but I think in these cases the minister should be supplied with them and have them ready for us. Evidently the House cannot tell what it is doing.

Mr. HYMAN. I have told the House that it is an extension of the deep water landing. I cannot give all the plans, nor do I desire to withhold any information from the House.

Mr. FOSTER. A department like the Department of Public Works ought to have the profiles at least all ready to be spread on the table. These things are not costly, neither are they hard to carry around. When Sir Hector Langevin was administering that department fifteen years ago, he never came down to this House without the most perfect information, everything he had you could get from his book, or you could see his plans on the table. My hon. friend comes down here now with a few scraps of paper and large votes. He ought to have more scraps of information and smaller votes.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is entirely reasonable that all the information asked for should be given. I think we cannot give too full information as to the manner in which the people's taxes are being spent. But I can hardly agree with my hon. friend in his statement that Sir Hector Langevin was always prepared to give here all the information that the hon. gentleman is now asking for. Whilst I quite approve of what the hon. gentleman wishes to get, I cannot recollect that we ever had a Minister of Public Works who laid upon the table plans of proposed buildings. Occasionally it occurs, but I think my hon. friend will remember that it was rather the exception than the rule.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not mean that all the voluminous drawings necessary for the work proposed should be brought here, but what we call the profiles we should have.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Sir Hector never brought down the elevations.

Mr. FOSTER. In justice to my old colleague, Sir Hector, there have been Ministers of Public Works on both sides, but I never knew a Minister of Public Works in this House who was so explicit in details, and who in his book had so many of these little plans ready, so that you could see by his putting the book on the table exactly every line upon which he was spending money. I do not mean that all the working plans and things like that should be brought

down, but a superficial view, so that we can tell exactly where it joins on to the present works and how far it goes.

Mr. BERGERON. How many gentlemen are there in the Harbour Commission of Quebec ?

Mr. HYMAN. I understand there are eight.

Mr. BERGERON. The Harbour Commission, I think, is dependent on the Department of Public Works.

Mr. HYMAN. No, it never has been.

Mr. BERGERON. Of course it was until lately, at least so far as Montreal is concerned.

Mr. HYMAN. The approval of plans and advancing the money belonging to the Public Works Department, but the actual control of the Harbour Commission is vested in the Marine and Fisheries Department, both in Quebec and Montreal, and everywhere else.

Mr. BERGERON. We are entitled to get some information about these commissioners, either from the hon. gentleman or from some officer in his department. I remember the criticism made in this parliament many years ago to the effect that it was an extraordinary state of things that this commission should be allowed to spend money without being responsible for it. I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will insist in his proposed Bill that they shall be responsible. I would like to know the names of the Harbour Commissioners there, and the names and number of the employees who are in receipt of a salary, or hold an office in the Harbour Commission of Quebec.

Mr. STOCKTON. I have listened with much interest to the information that was given by the minister and elicited by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). Now it appears that this very large amount of money is to be given to the Quebec harbour board, which is not responsible to the government of Canada at all, and that the money is given without any control by the government as to the management of the harbour. It does seem to me that the time has come when the government should have some well defined policy with respect to all the harbours of our country—Montreal, Quebec, St. John and Halifax, and all other harbours requiring aid from the government. In St. John the people have spent $800,000 of their own money for the purpose of providing terminal facilities for the export trade of Canada, and I think the minister will admit that very slight encouragement thus far has been given to that port, in view of the expenditure the people have made of their own money. We are needing certain improvements, as the minister knows, in the harbour and port of St. John. There are certain reasons which have been given to me by the minister why certain work has not been done before, and which reasons are satisfactory. But it does seem to me that when we expend money in one port without having any control over its expenditure, or rather over the commission having charge of the harbour, we should extend some greater consideration to a port where the people have expended $800,000 of their own money to make it suitable for the export trade of this country.

Mr. HYMAN. Of course the discussion has broadened a good deal from the question before the chair, although I admit the hon. gentleman is quite in order in discussing it in connection with this vote. But I think possibly he might do better to discuss the general question of harbours on some estimate of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, at which time he will be able to get all the information.

Mr. FOSTER. It is such a Siamese twins business that we never know where we are. The House should insist on the Minister of Marine and Fisheries being seated alongside the Minister of Public Works whenever these estimates are going through, so that what one does not know the other could tell, and not have them throwing the responsibility from the one to the other. Has the ligature been entirely cut between the two, or do there still exist certain tendons which keep the two corporate bodies joined together ? What authority does one of them have which the other has not ? I see in the estimates of Public Works some items opposite which there are dashes followed by the designation 'Marine.' Is my hon. friend going to take up these items or refer them to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ? In fact, these two departments are so dovetailed, the one with the other, that each of the twins should be here at the same time whenever the estimates of either department are going through. This is just a good illustration of the business methods of this government. They appoint a transportation committee, declaring that they themselves know nothing about the difficulties and technicalities and science of transportation, and that they must be instructed. Then, before that commission gets to work, they rush into an expenditure upon the Transcontinental Railway in which hundreds of millions of dollars are involved, and which, in one way or the other, affects transportation more than probably any other act of the government could do. Then they just treat the different ports of the country as political or other necessity dictates. There does not seem to be any element of fairness in their methods of treating the different ports. Take the great trade harbours of the country. If one presses for expenditure, they give it something. If the other presses for similar

expenditure, but does not press sufficiently strong, they do not give it anything. Take, for instance, the harbour of St. John. That is one of the great export harbours of this continent, ready to handle the export trade equally to the harbour of Quebec, if you will only improve it. Yet they have allowed the people of St. John, through their municipal taxation and the loans they have had to make, to do almost everything that has to be done in that harbour and do not give them a dollar of contribution towards that work. But go to the harbour of Quebec and see what is being done there. After spending five million dollars in that harbour—and the Lord only knows what has become of it—after that expenditure, which one would think ought to make it a harbour capable of taking in all the sea-going vessels that could get to it, the minister cannot find sufficient place in it in which ships can lay up, and he has to come back to his colleagues and say: I want to spend a half a million dollars more in order to get some adequate facilities. The time will come—and I hope it will come soon—when we shall have an accounting for all these things. This government came into office in 1896, yet it has not had time to take up these most important questions and settle them on some basis of what is consistent, right and just, as regards the different ports of the country. They have no confidence evidently in the Harbour Commission at Quebec, or they would let that commission have the spending of the money in its own waters. If the government had full confidence in it, they would have given it this money to spend, as that commission ought to know best what is necessary. There is no principle, no consistency, no method in their expenditure, and that is a good illustration of the lack of business methods which characterizes the present administration. I am sure that my hon. friend would not justify in his own business the course of procedure which is followed with regard to our different ports. Instead of devising some general, reasonable plan which would be uniformly and consistently carried out, we have these hap-hazard methods followed, and followed apparently to suit some political or other caprice or exigencies.

Mr. HYMAN. My hon. friend knows that there always has been and always will be great difficulty in establishing a line of cleavage between, not only the Public Works Department and the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but also between the Public Works Department and the Department of Railways and Canals, in regard to certain works. Take, for instance, our canals. They must be under some department, and they are under the Department of Railways and Canals. But every one knows it is very often difficult to define exactly where the jurisdiction of the Department of Railways ceases in that respect and that of the Public Works Department begins. Take, for instance, the improvements in harbours and canals. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but there has always been that difficulty. There has been no change made in the jurisdiction of the Department of Railways and Canals and the Department of Public Works as regards these matters. There must be a certain amount of dovetailing all through, so long as the harbours are under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the public works under the control of the Public Works Department. The latter has control of the building of wharfs; and if a wharf happens to be very close to the mouth of a canal or to where there is a harbour commission, there is always a question as to which department should control it. One word with regard to the harbour of St. John. There has been a large expenditure made in that harbour by this government.

Mr. STOCKTON. Not for the western export part.

Mr. HYMAN. I cannot draw the distinction quite as fine as my hon. friend does, who is possibly more acquainted with the details as to where the western and eastern export trade take place, but we all know that large expenditures have been made in the port. The hon. gentleman appeals to me as a business man. Speaking frankly as such, I would be glad if at the proper time we had a discussion in this House on the whole question of jurisdiction and the methods in which our harbours are managed. No doubt, in such a discussion, a great deal of information might be elicited. The government may have been somewhat dilatory in taking the question up. It is a large question which might be properly discussed, but I submit that that discussion would much more properly take place on some item in connection with the Marine Department, which has control of those harbours.

Mr. BERGERON. In view of the discussion which my hon. friend promises us later on, it would be well to get from him now such information as we can. The information I have asked for with regard to the number of harbour commissioners and the number of employees we ought to have. My hon. friend can get all that from the officers of his department. They know all about it.

Mr. HYMAN. This department has nothing in the world to do with the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal. I can obtain the information for my hon. friend, not from the officers of my department but from the officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. FOSTER. Since when had it not?

Mr. HYMAN. It never had.

Mr. BERGERON. Who is responsible in parliament to the people for all the moneys that have been spent in the harbour of Montreal or the harbour of Quebec ? Five millions of public money have been spent in Quebec and $3,000,000 in Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. Five millions.

Mr. BERGERON. There are $3,000,000 owing to the government. Who is responsible in the House ? This is a democratic country.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. No.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes. Every cent that is spent must be accounted for in parliament. It may not be entirely under the control of the department of the hon. gentleman, but he is a business man. He is doing a great deal of work at a great sacrifice and I hope he will help us in this direction. We want to know who is responsible for all these moneys which have been spent during past years and which are being spent to-day. We are here as the representatives of the people. We are responsible to the people for what we are doing. We have been called upon to vote an amount which will form a portion of about half a million dollars to be spent in Quebec harbour. We are entitled to know who is responsible for the moneys that have been spent in the past. My hon. friend says that when finished these works will be transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries according to the law passed last session. Then the Department of Marine and Fisheries will probably give them back to the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec unless there is a change in the Bill now before the House. In the meantime we are entitled to all the information necessary to help us in the discussion of this question. When my hon. friend says that the Department of Public Works have nothing to do with that surely it places matters in a worse position than ever. If my hon. friend will say here : I do not know anything about it and my officers know nothing at all about it, there would be some excuse in that and we would postpone the matter until later on, but when we are told that the Department of Public Works is not responsible I am sure that if the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries were here he would say that he was not responsible for it. Well then, who is responsible ?

Mr. HYMAN. The position is exactly the same as it was previous to 1896.

Mr. BERGERON. That is no excuse.

Mr. HYMAN. It may not be an excuse, but I think that my hon. friend, being an old parliamentarian, will understand the position. It is a very simple one. As far as the actual expenditure on the harbour is concerned, the Department of Public Works have always had charge of that expenditure. The Harbour Commissioners are there, they expend the public money, the Department of Public Works advances the money and the Department of Public Works have up to this time exercised a supervision over the plans. That has always been the method pursued. As far as the management of the harbour is concerned it is within the purview and under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The line of cleavage is exactly the same as that which has always existed.

Mr. STOCKTON. Mr. Chairman, I cannot allow the statement of the hon. Minister of Public Works to pass that a large amount of money has been expended by the government of Canada in fitting the port of St. John for export trade. The expenditure on the part of the government was really for the purpose of perfecting the terminal facilities of the government railway and nothing beyond that.

Mr. HYMAN. I think I said very plainly that I did not undertake to say that it was for the export trade. I said on the harbour of St. John. I do not know whether it was for that purpose or not.

Mr. STOCKTON. I assure my hon. friend that I do not wish to misrepresent or misinterpret his language.

Mr. HYMAN. I know you do not.

Mr. STOCKTON. But I say that the expenditure that has been made has been made for the purpose of building the terminal facilities of that railway. It is true that in doing that two extra berths have been provided for ocean steamships on the east side of the harbour. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if, in consequence of advancing money or making expenditures on the harbour of Quebec, there is any exemption or reduction of port dues on export trade from the west ?

Mr. HYMAN. I am sorry again that I am not exactly in the same position as I was before. As far as the Department of Public Works is concerned this is a matter of which we have no knowledge at all. I am sure there would be no difficulty in getting the information for the hon. gentleman. But, the committee must understand that we have got into a discussion which is aside from the item under consideration. It is rather stretching the rules of discussion althogether, I have no desire to take any exception to the fact. It would seem though, that we might confine the discussion a little more closely to the item under discussion. As far as the Department of Public Works is concerned, whenever there is an item up in regard to the harbour of St. John, I shall be very glad to give the hon. gentleman the fullest opportunity for the discussion of that question.

Mr. STOCKTON. I quite appreciate the courtesy of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works and I accept his statement fully and in the terms in which he has presented it, but he cannot blame me if I would like to see an appropriation side by side in there for the important harbour of St. John. I think I am correct in saying that although the government of Canada has spent large sums of money for the benefit of the port of Quebec, yet there is no reduction of port dues, while in the harbour of St. John none of the export trade from the west is charged a single cent for port dues.

Mr. FOSTER. A difficulty arises in this; if you are bringing in a vote for improvements in Quebec harbour it is almost impossible to confine the discussion just simply to the expenditure of the $157,000. A member wants to know why this is being expended and what will be the result for trade just as my hon. friend asked and it would conduce to the smoothness and dispatch of business if we could see the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries more frequently in his place when these estimates are going through. I dare say there is some important business that keeps him out to-night but when these estimates are going on in which he is intimately interested it would be a great advantage to the committee to have the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries—the other part of this Siamese arrangement—in the House at the same time so that we could refer him for information. However, it is a saving clause that we have an opportunity of going back in order to get information upon this question and the minister cannot do anything more than he can do and, I suppose, defend his own department. But, there is one question that I do not quite understand. Is it true that after the advance of the $5,000,000, these sums have been expended on the initiative of the Harbour Commission ?

Mr. HYMAN. They were expended on the initiative of and by the Harbour Commission under the control of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Under their jurisdiction?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. But this is not expended in that way ?

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Why was that ? Did you distrust the commission ?

Mr. HYMAN. Of course I cannot speak of my own knowledge as this expenditure was started long before I was in the department. I understand from the deputy—and I speak from the knowledge I get from the deputy—that possibly when this contract was made not through the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal or Quebec, but directly by the department, the minister had in his mind some such idea as has been suggested in regard to the nationalization of these harbours. It may have been an initial step which did not go any further, but I am given to understand by the deputy that the minister probably had that idea at the time, however hazy it might be, hoping that it might take some more definite form in the future.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the government a Bill before the House to nationalize the harbours of Montreal and Quebec ?

Mr. HYMAN. No, I understand not.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I understood there was a Bill to that effect.

Mr. HYMAN. No, there is no such Bill.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am aware that there is no Bill but is it not the intention of the government to bring in a Bill ? Has not notice been given of such a Bill ?

Mr. HYMAN. I cannot say what the intention of the government is in regard to the matter, but there is no Bill before the House.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If there were, it might be well to hold this over until we see the nature of the Bill. Why should the government spend money directly on Quebec harbour and also have money expended through the Harbour Commission ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have not the plans here.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If the minister will permit me to remind him, last year when the harbour of Seven Islands was under discussion the minister promised that he would bring down plans of all works in his department for the future.

Mr. HYMAN. If the hon. member will pardon me I made no such promise. The hon. gentleman must know that the estimmates of the Public Works Department have become very voluminous and that it would be a practical impossibility to bring down plans for all works. I shall be glad to bring down plans of any one work and furnish the fullest possible information in reference to all items, but it is hardly possible to bring down the plans for all works. This is not the intention of this work ; if we were commencing the work then possibly, in a large work like this, I might have thought of bringing down the plans.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the nature of the work ?

Mr. HYMAN. In the hon. gentleman's absence from the House I gave a full explanation.

Mr. MONK. Is it expected that we will have an announcement of some policy from the government during the present session in regard to the principal harbours, Quebec, Montreal, St. John and Halifax ? I say this in order to better define our position, because

when we ask some question about any particular harbour, our experience has been that the next day the local press accuses us of being against all improvement in that particular harbour. I have no doubt that to-morrow we will see in the Quebec papers that with extraordinary narrow-mindedness the opposition were anxious to prevent any improvements being carried out in Quebec. That is not at all the object. For my own part I think that the four principal harbours interest me all in an equal degree, but I do not notice that there has been the slightest change, the slightest announcement of policy since 1886. Take the harbour of Montreal. In 1896 the Department of Public Works had almost completed its plans of improvement. These plans with some very small modifications have been completed and have taken an extraordinary long time in being carried out, largely on account of difficulties that have arisen between the government and the Harbour Board, between the Harbour Commissioners and the Department of Public Works during the incumbency of my hon. friend's predecessor, and the Department of Marine and Fisheries since. I mention this because for my own part—and I think it is the feeling expressed on this side of the House—we are all anxious to see the harbours improved. I believe the government ought to nationalize our principal ports. We are all the time advancing money and in some instances we do not get back the interest while in other instances the harbours pay the interest on the advances or guarantees. I think it would be fairer to these ports, fairer to Montreal at any rate, if we were not always kept in a state of uncertainty, and if we knew that the government did not intend assuming the harbours. We ought, I think, after eight years to have a declared policy. I ask this not to embarrass my hon. friend in his estimates, but because I think this third parliament ought to bring us a declaration of what I said that not more than two or three days ago the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Prefontaine) announced in the House that he was going to bring in a Bill entirely modifying the relations between the government and the Harbour Board of Montreal. My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has just asked the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) and has been informed that he has never heard of such a thing. We have been in that state of uncertainty since 1896, and the passing of these estimates would hasten if we were permitted to know what the government's policy is. My hon. friend reminds me that a Bill stands for second reading in the name of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to amend the Quebec Harbour Commissioner's Act.

Mr. HYMAN. This is not the question my hon. friend asked me. The question he asked me was whether the government proposed bringing down a policy affecting all the harbours.

Mr. MONK.

Mr. MONK. All or any of them.

Mr. HYMAN. The words 'all or any of them' were not mentioned. I am sure that Hansard will bear me out.

Mr. MONK. Well, all of them.

Mr. HYMAN. There is no such Bill before the House affecting all the harbours. I think, with all due respect, that it will be only fair that this discussion which has broadened so much, ought to take place upon the Bill when the whole matter can be discussed. So far as I am concerned all the information from the Public Works Department that can be furnished I shall be glad to give my hon. friend. I have no objection in the world to the question he asked me about the Harbour Commissioners in Quebec, but I have not the information. We have nothing to do in the Public Works Department with the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec and in the memoranda which are furnished me by the officers of my department I have no reference to the personnel of the commission.

Mr. MONK. My real intention was not to embarrass or delay but to define what we on this side were anxious to know. Take these estimates; we are voting $207,000 for the harbour of Quebec and for Port Arthur and Fort William $195,000, $600,000 in round figures for the River St. Lawrence channel improvements, and for Montreal harbour, the lower division where we have been spending very considerable sums every year that is on the wharfs below St. Mary's current, $90,000, and at Port Colborne harbour, improvements including the eastern breakwater $180,000. We have been spending money within measurable distance of these figures every year since 1896, and I say that we have no declared policy from the government as to what it intends doing for these ports, whether leaving them under the control of the Harbour Commission or assuming the responsibility for these ports and making them national harbours.

Mr. HYMAN. Of course, the hon. gentleman understands that the harbours of Port Colborne, Port Arthur and Fort William are entirely under the control of the Public Works Department. The control by the Department of Marine and Fisheries is confined to those harbours which are operated by commissions.

Port Arthur and Fort William—harbour and river improvements, $195,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This vote is for the purpose of continuing the work of dredging which has been in progress for a number of years. The harbour is being deepened to 22 feet.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose there is some systematic plan of working. There is the harbour of Port Arthur, and there is the river, which forms practically a harbour, extending to Fort William and beyond.

Then there is another passage from the harbour of Fort William, which at present is not capable of being used much for purposes of navigation, but it was anticipated when I was there two years ago that if that was opened out the season would be lengthened a little. Will the minister give us an idea of what is being done there, and what expenditure will have to be made before the harbour is available for all the purposes to which it may be applied in the immediate future ?

Mr. HYMAN. The work progressing there at present is, as I have said, the deepening of the harbour within the breakwater to 22 feet. The total estimate for the whole work of dredging is $815,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How much a yard ?

Mr. HYMAN. The estimate is based on the nature of the soil.

Mr. FOSTER. How much of that has been spent up to the present ?

Mr. HYMAN. About $336,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the nature of the stuff taken out ?

Mr. HYMAN. All kinds—clay, sand, rock, hard-pan. It depends entirely on the depth at different parts of the harbour.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the material which has been taken out silt back or fill up in any way ?

Mr. HYMAN. I am informed by the engineer of the department that we are very fortunate in that respect—that there has been no silting except at the mouth of the Kaministiquia river.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has it struck the minister that the breakwater of Port Arthur harbour is altogether too near shore for a great harbour ? It should be at least one-third of a mile further out. Then the minister would not need to go to so much expense in dredging, and a part of the money now expended in that way could be utilized for docks. He can go on dredging for a hundred years, and he will not make a good harbour so long as the breakwater is kept where it is.

Mr. HYMAN. The time may come, perhaps is fast approaching, when such an extension of the harbour will become necessary. The distance from the breakwater to the shore is not perhaps as great as it ought to be, but, at the same time, the dredging operations which are being carried on are very largely increasing the advantages of the harbour within the breakwater. I have no doubt that the time is not far distant when the largely increased tonnage at Port Arthur and Fort William will render necessary a largely increased expenditure there. I hope to be able, at no very distant date, if I am in the Public Works Department, to work out a more comprehensive scheme with regard to those harbours, and I intend to visit them personally along with the chief engineer of the department. Whatever plan may be determined on, this expenditure is necessary.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Not at all.

Mr. HYMAN. I am assured by the officers of the department that a large part of this work is being done immediately inside of the present breakwater, and that we are gradually increasing the area of deep water In time to come the larger scheme suggested by my hon. friend may be carried out.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not know whether the hon. minister understands the point I made. The present breakwater was built when no one ever expected that vessels drawing more than 16 feet of water would enter Port Arthur harbour, but to-day it is frequented by vessels drawing 20 feet of water. That breakwater is very close in shore. If this million of dollars is to be expended in the erection of a new breakwater, at each side of the present one but much further out, undoubtedly some dredging will have to be done, but the minister cannot spend $2,000,000 honestly in dredging that harbour. What he should do is let those who are going to construct docks build them out and then a large part of the dredging could be used to fill up the cribwork and concrete work of these docks. What we want is some comprehensive scheme of building up Port Arthur and Fort William harbours. Is the hon. gentleman going to take into consideration the dredging of one of the mouths of the delta to which the leader of the opposition has referred? There are three mouths. In the middle one, dredging could be made effective for the purposes of the harbour, and if he is going to dredge the middle mouth of the delta is he going to take into consideration the fact that the value of the property in proximity to it will be greatly enhanced.

Mr. HYMAN. Does my hon. friend mean the Mission river? There is nothing in this appropriation for the Mission river. I quite appreciate what the hon. gentleman says but it is easy in the House, when discussing harbour improvements, to speak of an expenditure of a million dollars. I would not like, however, to undertake the responsibility of any such expenditure until I had the report of the government engineers and visited the harbour personally with them. In the opinion of our engineers, the dredging we are doing will be necessary in any case. Whether in the future we would be justified in making a large expenditure of a million or more can only be decided when we have laid out a general scheme and have ascertained whether the necessities of the harbour demand that that scheme should be carried out.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The matter has been before the House two or three times, but there have been so many changes in the hon. gentleman's department that the acting minister himself evidently does not know what has transpired.

Mr. HYMAN. It has been up every year since I have been in the House.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What I say is this, that my hon. friend cannot expend a million of dollars in dredging behind the present little breakwater in that harbour to any proper advantage.

Mr. HYMAN. I did not say it was my intention to spend any such sum there. This work covers the work in the Kaministiquia river as well. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition asked me for the estimated expenditure in dredging the two harbours and I gave him the sum of $816,000 as the figure estimated by our engineers after carefully ascertaining the different classes of soil found on the bottom.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If the hon. minister has been misrepresented, he himself is to blame because he certainly stated this sum was to be expended for the purpose of dredging. I drew attention to the fact that there is no breakwater at Fort William and he does not intend the expenditure to be limited to Port Arthur. I do not see where there can be any more dredging done in Kaministiquia river.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the work done directly by the department by their own dredges or under contract?

Mr. HYMAN. Under contract. We pay for some by the yard and some by the hour but the result is practically the same. When we pay by the hour it is for the minimum amount of work they are obliged to do.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who are the contractors?

Mr. HYMAN. Dredge No. 6, Mr. A. F. Bowman; dredge No. 1, the Great Lakes Dredging Company; dredge 'Kingsford,' C. S. Boone.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is this the Mr. Bowman who is a member of the local House and to whom the government gave a guarantee of a million dollars?

Mr. HYMAN. No, he is a brother of that gentleman.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the principle upon which the department acts in this dredging business? Some dredges are paid by the hour and some by the yard and when paid by the yard the prices are not the same. This man Bowman must be a great friend of the government. Does the dredge 'Kingsford' belong to Mr. Boone?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. HYMAN.

Mr. BERGERON. Evidently the plan of the late Minister of Public Works, Mr. Tarte, of having dredges owned by the government operating all over the Dominion, and which, he claimed, would cost less than hiring dredges, is not being carried out. Mr. Boone got $10 an hour for dredging 869 hours in July and September. Yet some years ago we were told by hon. gentlemen opposite that $8 an hour was too much. Then the Great Lake Dredging Company are paid on a different principle. They were paid 8,323 yards at 90 cents; 481 yards at 45 cents; 7,959 yards at 23 cents and 13,122 yards at 15 cents. And all this dredging was done at the same place. I notice that any number of engineers and inspectors were employed on this work, no doubt, to inspect one another. Who is the man who decides whether a dredge will be paid by the hour or the yard and what prices shall be paid by the yard. Here is another dredge, Dredge No. 5, which I suppose belongs to the Great Lakes Dredging Company. This one was paid 7,224 yards at 90 cents; 8,777 yards at 40 cents; 47,022 yards at 23 cents; 22,623 yards at 15 cents and 444 yards at $1.25, and all done at the same place. Mr. Bowman, who is mentioned here must be a great friend of the government.

An hon. MEMBER. He was in the Local House.

Mr. BERGERON. There is likely to be a row in the future. Because the two governments will not work on the same dredges. He has dredge No. 6 which is employed from August 13 to October 13, 139,596 yards at 15 cents. Another one not far from the same spot, $1.25. Then I find Bowman again at 20 cents a yard. Then there is Mr. Boone with the dredge Kingsford. It is employed for 168 hours at $12—the rate seems to be increasing. Then there is a charge of 496 hours and 50 minutes—that is getting it down fine—at $10.

Mr. HYMAN. That shows that we watch them closely.

Mr. BERGERON. There seems to be a great deal of watching judging from the number of inspectors and engineers, but I am afraid there is a combination amongst the crowd. For the purposes of this work, I suppose, Fort William and Port Arthur are considered together, because they almost join. I understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hyman) is the minister in charge of those works. I would like to know who is the man representing the government who is above all these sub-engineers and inspectors and on whom the government relies. Then I would like to know on what principle the men are paid. I do not know their political leanings, but I find some labourers are paid $2.50 a day, some $2 a day and some $1.50 a day. There seems

to be no principle in the working of the department of these matters.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman is asking a question and answering it too.

Mr. BERGERON. That is very clever, but I do not see it. Perhaps the minister can tell me whether there is any rule or principle that he follows in these matters. There is another question I should like to ask. I see here a charge for a quantity of timber bought from the Pigeon River Lumber Company. In such a case are tenders called for, or does the engineer or inspector in charge go to the Pigeon River Company and say : We want to get so much timber—

Mr. HYMAN. That does not come under this vote. That is for repairs to the breakwater.

Mr. BERGERON. It must be all the same thing. There is only one Port Arthur.

Mr. HYMAN. But there may be different kinds of work at the same place.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the hon. minister call my attention to the item under which this expenditure arises when we reach it ?

Mr. HYMAN. I will try to remember.

Mr. BERGERON. And will he answer my other questions now ?

Mr. HYMAN. With pleasure.. So far as the different prices for labour is concerned, the same differences have always existed. For certain surveys we must have a better class of men, men who are a little more than labourers. These are paid $2.50 a day. As to the dredging, my hon. friend seems concerned because there were so many different kinds of material at Port Arthur. I may tell him that the plans show, in places, as many as four different kinds of material at the same spot—mud and sand on top, then clay, then hard-pan and then rock. There are different prices for these different kinds of work. The department have an engineer there, a Mr. Temple. He has been in charge there for some four years. Of course, we hold him responsible. He does not fix the prices for the dredging, but he makes reports that come to the chief engineer and the deputy. As to the different prices for dredges, $10 and $12 an hour, the price is based upon the quantity of work the several dredges can do. It is all done to a standard. As to the general policy, speaking for myself, I think it would be well if the department had a larger fleet of dredges. But the hon. gentleman must know that these dredges are very costly. A first-class dredge to-day will cost at least a quarter of a million dollars. The department have been for years asking for votes and supplying themselves with dredges of the latest pattern and able to do work at the lowest cost. But the department could not very well ask a vote to supply dredges for all the harbours, because in some harbours a certain kind of dredge will do the best work, while others require a different dredge. I do not think the department can ever hope to be equipped with enough dredges of its own to cover all the harbours. But it is the policy of the department to increase its dredging fleet.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How many dredges are employed at Port Arthur and Fort William ?

Mr. HYMAN. Four.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Were they constructed especially for this work ?

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Where were they constructed ?

Mr. HYMAN. Those dredges do not belong to the department. Still I am sorry I have not the information the hon. gentleman desires. We deal simply with the contractor, and, so long as the dredge comes up to the requirements of the department we are satisfied.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was asking with a view to understanding the practicability of the department acquiring dredges. I thought that as that was the policy of the minister he would have considered that point, and would be able to tell us whether these dredges were made in this country or elsewhere.

Mr. HYMAN. I have not that information.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What are the names of the other two dredges ?

Mr. HYMAN. No. 5, the 'Arthur,' and No. 6 the 'Kingsford.' No. 5 is the Great Lakes Dredging Company's.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the contract made with ?

Mr. HYMAN. My deputy tells me that it is with Mr. A. F. Bowman.

Mr. BERGERON. The same man ?

Mr. HYMAN. The same man.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We have here for dredging the Kaministiquia river, $20,939, that is to F. A. Bowman. Then we have the Great Lakes Dredging Company, $2,119. Dredging in Kaminisquia river near elevator D, $4,036 ; Great Lakes Dredging Company, $1,333. Who owns the dredge 'Kingsford' ?

Mr. HYMAN. C. S. Boone.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Dredging in Port Arthur harbour at new Canadian Northern Railway elevator, $14,484 ; Great Lakes Dredging Company, $18,917, making a total amount of $73,679 for dredging Port Arthur last year. This year the minister comes

down with another estimate of $195,000 for dredging. I have no hesitation in telling the minister that he is carrying out a wrong policy, and the public is not getting service for the money expended.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman has a right to his opinion, and possibly I have a right to mine. My opinion is that the country is getting service for the money. The expenditure comes directly under the Department of the Chief Engineer, who is watching it very closely. Since I have been in charge of the department no contract has been made or arrangement of any kind except after a report of the chief engineer.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. From what depth to what depth is the hon. gentleman dredging, both in Port Arthur and Kaministiquia ?

Mr. HYMAN. The average present depth varies. The intention is to give twenty-two feet of water, gradually extending it along the docks to twenty-two feet.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Could the minister give the committee an idea of the size, capacity and value of each of these dredges ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have not the value of the dredges, because we are dealing with contractors who do the dredging. We take into consideration the amount of work a dredge can perform in a given time. When a dredge is paid $10 an hour it is supposed to be for ordinary work. If it is in mud or sand, it is 15 cents a yard, that is considered to be a fair price.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. A modern dredge can do the mud dredging for an infinitely less price than that.

Mr. HYMAN. Perhaps so. The department is now looking at a new dredge that can do the work for less price ; but there is not a dredge of that kind available in Canada.

Mr. STOCKTON. Does that include scowage ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes. While a dredge is being paid $10 an hour it is working in different kinds of material all the while, which varies in price from 16⅔ cents per yard up to 40 cents, depending altogether upon the character of the work the dredge is engaged in.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The reason I asked the question as to the value is this. It was stated to us in committee several years ago by a predecessor of the minister, that the department was, as stated by my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), considering a proposition to construct dredges to do this work, for the reason that it could thus be more economically performed. Several years have since elapsed, and I would have thought, if that is the opinion of the department still, that the deaprtment would have made itself acquainted with the particulars to which I have referred respecting these dredges, because I assume they are proper dredges for undertaking this work. If they are proper dredges for this work, then it would seem that an inquiry might have been made long ago as to the value of these dredges, and the cost of acquiring dredges of a similar character, in order that the saving spoken of by the hon. gentleman's predecessor might be effected. The minister will agree that in that aspect of the question it would have been proper for the government to obtain some information along that line. He has spoken to us of a dredge costing $250,000. I want to find out whether any one of these dredges cost anything like that sum.

Mr. HYMAN. I do not think any of them did, of that character.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the minister will find that for the same purpose he could have bought the whole of these dredges for one-half or one-fourth of that sum. The inquiry seems to be pertinent for that reason, because if you can dredge out the harbours of Fort William and Port Arthur for 5 cents a cubic yard, there is no reason why you should be paying 15, 20 and 25 cents per cubic yard. I hope, therefore, that the minister, during the present session or at some early date, will give us some information along these lines ; because while it may be profitable to some of these gentlemen to be dredging these harbours at these rates, there is no reason in the interests of the people why that system should be pursued if it be true, as stated by the hon. gentleman's predecessor, that the work can well be done for one-third or one-fourth of the price now paid.

Mr. HYMAN. The department can do no work at Port Arthur or at Kaministiquia until such time, as we get up-to-date dredges. If we were to attempt to do so with the present dredges, I think the hon. gentleman would say that we were not doing our full duty. If we were to acquire these dredges, I do not believe that we could do the work a single bit cheaper than we are doing it under the system we are pursuing at the present time. If we pursued that policy we would require immediately to spend a large amount of money on capital account for the purpose of doing the work in Port Arthur. What is to be done with the dredges afterwards ? I understand it to be a rule in dredging contracts that a certain amount has to be charged up to the price for dredging to provide for the plant. If the department simply say : we will do no work, or we will ask parliament for $400,000 or $500,000 to get these dredges to do the work in two or three years, and at the end of that time possibly the dredges may not be placed where they can be used, the result will be that a large price must be charged up against the work. But we are gradually adopting a new policy. At the

present time we are building a new dredge on the most approved plans and we hope to be able to accomplish some results with that dredge.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is that being built ?

Mr. HYMAN. That is being built under contract at the Polson Works in Toronto.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it a big dredge ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is a 24-inch hydraulic dredge.

Mr. BERGERON. Like the 'J. Israel Tarte' ?

Mr. HYMAN. Practically on the same principle, except that it has the latest up-to-date improvements in every possible way. The department are gradually trying to get themselves into that position, but I hardly think this House will be prepared to say in the meantime that we should stop all work at Port Arthur.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I know that my hon. friend is not disposed to be unfair ordinarily, but he has given a construction to my remarks which is not in the slightest degree borne out by anything I said. How long have we been dredging in this river ? For several years, have we not ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. For at least thirty years.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, we had the announcement made by a responsible minister of the Crown that this work could be done in a very much cheaper way by acquiring dredges and doing the work directly by the department. I do not know whether that can be borne out or not. I was not suggesting that the hon. minister should wait, but I was suggesting that if the policy of the department had at any time been what was thus stated, some inquiry should be made, so that the hon. Minister of Public Works could give some necessary information. The hon. minister says it will not be cheaper, but when I ask him the very questions which are pertinent to the consideration of the subject he is not able to give me any information. He does not know what the cost is of a dredge capable of doing that work. Is not that the first thing to consider in order to come to a conclusion as to whether or not we can do the work more cheaply ourselves ? Would you not have to consider the cost of the dredge and the cost of operation afterwards ? Would you not have to consider that the dredge during a portion of the time might not be employed after this work has been done ? All these things are proper subjects for consideration, but the hon. minister did not seem to be able to give very much information to the committee. One consideration is, of course, the cost of dredges which will be capable of performing this work, and whether or not such dredges can be obtained within a reasonable time. It might turn out, if we had the information, that the hon. minister is exactly right in his conjecture, but the committee should be furnished with the necessary information to enable it to come to a conclusion on the subject, and to offer any suggestions which may seem pertinent before voting the money.

Mr. HYMAN. I am sure the hon. gentleman will acquit me of in any possible way desiring to put any unfair construction upon his words. As far as the cost of a dredge is concerned, the committee will quite understand that for in the neighbourhood of $250,000 a first-class suction dredge could be built. That dredge would not do all the work there ; we would require a dredge for hard-pan and rock work, so that we would have to build, in addition to that class of dredge, a dredge which would do hard-pan and rock work.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. These dredges are of more than one class ?

Mr. HYMAN. These four dredges are all of one class ; they are all of the class which is known as the 'dipper' dredge. I do not think it would be the policy of the department to acquire these dredges. If the government were to acquire and man these dredges themselves, I question very much if the work could be done cheaper than by paying so much for each dredge per hour, or so much per yard for the work under contract. I just wish to say that this dredge question is in Canada a very important and serious one. There are practically no dredges available. I do not know of a single dredge of any capacity which is available in Canada for the works of the department that we are not using. It is a very difficult matter to get dredges, and for that reason I feel convinced that the department must gradually extend this system of buying and manning its own dredges, but I do not believe that the House would agree with the opinion that it would be a proper thing that we should do so in one year.

Mr. BERGERON. I sympathize very much with my hon. friend the acting Minister of Public Works. I believe he did not quite catch what the chief of the opposition said. He was not here some years ago, when one of his predecessors asked parliament for a very large amount of money to equip government works at Sorel. These works were designed for the building of the dredges which will be necessary in Canada. This question was very much discussed here. It was a very large amount of money that was required. Some hon. gentlemen expressed an opinion very much in line with that of my hon. friend, but the majority of the House and the government, who were responsible for it, sustained the opinion of the then Minister of Public Works. The money was spent. I believe

that over half a million dollars was spent at Sorel for the building of a shop there. Am I right in regard to the figure ?

Mr. HYMAN. It was a large amount, as the hon. gentleman says.

Mr. BERGERON. A good deal of work, in accordance with the intentions of the then minister, was commenced there, but it was not continued. I think this is an evidence of the unfortunate results that follow from the government having no stated policy. If that had been the policy of the government on that subject, whether the Minister of Public Works disappeared or not, that policy should have been continued. It has not been continued. The works at Sorel are not to-day operated to as great an extent as was intended when they were built. I know it may be answered that they are used for repairs for the fleet that is employed in the St. Lawrence channel. That work is not being properly done, if I can judge by what was done last summer, when the boiler on the largest dredge—the 'J. Israel Tarte'—burst, with the result that the dredge could do nothing at all.

Mr. FOSTER. It was Préfontaine that burst.

Mr. BERGERON. The steamer 'Préfontaine' was near the dredge 'Tarte.'

Mr. FOSTER. He burst his boiler.

Mr. BERGERON. The then minister was to build other dredges. This was six years ago. How many of these dredges have been built ? It was said that when they finished the work in the St. Lawrence channel they were to be used later upon the Georgian bay canal, a scheme which is now before parliament. It was said here by that hon. gentleman, as a minister of the Crown, and it was accepted by parliament, that it was a good policy, because dredges built and owned by the government could do the work for one-half the price the government has to pay to-day for rented dredges. My hon. friend has said what is perfectly clear, that it is hard to get dredges, and naturally the prices are going up, but had the government been building dredges of their own, then these contractors, knowing that the government were building their own dredges, would have to keep the prices as low as possible. What is being done about that famous dredge—which must have been a good one, since the government are building another of the same kind in Toronto—it is a special kind of dredge, and the first one is not at work at all ?

Mr. HYMAN. The 'J. Israel Tarte' was at work last season.

Mr. BERGERON. It did hardly any work.

Mr. HYMAN. It worked in the fall last season. As regards the work at Sorel the very policy which the hon. gentleman says was laid down by a member of the government was carried out, so far as the dredges are concerned. Every dredge on the ship canal, except the 'Laval' whose hull only was built here was built in those works, and I have always understood that these dredges were doing remarkably good work. At Sorel they are also building a dredge for the Public Works Department, the dredge 'W. S. Fielding.' The Department of Public Works in addition to that are as I said trying to equip themselves with modern dredges, but I do not think it will be good policy on the part of the government to make all these expenditures in one year. We are gradually trying to equip ourselves with hydraulic and elevator dredges and there is no question that the work can be done at a lower cost with the kind of dredge that is best suited for it.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you arrive at the rate of $10 an hour ?

Mr. HYMAN. That is based on a capacity of 800 yards a day.

Mr. FOSTER. For what kind of work ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is all based on sand and mud work which is 15 cents. Then there is a regular schedule price which is supposed to be an equivalent for hard-pan and for rock.

Mr. FOSTER. Why fix 15 cents a yard there.

Mr. HYMAN. Because that is considered a fair price for the work.

Mr. FOSTER. And the contract is let on that ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There is no contract whatever.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. Of course there is a contract between the department and the proprietors of the dredge.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Will the hon. gentleman explain what a contract is ? Let him not deceive the House—I do not think he intends to deceive——

Mr. HYMAN. Mr. Chairman I rise to a point of order. I have no desire to deceive the House.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Oliver). I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) will have to consider that he is out of order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am not out of order. I said he did not intend to deceive the House.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Oliver). I understood him to say that the hon. minister deceived the House.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I understood him to say the contract with Bowman to be for

dredging, $14,484.39 and at the mouth of the Kaministiquia river $20,939.40. Was there a contract there? No there was not.

Mr. HYMAN. I wish to say there was a contract.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What was the contract, what were the terms ?

Mr. HYMAN. If the hon. gentleman wants the floor I will give him the opportunity.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I want him to tell the terms of the contract.

Mr. HYMAN. I wish to be allowed to make my statement without being interrupted. The terms of the contract are exactly as I said before. The contracts are between the proprietors of the dredges and the department to do the work at $10 per hour. That $10 per hour is based upon the capability of the dredge to do a certain amount of work, figuring at 15 cents for ordinary sand and mud work. There is a price which the dredge would get for rock work, a proportionate to the price of 15 cents for sand or mud. Then there is a price for hard-pan. That is the nature of the contract which is entered into between the owners of the dredge and the Department of Public Works.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The contract was for $10 an hour.

Mr. HYMAN. That is the contract.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is a mere agreement. What I would call a contract is that the engineer should have estimates for the work to be done for this coming year for which we are voting $195,000. We want to know from the minister if he can tell us how much of that is sand, how much hard-pan and how much rock. On what does he base his estimate of $195,000 ? Can he say to Conmee & Bowman and the outfit generally : Here gentlemen are certain obstructions in this harbour which you have to remove ; for what will you enter into a contract with us to remove all the sand and mud and hard-pan. What will you take to remove all of that ? I would call that a contract, but I call it no contract to go on at $10 an hour, as the minister bases his estimate, in asking for this $195,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The estimate of $195,000 is based upon the engineer's estimate of the amount of work that we will be able to do in these harbours this year. It is based upon an estimate that there will be so many cubic yards each of sand, clay, rock, mud, or hard-pan. The contract they entered into—or if you like to call it an agreement—the contract or agreement is based upon that basis that a dredge earns about $10 an hour, and it must do the equivalent of 300 yards a day. It figures out at 15 cents per yard for 12 hours a day at $120. Engineers know perfectly well what that equivalent is in hard-pan, rock and sand.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Can the minister furnish the figures of that estimate, because if he does not give them now I intend moving for them. I mean the estimate of material to be removed with this $195,000 this year. How much of it is of each quality ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have not the details of every yard of sand, rock, or hard-pan, but there is so much dredging to be done there—

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It is a large sum—

Mr. HYMAN. If I might be allowed to make the explanation, Mr. Chairman, there is a certain area to be removed ; we figure that we can remove this year a certain amount of material from this harbour and we estimate that so much of it is sand, so much hard-pan and so much rock. Taking these different items and putting them together the engineers of the department figure that we can do work to the extent of $195,000 in Port Arthur harbour and Kaministiquia river.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. On what data do you figure ?

Mr. HYMAN. I figure on the plans which are furnished to the department and on the surveys of these waters which the department has.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister can produce these figures, of course. Another point : where is the material put that is dredged out ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is dumped into deep water in the lake.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Whereabouts ?

Mr. HYMAN. At the closest possible point.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. So that it will be convenient to wash back again.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why is it not better for the department to pay so much per cubic yard for the material actually removed than to pay $10 an hour for the dredge.

Mr. HYMAN. In some cases we have done that. I do not know that there is really any great difference in the result. The payment is practically figured on the capacity of the dredge.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Simply a different way of arriving at what you regard as the same result. When you pay at the rate of $10 an hour, how do you know that the quantity you estimate for is actually removed ?

Mr. HYMAN. We have an engineer who visits the harbour, and an inspector on every dredge. A report comes to the department every day, so that we can check it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister spoke some time ago as if it were not advisable to employ dredges owned by the department because he expects this dredging to cease some time ; but the Postmaster General says that dredging has been going on there for thirty years. Is it not probable, from the nature of the river, that you will always have dredging there ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Always.

Mr. HYMAN. Then, the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) has brought up the question of the necessity that might arise for a considerable enlargement of the harbour.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that not an additional reason why the minister should consider what has been suggested to-night ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have received some information, and am very glad to have had the discussion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Where is the new dredge now being constructed by the Polson Company of Toronto to be employed ?

Mr. HYMAN. In the maritime provinces.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is no dredge now being constructed which it is intended to employ at this point ?

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the dredge now being constructed by the Polson Company be suitable for work at the mouth of the Kaministiquia ?

Mr. HYMAN. I am informed by the officers of the department that it would work specially well there.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I may say that I have always objected to the work that is being done at Port Arthur and Fort William, especially at Port Arthur. As the breakwater was placed too close to the shore in the first place, some dredging must be done inside of it to enable vessels to turn. But the whole policy of the department on those harbours, I contend, is wrong. I intend asking what the total sums are that have already been expended upon them. A hydraulic dredge could very properly be worked at Port Arthur. The mud—it is principally mud—I took soundings in the harbour before the engineers of the department did—could be dumped on the shore where there would be no danger of it flowing back into the harbour. When I see the large sums of money expended by the department on dredging in this harbour, I have no hesitation in saying that at the first opportunity I will go into the accounts before the Public Accounts Committee to show that this work has not been properly done.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the condition of the breakwater at Port Arthur ?

Mr. HYMAN.

Mr. HYMAN. It is being repaired at present. The expenditure last year for repairs was about $15,000.

Mr. BLAIN. The statement was made some years ago that the condition of the breakwater at Port Arthur was very serious, and that unless extensive repairs were made immediately it was in danger of being swept away altogether. When does the minister expect to have the present breakwater thoroughly repaired and completed ?

Mr. HYMAN. We are not asking for any vote for the breakwater this year. The engineer informs me that all the necessary repairs will be completed out of the vote for the present year.

Mr. BLAIN. On the question of the material dredged out of the harbour drifting back again, what is the experience of the department ? Is there a considerable portion required to be re-dredged ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is an appreciable amount at the mouth of the Kaministiquia river, where we shall require practically continuous dredging.

Mr. BLAIN. About how much ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is almost impossible to tell—some years less and some more. The same thing occurs in many other harbours.

Mr. BLAIN. The harbour now under discussion is a very important harbour, not only to Ontario but to all Canada, and it seems to me that one of those up-to-date dredges which the department has been constructing should be put into that harbour. Will the hon. gentleman state what is the prospect on that point ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have no decided policy at the moment in regard to that harbour, and the department has not all the details that may be necessary to decide upon a policy. There are certain contemplated changes which may postpone any large work there. Possibly new railway connections may be made there. We cannot decide upon a policy until we see exactly what the necessities of the case are.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose the minister would have no objection to lay on the table the contract between his department and A. F. Bowman, at the next meeting of the committee or at some other convenient time ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is no objection. I have explained the way in which that matter is arranged between the department and the contractor. We arrived at a decision after consulting with our engineer at Port Arthur, who has charge of these works, and our chief engineer ; and the contractor has to go on and do the work at a price considered fair and reasonable by both.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose the hon. gentleman will have no objection to laying the contract on the table.

Mr. HYMAN. I have explained how the prices were arrived at and that there is actually no formal contract.

Mr. BLAIN. I am not particular as to whether it is a letter or not, but I would like the hon. minister to lay on the table what he regards as the contract existing between A. F. Bowman and the department.

Mr. HYMAN. Certainly, any information in the department is at the disposal of the House at any time.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister anything which would show the cost of operation of the dredge 'Kingsford' for twelve hours? How many men are employed on it?

Mr. HYMAN. Three. There is great difficulty in arriving at the exact figures. In all these contracts the element of chance is a considerable one. Allowance must be made for breakages and depreciation of the dredge. Every dredge has to be laid up every winter and overhauled, and sometimes the depreciations and renewals are very large. The contractor has to take all that into consideration, and that is one of the greatest difficulties the department has to deal with.

Mr. FOSTER. That is quite true, but at the same time it would help us in coming to a conclusion. The way the minister has arrived at his $10 per hour is to place an arbitrary rate on mud or sand dredging. His engineers at Port Arthur say they think it is worth 15 cents per cubic yard to remove mud or sand, and it takes more for another kind of deposits, and so on. He gets at $10 per hour by fixing an arbitrary amount as the reasonable sum to be placed for sand or mud excavation, but possibly 15 cents may be too much or too little, and the only way of determining is to get at the cost of dredging and the average of depreciation and repairs. I suppose that any one skilful in these matters can come quickly to a conclusion as to whether a dredge has earned a disproportionate amount compared with the cost of running it and the loss by depreciation and repairs and by having to lay it up during the winter. The department which has been using dredges for years ought to have pretty accurate information on these points.

Mr. HYMAN. The department has sources of information which it has carefully considered in fixing the price at 15 cents. We have dredges of our own, and our engineers know what it costs per day to run a dredge of a certain capacity, and also what it has cost the government for repairs. But in making a comparison between the dredging done by contractors and that done by the department itself, it must be remembered that in the public accounts giving the items of dredging there is nothing added to the cost of the dredging for the cost and depreciation of the plant. The contractor must take these into consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. What would the cost of running the 'Kingsford' be per day of 12 hours?

Mr. HYMAN. We have not got the information concerning that particular dredge and such information might be very misleading.

Mr. FOSTER. It would not be misleading. The hon. minister is very quick to see that another element comes into the calculation and is quick to put it forward in the interest of fair-play to the contractor. Other business men would be just as quick to give a fair and reasonable price, but they would have something on which to base a calculation and make up their minds as to whether 15 cents per hour was too large as a unit of expense. The House has not that knowledge and therefore has nothing on which to form a conclusion. The House will not be so unreasonable as to refuse to take into account the element of depreciation or of laying up for six months in the year; but at the same time if those dredges are not very expensive as regards their first cost, in two or three years they would earn enough money to enable the department, if it had that money, to build all the dredges necessary and credit them with 15 cents an hour. Were any tenders called for for the dredging at Port Arthur?

Mr. HYMAN. No, but negotiations were had with these gentlemen because they had the dredges.

Mr. FOSTER. Would it not be possible to call for tenders and get a relative idea of the cost? You might say that there were no others in that vicinity, but if you take in the whole extent of the lakes, you might very well get competition.

Mr. HYMAN. I have explained the position the department took. There were practically no other dredges available and we considered that we had made as favourable an arrangement with the contractors as we could possibly have done, even had we called for tenders.

Mr. FOSTER. But the hon. minister leaves himself open at every stage of the argument to be reminded that this is a negotiation between gentlemen who are not unfriendly, politically or otherwise, and consequently there might be an unfair advantage given to one side. If the minister exhausted his resources in securing public competition he would be more strongly fortified in making an arrangement by private negotiation. I think that is always a protection to a minister. Of course, if he cannot get competition, he must fall back upon the parties and negotiate with them. There is always the chance, that once in a while a competitor will come in and offer to do the work at cheaper rates.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In the Auditor General's Report for 1904, page V—294, and following pages, he will find the charges for the working expenses of dredges. He will find that the dredge 'Lake Nipissing' was run for a year for $6,400; the dredge 'Nithsdale' for $10,587; dredge No. 1, for $4,220; dredge No. 6, $530— I suppose she was not run for the whole year. The dredge 'Ontario' ran from May to December, and the pay of officers and other expenses amount to $8,361; the dredge 'Progress' cost $5,962; the 'Queen,' $12,237; the 'Richelieu,' $6,602; the dredge 'P. V. Savard,' $3,846. I presume that these are the running expenses of these dredges and I presume also that some of these dredges are as large as the dredges at Port Arthur, possibly larger. Then, at page V—58 of this report we find that Mr. Bowman was paid for dredging in entrance channel to the Kaministiquia river, $20,939.40. We are informed by the minister himself that Mr. Bowman is the contractor for the Great Lakes Dredging Company, and that company received on the same work, $2,119.20. Then, for dredging in the Kaministiquia river near elevator D, Mr. Bowman received $4,036.80 and the Great Lakes Dredging Company, services of dredge No. 5, $1,333.05. Then for dredging in Port Arthur harbour, Mr. Boone received for services of dredge 'Kingsford,' $6,984.33. For dredging in Port Arthur near new Canadian Northern Railway elevator, Mr. Bowman was paid, $14,484.39, and the Great Lakes Dredging Company, $18,917.28. All this is exclusive of the cost of inspectors and various other expenses, nor is there anything for soundings and borings. The total cost of this dredging work is $73,679.54. In addition we have the charge for dredging the Kaministiquia river, $35,923. With inspectors and other services, the total for the four dredges is $109,602.81. Compare this with four of the most expensive of the government dredges, and you find that these contractors have a large margin of profit. If the minister did the work with government dredges, he would have this large sum of money to devote to procuring new dredges or to carrying on dredging elsewhere. The minister has come down from his high position about a contract for $10 an hour. He knows what the contract was—virtually a negotiation with the gentlemen and telling them, 'Go ahead and we will pay you $10 an hour.' The hon. minister has—at least, he certainly ought to have—a report showing how much of each class of material it is expected to remove with the vote he is asking for. If he will then advertise for tenders for the specific work I believe he can save 50 per cent of this money.

Mr. HYMAN. I have no objection to the comparison the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) has made, but I have not had time to consider it. Of course, the hon. gentleman knows that the length of time the dredge is running affects the question of expense, and so does the question of where the work is to be done and the time of work.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to call the attention of the minister to the statement of one of his predecessors on this question of dredging. He will find it at page 3284 of 'Hansard' of 1902 :—

> I hope that by next year we shall be sufficiently equipped to do our own work. The two or three new dredges which we are building now I hope will enable us to do the work ourselves, and at a cheaper rate than we have done it in the past.

This was on a discussion of an item of $619,000 for constructing new dredges, &c. With that statement before the committee I am sure the hon. minister will not think we are unduly inquisitive if we ask him how it comes in 1905 he tells us that they have not enough dredges and cannot say when they will have.

Mr. HYMAN. Did the minister in making that statement refer to all the dredging done in the Dominion of Canada?

Mr. BLAIN. Yes, I read his exact words. I am not responsible for them. The item is dredging, $619,000.

Mr. HYMAN. If I mistake not, that is for dredging in some part of the Dominion.

Mr. BLAIN. No, general dredging I take it. I will read a little further :

> Dredging, $619,000.
>
> Mr. WILSON. We should have some explanation of this very large item. The word 'plant' is mentioned in the estimates several times. It would seem as if we needed to build a great many dredges to require all this plant.
>
> MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The word 'plant' means a new dredge; not plant to build a dredge.

That is his explanation of it. I am sure the minister, when he reads this statement, covering two or three pages, will see that his predecessor wished to leave the impression upon the committee that in the course of a short time, even the next year, they would have sufficient dredges to do all their own work. He goes on further and points out that the present system of hiring dredges is out of date altogether, and that it would be in the interest of the country to build these hydraulic dredges, giving an explanation why he was asking for this enormous sum of money. Now we are anxious to know what has become of this money, and how it is that the minister now says that a sufficient number of these up-to-date dredges cannot be constructed without hiring dredges from Mr. Bowman.

Mr. HYMAN. I can only say that the department have gradually equipped themselves to a large extent since that statement was made. The vote of which the

minister was speaking then was the general vote taken for dredges. Since that date the department have largely added to their own plant, and largely in the interest of the public. But the demand for dredging has been growing all the time, and it has been found almost impossible to keep up with the demand. At that time the dredging of the St. Lawrence channel was under the Department of Public Works, which I think largely accounts for the minister's statement. The department has built several large dredges which are confined to that work.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the minister a statement of the horse-power of this new hydraulic dredge, this $250,000 dredge ?

Mr. HYMAN. 13,000 odd horse-power.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Can he give us the horse-power of these four dredges at Port Arthur now ?

Mr. HYMAN. The Marine Department has a record of them. I suppose they are registered.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I give the minister notice that I shall expect the information at a later date.

Mr. BARKER. As I have to confess that I am even more ignorant than the department on the subject, I would like to ask one or two questions of the minister. I do not desire to hold him responsible for the matters I am about to refer to. I desire to inquire into certain matters of expenditure by the Public Works Department in connection with this dredging business. I find that in certain cases certain dredges are paid $8, $10 and $12 an hour for their work ; I find that dredges are moved from place to place, and are paid something like half rates for moving. I find also that dredges employed by the government, so far as I can see, not by contract but by direct employment of the department, apparently by some method of hiring, are employed by the hour. Now I have found in the accounts dredges paid $12 an hour, which seems to be a very large sum. It may be right, I do not dispute it, but I would like to know something about it. I find also that dredges employed at $12 an hour are working in the month of November and up to the middle of December, twelve hours a day. That says a great deal for the diligence of the department, and the energy of the owners of the dredges, that they can work in the middle of December twelve hours a day. I think it a remarkable thing that in this country a dredge could be employed until in the middle of December for twelve hours a day. My own notion of things would make me believe that it was absolutely impossible, and I would like to know from the minister how it is that in the matter of dredging, hours and duration of employment exceed so enormously the ordinary custom of the country. I do not know of any other trade or employment in which people work in the middle of December twelve hours a day, especially in matters such as dredging, where light is, one would think, absolutely essential. Perhaps the minister can tell us how, in the middle of December, twelve hours of honest work can be devoted to the service of the country, no matter what the rate of wages may be. and if he can do that, it will perhaps save a good deal of time in this committee and others, where the members desire to inquire into these things.

Mr. HYMAN. Unfortunately, the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) was not in the House when I gave a great deal of information to the committee which he has just asked for. There are one or two things however, which I would like to explain, one of which is the hours the dredges work. It does not follow that they must work in daylight. In some of the dredges which we hire and even in some of our own dredges, there are two shifts of men that work the dredge day and night, so that a dredge will sometimes work 24 hours a day. In the case of some of these dredges which we hire by the hour, I explained already that the way we pay them depends altogether upon the quality of the material removed by the dredges, and upon their capacity. We have dredges which we pay $8 an hour, to others having a greater capacity we pay $10, and to others having a still greater capacity, $12 an hour. I explained fully that the payment is based upon the capacity of the dredges, and the number of hours that the dredge works. That is the method followed by the department. So far as regards a dredge working in December, I am assured by the officers of the department that they have a daily return from every one of these dredges which are under contract to the department. This daily return is furnished by our own officers, and payments are made upon that check, which the hon. member will agree is as good as can be devised upon the work of the dredges.

Mr. BARKER. The explanation of the minister leaves me just where I was before. My trouble is this: It does not appear to me that a dredge can very well work in the dark; certainly it cannot work in the dark in an economical way for the department. Now I find that in December with the sun setting before five o'clock, and the moon rising about one o'clock in the morning the department is paying for work twelve hours in the day. If they can pay for twelve hours I cannot see why they cannot pay for 24 hours. There is no reason why they should not pay for 24 hours just as well as for twelve and get the work done earlier. The peculiarity to me seems to be that the inspector who sends his report to the minister, as the minister says

under this most perfect system of checking, is paid extra for every hour that he is employed to inspect. I find that a dredge is employed in the month of December and is paid for 12 hours of dredging work and this gentleman certifies that it is employed every day no matter what the weather is, whether it is stormy or the finest and fairest weather. Apparently the dredge works the same number of hours and turns out exactly the same number of yards of earth whether the weather is fair or foul. It does seem to me a little singular that the inspector charges per hour just the same number of hours for his inspection as the dredge is employed. The inspector is allowed $3 per day for looking on. I do not know exactly how he measures day by day the exact number of yards turned out by the dredge, but he does so and certifies exactly to the number of yards turned out by the dredge and that, having certified that the dredge has been working a certain number of hours, charges here just so many hours extra for his services. It strikes me that an inspector who is allowed thirty cents an hour for every extra hour he certifies in his account that the dredge is on duty is tempted by that thirty cents an hour to not look too closely into the accounts.

Mr. HYMAN. As regards the overtime work of the inspector, of course when the dredge is working overtime the inspector is necessarily paid overtime. There is no objection to that. The hon. gentleman will agree with me that it is necessary to have an inspector. As far as the measurement is concerned it is scow measurement. The officers of the department know exactly the number of cubic yards contained in the scow that is being used and when the scow is filled up the dredge man gets credit for having removed that amount of earth.

Mr. BARKER. I think nobody in this House knows more thoroughly than the hon. minister himself that in the months of November and December, about the hour of five o'clock, under the game laws, darkness comes on very quickly. Sundown is a fixed minute. We can find that in the Canadian almanac. The hon. gentleman knows that thirty minutes after sundown there is such an amount of darkness that certain shooting and other amusements that are defined by the game laws are stopped. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that between thirty and forty minutes after sundown work of that kind cannot be done and to say that a dredge can go on for hours after sundown and do dredging work is to my mind all nonsense. I do not care how many inspectors of the government certify that the work is being done and I say that when the inspector is paid thirty cents an hour for every hour beyond darkness that the work has been done it is offering him thirty cents per hour as a reward for over-certifying the work that is really done.

Mr. HYMAN. I cannot accept the statement of the hon. gentleman that because an officer of the department is paid for over time and because he certifies to the work done during that time he is dishonest. I have asked my deputy to look through the accounts, but he does not see any case of the character which my hon. friend has mentioned. If my hon. friend will give me the particulars in regard to the dredge to which he refers I will be glad to have the matter investigated.

Mr. BARKER. I can tell the hon. minister that in regard to work done on the Grand river, the accounts show charges for 12 hours per day in October, November and December for dredging. In my opinion, knowing the province of Ontario as I do and knowing the months of November and December, as I do, it is absurd to say that a dredge works 12 hours a day.

Mr. HYMAN. We have dredges capable of working 24 hours a day. These dredges are equipped for that purpose. There are a great many of these dredges.

Mr. SPROULE. Are they equipped with electric light?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, a great many of them are or with other suitable light. We have departmental dredges which we can work 24 hours a day. It all depends on the number of shifts we put on.

Mr. SPROULE. I think where they charge for so much a day provided they take out a certain number of cubic yards per day they do very irregular work sometimes. It is said that when they get a nice soft place to dredge they will dredge away as much as possible until they get below the depth and when they get a hard place they will skip over it, and proceed to another place where they can scoop out the material so as to make up the number of yards that by their contract they are required to take out in a day. The result is that the bottom is often very unevenly dredged. I know from parties who took the trouble to make measurements that this is the case. As to dredges working at night, I do not see how they can work at night very well. I do not think it is the general custom in our part of the country. I have never known it to be the case. They may do so where the lights are sufficient for the purpose.

Mr. HYMAN. I am informed by the chief engineer that our officers are instructed to see that nothing of the kind to which my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) referred is done; that is to say that dredges shall not do the easy work and skip the hard work.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In reference to this work at Port Arthur there is no con-

tract, as I understand it. It says $10 per hour for every hour they work no matter what they take out. That is what the Auditor General's Report shows at all events.

Mr. HYMAN. They are paid $10 per hour which is based upon their doing 800 yards an hour.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. They have not done it every day then ?

Mr. SPROULE. There is another thing to which I drew attention once before. I am not complaining of any thing recently brought to my notice, but it has been brought to my notice that the inspector who is put there to see the amount of work done is often found around the hotel puffing away at 20 cents cigars, while the work is going on, and he makes his return just as if he had been on the dredge. Then too, the calculation of the number of yards taken out is made by counting the number of scows. I have often seen scows taken out not by any means full, and I assume that these are counted as full scows every time, as holding so many cubic yards. That is sure to be an overcharge, and in all human probability the dredge which is supposed to be taking out 800 or 1,000 yards a day is taking out less than that. I think there should be a very reliable man on each dredge to see that the scows are properly filled. This man cannot do his duty and be around the hotel.

Mr. HYMAN. I quite agree that very reliable men should be engaged for this work. We are always very careful in the department in selecting the men, and I quite understand that it would be dishonest for a man to certify to what he does not know of his own knowledge. The department do the best they can to guard against it but with the large number of inspectors that we have it may sometimes happen that one of them is remiss in his duties.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course it would be improper to attribute any dishonesty to any official, but speaking impersonally and with regard to the system, perhaps it is not wise to make the remuneration of the inspectors increase proportionately to the increase in the number of hours which they allow to the dredges.

Mr. HYMAN. I understand what you mean and I see the difficulty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is the point to which the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) drew attention. While we are bound to consider that the inspectors act honestly it is not desirable that the remuneration should increase proportionately to the different amounts of work done by the dredges.

Mr. HYMAN. I see the difficulty that strikes my hon. friend (Mr. Borden), that where one man is working 10 hours a day and another is working 12 hours a day it seems unfair that the payment should be the same. I would be glad if any member would suggest some means of overcoming the difficulty.

Mr. BARKER. When an inspector whose duty is simply to overlook the work of a dredge and the number of hours the dredge is employed gets $3 a day that is quite sufficient for a man doing such work, and if he has to stay longer hours he should take that as part of his duty and not be allowed more than $3. $3 a day is a very good wage for a man who has simply to look after that kind of work. When a man gets $3 a day and get 30 cents for each additional hour of work credited to the dredge, he is tempted to certify more—I do not say that he necessarily acts dishonestly in certifying—but it is a temptation.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman says that $3 a day is quite sufficient. I do not think it is fair that with one dredge working 10 hours a day and another working 12 hours the inspector on each dredge should receive the same amount, $3.

Mr. BARKER. There are many occasions when owing to storms or other causes a dredge cannot work more than perhaps 6 hours a day, but returns from these inspectors come in week after week, giving 12 hours a day for every day.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I notice that in the Auditor General's Report 358, one of these inspectors, as I presume he must be, Mr. Lefebvre, gets :

Services October to November and January to June, 232 days at $3, 11 days at $4 ; board, November to June, $271.

Why is this man paid his board, $271 during the winter months or during the winter and part of the spring.

Car fare, $70 ; travel, $123.80, voucher outstanding, $100.

Then also in connection with the Kaministiquia work, for overlapping time, the same person receives $131.75.

Mr. HYMAN. This as a matter of fact is an assistant engineer and while he was employed inspecting he was simply paid inspector's wages, and of course being an engineer of the department he was paid his expenses.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why is it charged in this way.

Mr. HYMAN. This is the way he was paid for this particular work.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Where does he belong, in Ottawa ?

Mr. HYMAN. The fact of his belonging in Ottawa would not matter.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister says he was sent out on inspection work. What inspection ?

Mr. HYMAN. Inspecting dredges.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister might have told us that.

Mr. HYMAN. I received that information this very minute, from the deputy. I cannot be expected to know the name of every officer in the department.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Just to show what a nice profit there is in operating one of these dredges, I see here the account of Mr. A. F. Bowman for dredge No. 6, August 13 to October 13, two months, and May 16 to May 31, two weeks, $20,939. That is in that two and a half months that dredge netted over $20,000. There is no use shutting our eyes to the fact that the country has not been getting value for the money it has paid for dredging. The same outfit has been doing dredging in the Georgian bay and along the shores of Lake Huron, and has been defrauding the country—I use the term advisedly—for a great many years by not giving good value for the money paid. And members who sat on the Liberal side of the House have received their $1,000 a year for dredges which they never saw, though they may have taken stock in them. We know that this is one of the many ways they have of getting certain profits without putting in much capital or labour. I want the minister to take this matter up seriously and to look at it on the basis of a contract. He has his engineers who know or ought to know the quantity of sand, of hard-pan, of clay, to be removed at any given place. Then he should advertise for tenders for so much dredging to be done, and if he gets honest tenders, he will save this country hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Mr. SPROULE. I think there is something wrong about a good deal of the dredging that is being done, and I imagine, from what comes out from time to time, that that accounts for the ease and lavishness with which certain contractors can furnish money for contesting elections. This Bowman firm has been notorious, and also another gentleman who is in this House today. There is a prevailing idea that these people get a great deal of money out of the country for which they give nothing in return, and therefore they are able and willing to help the government party whenever they become needy. If money is taken out of the country improperly in that way, it should be stopped. I am not saying positively that it is, but I have a very strong suspicion that it is, because I hear about it so frequently and so circumstantially; and when one looks over the Auditor General's Report and sees the large amount of money earned by these dredges in a short time compared with the amount of money invested in the plant, one cannot help coming to the conclusion that they get a great deal more than a reasonable return for their labour.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the minister arrived at any conclusion yet as to the proper plan for carrying out on a large scale the works at Port Arthur and Fort William?

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. member and myself have discussed the matter several times since this item has been under discussion. There have been no plans made for the larger work which the hon. member brought to my attention. Upon the necessity of that work, whether immediately or in the near future, I am not prepared to speak. I have not had an opportunity, since I have been in charge of the department, of going to Port Arthur. I hope this year to be able to visit the place with the chief engineer of the department and to form some idea of what the necessities are.

Mr. BLAIN. Are the United States authorities doing any dredging at the present time at Port Arthur?

Mr. HYMAN. I have never heard of any.

Mr. SPROULE. There is one unfortunate thing that we are often confronted with when we attempt to elicit information in regard to the expenditure of public money for public works, that is, the numerous changes made in the heads of these departments. One man is away for months, and if I ask for information from the one in charge of the estimates for the time being, he tells me that he has only been in the department for a short time and does not know much about it; and perhaps before the end of the session another change is made. During the last few years especially it has been impossible to get any connected information in regard to these works. I do not know how that condition of things can be corrected, but it ought to be, if possible. Whoever comes here and asks the House to vote money ought to be prepared to give such information to the House as to enable it to intelligently vote the money.

Mr. HYMAN. I do not think the hon. member can fairly charge me with having withheld information. This matter has been under discussion for three hours, and I have given every scrap of information that has been asked for. No one in this House regrets more than I do the unfortunate circumstances under which the Minister of Public Works has been compelled to remain so long from this House. For that I do not think blame can be thrown on anybody. What the hon. gentleman refers to is an entirely new scheme which the hon. member for Victoria has laid before the House.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister told us that he did not know and the reason he gave was that he had but recently taken

charge of the department. But he was here last year, when the estimates were voted, and I think he told us that after the session he would take occasion to acquaint himself with these harbours so as to be able to give the House the information it desired. We all know that a very heavy expenditure is going on at Port Arthur. Surely that is not going on without the government having some definite plan for carrying out the work. The minister in charge of the estimates for the time being ought to be able to give the House the information to which it is entitled. A good minister always comes prepared to give that information.

Mr. HYMAN. I have given the House the fullest information that it is possible to give with regard to this item. The hon. gentleman was not in the House when that information was given, and I think it is unfair for him to come in now and make a charge of that kind. I have been during the last two and a half hours, explaining the details of the work. The hon. member for Victoria spoke to me about some more extensive plan, and I stated that I hoped to be able to visit Port Arthur with the chief engineer and be able to form some idea of any additional requirements of that harbour.

Mr. SPROULE. But a plan must have been made out years ago.

Mr. HYMAN. The member for Victoria suggested a new plan.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand him to ask whether the government had considered any extensive plan and the minister replied that as he had been only a short time in the department he had not had opportunity to make himself acquainted with the requirements of the harbour. But there must be some plan which the government have been following for years and surely they have not been making expenditure in a hap-hazard fashion.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The plans for the harbour of Port Arthur were drawn at a time when it was not contemplated that any great Transcontinental road would be built which would reach that harbour. The expenditure of any money for dredging, except what is absolutely necessary, will be waste of money in view of the fact that in a short time we must have an entirely different plan for Port Arthur and Fort William. I would ask the minister to consult his engineers and find out what is a reasonable price for removing the sand and mud and other deposits and then call for tenders. If necessary he could let American dredges come in, but I believe that with this sum of $195,000 he could buy dredges and get more work done for less money than he is now spending. If necessary he could let yankee dredges come in, but I believe he could with the money he is now voting purchase dredges to do the work.

Montreal Harbour (lower division)—improvement below St. Mary's current, $90,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I think we ought to hold over the Quebec item until the hon. member for Jacques Cartier is here.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Of course I cannot speak for the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, but on looking over the estimates with me, he said that he was not interested in discussing any of the items until we reached public buildings in the province of Quebec on page 45.

Mr. HYMAN. This is simply to complete the payment under the contract that has been made ?

Mr. AMES. Is that the contract with Malone & Poupore ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. AMES. Was not that contract to have been completed eighteen months ago ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. AMES. What is the cause of the delay ?

Mr. HYMAN. Five feet have been added to the height of the work.

Mr. AMES. Why were the five feet added ?

Mr. HYMAN. On the report of the engineer of the department so as to bring the work up to the high water level of the harbour.

Mr. AMES. Were new tenders called for?

Mr. HYMAN. No. The work being under the control of the contractors, there was nothing for the department to do except to see that the prices paid would be fair and reasonable. No other contactors could have possession of the work, and the additional work was given out on schedule rates. It is practically all one contract.

Mr. AMES. Was the original work completed within the time stipulated ?

Mr. HYMAN. There was some delay with regard to that. The water kept very much higher than was anticipated, and the difficulty of working with the higher water was such that the contractor could not finish his work in the specified time.

Mr. AMES. Does the hon. minister believe that with this additional amount the work can be finished during the coming season and that this is the last vote which will be required for it ?

Mr. HYMAN. Another vote will be required, but not a large amount. The chief engineer states that he hopes the contract will be finished this fall.

Mr. AMES. What was the amount of the original contract and what would be the total expenditure when completed ?

Mr. HYMAN. The original contract was $631.000. The total extra expenditure with contingencies will be about $250,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the nature of the improvement ?

Mr. HYMAN. The building of a pier at the foot of the harbour—length 1,000 feet on the western side, or up stream, and 800 feet on the eastern side or down stream.

Port Colborne—harbour improvements including eastern breakwater, $150,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the total expenditure ?

Mr. HYMAN. This contract is for $179,000 and the only one there at present.

Mr. LANCASTER. How long before the work will be finished ?

Mr. HYMAN. It was let on June 8, 1904 and should be completed November 30, 1905.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How does the minister explain an expenditure of $140,000 last year and $150,000 this year ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is a typographical error. Part of this is a revote.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Was this in connection with the new harbour, or the ordinary works there ?

Mr. HYMAN. The harbour, the breakwater and other works going on there.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it for the purpose of making the harbour more secure against storms ?

Mr. HYMAN. To make the harbour perfectly secure.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is not this in connection with the two million dollar scheme ?

Mr. HYMAN. No ; that is in the other department. This is the breakwater making the harbour.

Mr. SPROULE. What amount of money has been spent on the work, and in what state of advancement is it ?

Mr. HYMAN. The completion of this will end that part of the work, and it is to be finished, according to the contract, on the 30th of November next.

Mr. FOWLER. Who is the contractor ?

Mr. HYMAN. M. J. Hogan, of Port Colborne.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the nature of the work ?

Mr. HYMAN. A breakwater 2,400 feet long. which this will complete.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the harbour then be finished and the desired depth of water available ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is simply completing the breakwater. There is work to be carried on under the Department of Railways and Canals in connection with the elevator and the piers.

Mr. SPROULE. According to my recollection, there was dredging to be done—I think some rock had to be taken away. Is that work going on at the same time ? There is little use in carrying on this work if it is not finished to be available for commerce. In view of the rapid changes which sometimes take place in the trade routes, there is danger that this work may be finished too late to be useful.

Mr. HYMAN. There will be some additional work to be done, but, until the work under the Department of Railways and Canals is completed, we cannot say exactly where the dredging work ought to be carried on.

Mr. SPROULE. If the other work is never done, what will be the advantage of this expenditure ?

Mr. HYMAN. The other work is being done. The whole is practically one scheme.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. This breakwater will be a shelter for vessels, and will be the completion of a portion of the work.

Mr. HYMAN. In addition, there is work going on in connection with the foundations of the elevators and in other directions. My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) lives near the work, and is probably aware of what is being done.

Mr. LANCASTER. I know there is work going on there, but I do not know to what extent.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is the dredging under the same department as the building of the breakwater ?

Mr. HYMAN. Not up to date. Both the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Railways and Canals have control of certain of the works in that harbour. Of course, it is not always easy to define where the jurisdiction of one ends and that of the other begins.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Can the hon. gentleman tell whether the breakwater is filled in with stone or with concrete ?

Mr. HYMAN. A timber foundation and a concrete superstructure.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would it not be a saving to use the stone taken from the bottom to fill in the breakwater, instead of hauling it for miles to get rid of it and hauling other stone for miles to fill in with? I understand that the docks at Port Arthur

are being filled with material taken from the lake.

Mr. HYMAN. I understand that there is plenty of stone to be found in the vicinity.

Mr. SPROULE. What depth of water will there be when the whole work is finished ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is contemplated to have 22 feet.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose that, even though this item is carried, if any hon. member desires to ask questions about it, he will be at liberty to do so ?

Mr. HYMAN. Certainly.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the minister tell us what business we may expect tomorrow ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If there are any Bills ready, we will proceed with them. When those orders are exhausted, I suppose we shall go on with supply, taking up, until six o'clock, the estimates of the Minister of Public Works, and after that the estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 10, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Century Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 50) to incorporate the Calgary and Battleford Railway Company.—Mr. Turiff.

Bill (No. 53) to amend the Act respecting the Department of Railways and Canals.—Mr. Emmerson.

TORONTO AND HAMILTON RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. CALVERT moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 48) respecting the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is the object of the Bill ?

Mr. CALVERT. It is to give power to the company to issue preference stock and pay dividends on the same over common stock.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CONTRACTS FOR GOVERNMENT WORK.

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 51) respecting contracts for government works. He said : This and two other Bills on the order paper in the names of Messrs. Emmerson and Hyman are practically to the same effect. The intention is to provide that hereafter contracts in which the amount involved exceeds $5,000 will be let, not only after tenders have been called for, but also after they have had the sanction of the Governor General in Council. Hitherto the practice has been for the minister at the head of the department interested to dispose of such contracts. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will remember that in 1880 an Order in Council was passed authorizing the letting without tender of small contracts in which the amounts involved did not exceed $5,000. After I became Minister of Justice, I came to the conclusion that there was no warrant for such a proceeding, and in 1903 introduced a Bill to give legal effect to the practice. The intention now is to provide that when a contract involves expenditure of more than $5,000 it cannot be awarded by the minister alone, but must receive the sanction of the Governor General in Council.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FRANCHISE ACT, 1898, AMENDMENT.

Hon CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 52) to amend the Franchise Act, 1898. He said : This Bill is to facilitate proceedings in contested election cases. The effect of it will be to enable any list of electors bearing the imprint of the King's Printer to be produced in court as prima facie evidence of the original list. At the present time, in order to prove in a contested election case that the petitioner is a qualified voter, it is necessary to do one of two things, either to summon the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to appear before the court with the original list, or to get from him a certified copy of the list. Either method is cumbrous and expensive, and to overcome the difficulty this amendment is proposed.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PUBLIC WORKS ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 54) to amend the Public Works Act. He said : The purpose of this Bill is explained by the statement of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) concerning the Act respecting contract for government works.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. How will that affect the practice, which was in vogue in 1890 at least, of giving work out without tender or doing it by day labour if it did not exceed $5,000 ? Is that excepted now under this Bill ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. These Bills do not affect that question. That was affected by the Bill of 1903. As I said a moment ago, my hon. friend will remember that in 1880 an Order in Council was passed authorizing the Minister of Public Works to let contracts for works that did not exceed $5,000 without tender or by private tender. I came to the conclusion that there was not statutory authority for that practice, and it was doubtful whether the Order in Council was effective. And, in order to make it effective I introduce the legislation of 1893.

Mr. FOSTER. So that works below $5,000 could be carried out in this way ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an ingenious way of getting around that provision, by cutting the work up in sections of $5,000 of less and spending, it may be $30,000 or $40,000 in the end. That is very much like an evasion of the spirit of the Act, and ought to be provided against in some way. I know that it is a little difficult because the minister may say : What I propose to do amounts to $5,000 or less, but when that is done, his intentions may broaden and he may want another $5,000 worth done.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think it is the intention of the House—and after all this legislation is intended to give effect to the intention of the House—that a contract that involves $5,000 or more shall not be let except by public tender. Still, of couse, we know there are works of immediate pressing necessity that must be done without tender. When the Bill is in committee, I shall be glad to consider any amendment that will make in the direction of requiring public tenders for contracts of over $5,000.

Mr. HAGGART. As I understand it, it is not so much the intention to interfere with the present law as to take the jurisdiction from the department and give it to the Governor in Council.

Mr. SPROULE. But the department, apparently may carry on a work involving more than that $5,000 where there is no contract at all. Are they not building the post office in this city by day labour ? That is a work that will cost much more than $5,000.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is a matter of repair.

Mr. SPROULE. But involves a very large outlay. And it will hardly be said that there was any urgency there.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CENSUS AND STATISTICS.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER moved that the House go into committee on Tuesday next to consider the following proposed resolution :

That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may from time to time pay out of the moneys to be provided by parliament for such purposes, such sums as are required for the taking of the census, and for the collection, tabulation and publication of agricultural, commercial, criminal, educational, manufacturing, vital and other statistics ; the remuneration of the necessary officers and clerks and the payment of all expenses incurred in carrying into effect an Act for such purpose.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

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

That from Wednesday next, the 15th instant, inclusive, to the end of the session, government orders have precedence on Wednesdays and Thursdays, immediately after questions to be put by members.

He said : I think the state of the order paper justifies the government now in taking these two days.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. The state of the order paper might be tortured into support of an idea of that kind. But where is the government's legislation ? I think my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) intimated some time ago, in answer to a question of mine, that the Autonomy Bill would be down about the second week of February. The second week of February is here and we have not seen any trace of the Autonomy Bill, while the minister who is most interested in it does not seem to be present with his colleagues. So, I imagine, that intimation will have to be revised. If the government work is not ready, it is not worth while taking more days for it. But, if the government will be good and get its work ready, I do not think there will be any objection from this side of the House to considering it on Wednesdays and Thursdays even up to midnight.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The government always wants to be good. That is its constant disposition——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir WILFRIED LAURIER——but very poorly appreciated, I am sorry to say. I did state to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) that I intended to introduce the Autonomy Bill during the second week in February; but, owing to the absence of certain gentlemen who have much to do with the discussion of the legislation, our work has been delayed. My intention is to introduce the Bill on Tuesday the 21st inst. I cannot commit myself absolutely, but I think I shall be able to introduce it on that day.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) be here?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Prime Minister will be here.

Mr. MONK. I think the passing of this legislation might be deferred. The Auditor General's Report is not complete, and I do not think that the reports of all the departments are down. Possibly this may explain why there are not more notices of motion from private members. Before taking away these days from private members, I think it is the duty of the government to lay before the House all the legislation and all the departmental and other reports upon which members rely for their information concerning public affairs.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) will remember that every private member's day during this session has been in part taken up with government business. We have gone over the order paper day after day and exhausted all the business standing in the names of private members, and then have taken up government business. Under these circumstances I think it is fair that the government should have the time for its business. It is not our fault if the report of the Auditor General has not yet been brought down. I am sure that according to the law as it stands at present, the report of the Auditor General should have been here on the 31st of January; and I have reason to believe that on the 31st of Jaunary all the manuscript for the report was not yet in the hands of the printers. But I do not admit that we are at all at fault. If the hon. gentleman will look at the order paper he will see that there are only eleven notices of motion, most of them not contentious, and I think that they will all, or the greater part of them, be disposed of on Monday.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the report that was to be made to this House by Judge Britton regarding the Treadgold concessions was never presented to the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman's memory is at fault.

Mr. SPROULE. And the report on the importation of alien labour for the Transcontinental Railway—was that presented to the House?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not remember. The report of Mr. Justice Britton was brought down during the last days of the last session.

Motion agreed to.

OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL SURVEY.

Hon. PETER WHITE. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works if he will lay on the table of the House a copy of the instructions issued to the engineer in charge of the Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal survey, before that item is taken up in the estimates?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works). Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. White) wants a copy of the orders issued by the chief engineer?

Mr. WHITE. Perhaps I can explain more fully what I want by referring to an article that appeared in one of the newspapers the other day, in which it was stated that the instructions to the engineers required them to make an estimate for a depth of water of 22 feet. Whether that be so or not, I would like to know.

Mr. HYMAN. If the hon. gentleman wants the instructions which have been sent to the engineers by the chief engineer in charge of the work, I would be glad to bring them down.

Mr. WHITE. Will they be laid on the table?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

SUPPLY—THE POLITICAL CRISIS AT QUEBEC.

Mr. J. E. E. LEONARD. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, and as the hon. minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has promised us yesterday in answer to the question I asked about the crisis in Quebec, I would like to know if the hon. minister of the Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) has any information to give us about his mission to Quebec.

(The assistant clerk of the House called item No. 9, House again in Committee of Supply).

Mr. F. D. MONK. Are we not entitled to the explanations which were promised yesterday by the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) on behalf of the government, explanations that were to be given by the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Brodeur) to-day? I see the Minister of Inland Revenue back in his place. I have followed him with some difficulty around the House, no doubt he has been reporting the result of his mission to the individual members of the House. Would it not be fairer to take the House into his

confidence and give us the explanations to which we are entitled?

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). The hon. gentleman has not stated accurately what occurred yesterday. I endeavoured to express myself in very imperfect French to the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Léonard). What I said was that if he would be good enough, when the minister was in the House, to put his question to him, and that was intended not for me but for him, he would no doubt get an answer.

Hon. G. E. FOSTER. I would suggest to the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), if the Minister of Inland Revenue is not here, that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) might give us some news, as I have no doubt the Minister of Inland Revenue confined the whole thing a few moments ago to the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. MONK. I think we have a right to insist. I understand the French of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice perfectly well, he speaks it admirably, as he knows himself. I may be mistaken, I did not take his words down in writing, but I understood him to answer the hon. member for Laval that the Minister of Inland Revenue was absent at Quebec, and that he would give an answer to-day, which answer would not be a vague one like the stories which have been flying around, but would be certain information. Now if I am not in order, I will move the usual motion. But I think our demand is a just one. We have seen ministers from Quebec who have resigned and ministers who have not resigned but were holding on still.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. MONK. I am in order, Mr. Speaker, I intend to move the adjournment of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, there is no necessity for that. If the hon. gentleman will let us move the House into Supply then he will have an opportunity.

Mr. MONK. I am putting my question now, which I have a right to do, or later on, as I see fit.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is not in order.

Mr. MONK. I ask your ruling on that point, Mr. Speaker. I am not obliged to wait to another stage in the proceedings.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend has a right to move the adjournment of the House, but he knows that is usually done only on matters of necessity and urgency. I do not know the matter as to which he wants to have a little chaff, whether it is either urgent or important. But he will have an opportunity to be as funny and as pleasant as he desires when the House is moved into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MONK. I do not think there is any such restriction. If there is in England, we have not introduced it here.

Mr. WHITE. I understood, Mr. Speaker, that you had put the motion that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have not yet.

Mr. WHITE. If that be so, then the hon. gentleman is perfectly in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion has not been moved yet.

Mr. WHITE. I heard the clerk at the table call order No. 9.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But it was not put to the chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. Sir Wilfrid Laurier moves that I do now leave the Chair.

Mr. MONK. I wish to call the attention of the House to what is, in my estimation at least, an interference by the government with proceedings actually going on in Quebec. A political crisis has arisen in the provincial cabinet, and we are entitled here, as members of the House, to know exactly what part the government of Canada is taking in that crisis. I mentioned a moment ago that within the last ten days we have had here from Quebec interviewing the right hon. gentleman and other members of the government, ministers of the cabinet in the province of Quebec who have not resigned, and we have had others up here on alternate days who have resigned. We have had a large number of members of this House and of members of the cabinet moving down to Quebec, and down to Montreal, in connection with this crisis. Liberal organs announced freely before the opening of the session that my right hon. friend himself had gone down to Quebec, and made no secret of the object of his mission; he had gone down there in order to set matters right, and arrange the internal difficulties that have arisen in the cabinet itself at Quebec. The government organ in the city of Montreal, the Montreal 'Herald,' states this in regard to the point which I have just raised. It contains a telegram from Quebec dated February 9.

Conciliation was in the air all day. Hon. L. P. Brodeur and Senator Dandurand were on hand as peace makers and they did their best.

Further on :

A HEAVY DAY'S WORK.

It was obvious an hour after breakfast time that there was 'something doing.' Mr. Brodeur had come in by the morning train. Mr. Dandurand was stopping with relatives. Presently it was whispered that these gentlemen, acting at Sir Wilfrid Laurier's request, were doing their best to make peace. In the course of the day

the ex-ministers had several interviews with Hon. Mr. McCorkill and Hon. Mr. Archambault. It is conceded by all who have been in any way privy to what went on that, in a day of disappointments, the one clear gain to the party is a pronounced enhancement of Mr. McCorkill's reputation as a public man.

I could quote from several of the Liberal organs' articles, telegrams and items which point clearly to the interference of this government and by members of the government with the difficulties which have arisen at Quebec and which are very far from a solution as my right hon. friend knows better than any one else. On two occasions the attention of the government has been called to this point. Yesterday my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Léonard) knowing, as everybody knew, it being a matter of public notoriety that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue had gone down to Quebec with the mission with which he was charged as has been intimated here by the Montreal 'Herald,' asked that we should have some report. Ministers are responsible to the House of Commons in general and they are responsible for every one of their acts. As I understood the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) he stated that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue was absent at Quebec and instead of listening to vague rumours of all sorts, my hon. friend would receive to-day some answer, some information from that minister. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue has been in the House since three o'clock. He has, as has been noticed by everybody made a report evidently of his mission to Quebec to a number of hon. members of this House, and I think it is only fair to us to-day in view of the promise made yesterday that he should tell us what the mission was with which he was charged and with what results he has performed the mission.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I cannot gratify the very fastidious curiosity of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I wish I could. The ideas of my hon. friend and my ideas in regard to responsible government do not agree. There is a crisis in Quebec. It is not the first time that there have been crises in governments; it has happened before and perhaps may happen again so long as men are men and divide into opposite parties. My hon. friend said that he wanted to know what part the government intend to take or are taking in regard to the crisis at Quebec. I am very glad that I can satisfy him on that point. The government are taking no part whatever in the crisis at Quebec and the government have no part to take in that crisis. I do not deny that personally I am very much concerned in what is taking place at Quebec. I take an interest in what is going on, some of my colleagues do the same and I understand also that on the other side of the House a very deep interest is taken in that crisis. My hon. friend is not perhaps the least of those who take an interest in it. Perhaps he is not as immediately concerned as I am, because the crisis is not amongst his own political friends, but in the charity of his bosom he takes an interest in it as if it were amongst his own friends. I have to say that if my colleague, Mr. Brodeur, went to Quebec, he went simply as Mr. Brodeur and in no other capacity. My hon. friend says that ministers are responsible for their actions. There is no doubt that ministers are responsible for their actions when they act as members of the government in matters which concern the government, but if a minister of the Crown goes to Quebec or Montreal, I do not think he gives an account where he sleeps or what he has done or how he has disposed of his time. I think that as much liberty ought to be given a minister as any other man. If because a man is a member of the government does it follow that he must be dogged and followed and that he shall give an account of what he has done during his trip ?

Mr. FOSTER. The defence of my hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has certainly not been a very long one and I think the House will agree with me that it has not been a very strong one.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, because there is nothing to defend.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that any one will stand up and say that it has been a very skilful one or a very frank one. It is impossible that the whole public sentiment of the country can be under a grave mistake in believing that there is an attempt being made by the government here in Ottawa, or certain of its individual members, to interfere in the party crisis which has taken place in the province of Quebec. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has quoted original extracts from one of my right hon. friends own well-informed papers. Neither the editor of that paper nor the staff of reporters who work for that paper are without sense or intelligence, and it is impossible that these things would be going on and be reported as they are by my right hon. friend's own papers in plain and unmistakable terms if there was not something in them. Does my right hon. friend think that what he has stated here to-day will disarm public sentiment and operate the impression that he and the members of his government are taking no interest at all in this crisis at Quebec ? I do not think so, and I do not believe there is a man in this House who reasonably looks upon the thing who will come to that conclusion either. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) left his place and went down with that alter ego of the right hon. gentleman in matters political. Senator Dandurand,

and they have been travelling to and fro in Montreal and Quebec city, they have had conferences with the dissidents on both sides and is the country to be asked by the right hon. gentleman to believe that when they were having these excursions the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue was looking after his pipes and his valves and his butts and his vats ? The people know just as well as my right hon. friend knows that when the hon. minister and the senator went down there they went for the purpose of patching up the difficulty that has arisen in the ranks of the party in Quebec. I think this House has also an interest in it, because, invariably in these cases, sooner or later, the public pays the bill. These rapprochments are brought about, as my right hon. friend has been very skilful and untiring in bringing them about by the interposition of public moneys and public offices, and so after this rapprochment is effectually carried out, it will not be many weeks, certainly not many months, before this House and the whole country will know just how much they will have to pay in order to foot the bill for the reconciliation. I was thinking while my right hon. friend was speaking so mildly and innocently as if he had never taken part in provincial party politics of the old times, old days, old men and old manners now for ever gone.

And if the shade of the honest and honourable Alexander Mackenzie sitting close to where I am, could form voice for itself and speak in this House to-day, what would it say. It would certainly read my hon. friends on the other side a formidable lecture on the vice and the infinite folly of putting their fortunes to the test in every conflict that takes place in the different provinces of this Dominion. If the shade of Edward Blake, the substantial body of whom lives and moves on the other side of the Atlantic, could here utter its thoughts what would it say ? It would point out the same lesson of the unconstitutionality, the inadvisability and utter folly of a party making common cause with the party politics of a province, in that the retribution always comes and will have to be paid. The right hon. gentleman had colleagues here who spoke on this subject. Take for instance the Hon. Mr. Mills. My colleagues on this side of the House know with what untiring vehemence he denounced this interference of the federal party in the concerns of the different provinces. Yes, there is a gentleman who at this time sits on the other side of the House, the hon. Postmaster General who was untiring and I suppose just as sincere in his vehement denunciations of that course at that time, a course which since he and his colleagues have come into power they seem to follow with wonderful avidity and until lately with seeming success; but the success of such a policy in the long run now seems a little doubtful. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) two elections ago stood in a hall in this city and, leaning his left hand on the right shoulder of Mr. Ross, said: this Reform party is the right hand of our party in this Dominion of Canada. The right hand of his party, thanks to the right hon. gentleman's influence, was at that time successful in keeping in power although absolutely unsuccessful in getting the majority of the electors of Ontario registered in its favour. That right hand from 1902 to 1904 has been holding office through means which were not legitimate and which did not approve themselves to the electors of Ontario. But not retarded by the statements and the principles which were reiterated by his colleagues and old time friend, and by none more stoutly than himself, not retarded by the evident unwillingness of the people of Ontario to take his right arm, only a few months ago, the right hon. gentleman stood again on the platform, made common cause with a discredited party in Ontario, linked his fortunes with theirs and went to the test. The test took place and ended on Jan 25, and my right hon. friend has got his lesson; his right arm has been shattered into bits, and the right hon. gentleman's fortunes have taken on a little more sombre cast since the overthrow of his right hand in Ontario. Now he makes common cause with the party in Quebec. Does he not recall the old pledge between himself and Hon. Mr. Mercier that one was to deliver a majority to the other and the other was to have his price, whatever he demanded after the majority had been delivered ? Does he not remember that in defiance of every constitutional principle, in defiance of every one of the canons of good government my right hon. friend if he did not advise certainly connived at the action of his favourite and dependent in Quebec, the present leader of the government, and advised him—or if did not advise him, was cognizant of his action, and did not reprove it—when Mr. Parent took the unconstitutional and unmanly advantage of destroying entirely any opposition in his local parliament if he could possibly carry it that far by bringing on an election before the proper time and within a period which made it impossible in the large province of Quebec, to organize an opposition in their widely scattered counties ? To-day the same thing is going on. Mr. Parent is one of the government's directors in the Grand Trunk Pacific, is one of the high officials in the Bridge Company to which a vast subsidy has been given. Mr. Parent has this, has that, has the other. My hon. friend is determined to keep Mr. Parent—and it is strange how things happen. My right hon. friend wanted an organizer. After looking all over Quebec, he could not find an organizer to suit his particular wishes; he aimed high, his flight went as far up as the bench, the judicial ermine of the province of Quebec, and he called down one of its

honourable judges whom I think he himself had placed there, and by a very skilful dicker between senatorships and judgeships he got this hon. gentleman where he wanted him, removed him from the bench, made him a senator, assured him of a life pension and then sent him out to organize his forces in Quebec. Strange fatality and strange Nemesis! The very man whom he haled from the bench, then elevated to the Senate, then sent, armed cap-a-pie to be his organizer and militant representative in Quebec—this same man quarrelled with Hon. Mr. Parent and to-day there is a feud, a feud in law, a feud in politics and a feud all through, a war à l'outrance between the premier of Quebec and the right hon. gentleman's organizer. I am anxious to find out where the hon. gentleman is. Has he confidence in his organizer? Is he his organizer? Is he in favour of the present government faction that seems to be on top? His fight seems to be going both ways. The right hon. gentleman sends down his Minister of Inland Revenue and at once the frigid air in Montreal takes on an aspect of warm conciliation, and yet there is his organizer, his former judge, his present senator raising an acrid smell of brimstone and a suspicion of post mortem fires in his denunciations of Hon. Mr. Parent and all his works. It is a strange lesson for the electors of this country to read, and I think they will profit by its reading.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have just one word to say; I have not the right to speak and therefore I shall be very brief. I would simply say to my hon friend (Mr. Foster) that he has put a different complexion on the remarks of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) did not make the statement absolutely, but rather insinuated that I had sent the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) with a mission to Quebec, a mission which meant a money consideration in some way or other. I have to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) that he is absolutely mistaken. I repudiate that absolutely. I gave no instructions whatever to the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue and especially nothing in the way of a money consideration or promise of any kind. I have to say that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) is a human being like every one else; he belongs to the Liberal party and he takes an interest in the future of the Liberal party. There have been some feuds in former times in the Conservative party also.

Mr. TALBOT. The nest of traitors

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And just as there were men in that party who took an interest in bringing about a conciliation which was effective, I hope that we may have the same success some time or other.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE. There is an additional reason why the House is interested in this case. Not only has a minister of the Crown gone from here to do conciliatory work but he is accompanied by the Speaker of the Senate; both branches of the legislature have been pressed into service to do political work down there. Heretofore it has always been claimed that the upper House had no politics; there were no political shadows there, the Senate was quite independent. That was the Reform doctrine but now even the first man in the Senate, the hon. the Speaker of the Senate, is pressed into service along with a minister of the Crown to go down there and patch up some kind of an arrangement between the present leader of the provincial government and the other ministers who are rebelling against him.

That being the case, it seems to me that we are specially interested to know whether we are drifting. If members of both Houses of parliament are going to be forced to take part as politicians in these provincial feuds and troubles, the affairs of the provinces and the affairs of the Dominion are not going to be kept as distinct as we were led to believe, from the professions of hon. gentlemen opposite hitherto, would be the case.

Mr. J. E. E. LEONARD (Laval). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I heard with pleasure the Right Hon. Prime Minister state that he had given no instructions to the Hon. Minister of Inland Revenue. I am bound to accept his word; but,—always in connection with that crisis at Quebec—may I inquire of the right hon. gentleman whether he has read an article of the 'Soleil', dated February 8, in respect to the policy followed by that paper. It runs as follows:

THE SOLEIL'S POLITICAL MANAGEMENT—WHAT IT IS.

The stand taken by the 'Soleil,' during the present crisis, is variously appreciated. Those whose life-long weakness has been to talk too much could not very well miss this opportunity of falling into their capital sin.

To set things right, we may state once for all that the 'Soleil' is the organ of the Liberal party, and as such, under the absolute guidance and control of Sir Wilfrid. Consequently, the partisans of Sir Wilfrid, those who are sincerely so, as well as those who call themselves such, will please take note of the fact.

If the above editorial states the truth, I am unable to understand how the Right Hon. Prime Minister can inform the House that he does not interfere with Quebec politics.

Then I read on the same page of the 'Soleil' another article under the following heading:

THE REAL ISSUE.

Now that the first moment of excitement is over, light is dawning again, and the true

question at issue, as laid down by us yesterday, is very clearly in evidence.

It was necessary that a number of honest minded people living in far off counties, and who had been made to believe in the existence of a political scandal, should have their minds disabused as soon as possible. It cannot be said too many times, and it is an actual truth, that the whole matter is a question of personal differences and personal dislikes.

The 'Evenement' is, therefore, completely at variance with the facts when it points to recent events as a vindication of the criticism made and the charges brought forth for the last five years by the party to which it belongs. Such an accusation, the Liberal party cannot afford to assent to, unless they wish to shamefully repudiate themselves.

It is the Parent government and no other which has been entrusted with the task of managing public affairs. Should there be any doubt as to the truth of this contention, it would be necessary in order to disprove it, to make a new appeal to the people. It is the rank and file who undergo the hazards of war, but it is the general who gets the credit for any success. The victories won by the Liberal party in 1900 and 1904 are in justice attributable to the Hon. S. N. Parent. As Scipio Africanus, he might proudly say to his accusers : 'Twice have I led you to victory, now let us proceed to the Capitol to thank the gods.' And it shall be in order to follow him.

If ever time was ill chosen to remove a leader is it not just now, hardly three months after the most overwhelming victory which ever a party has had to its credit ?

The Liberal party has come out of it so powerful as to become headstrong, believing that it can with impunity indulge all its fancies, even to the point of revelling in internal strifes for the mere pleasure of a change. But those are untoward fancies, the result of thoughtlessness. Once the first nervous crisis has been got over, wisdom will assert its rights, and it will be conceded that the least that could be expected by a political leader, after fifteen years of services of an exceptionally fruitful nature to the country, is to be allowed to depart with full honours. To attempt to remove him by sheer force would be acting contrary to common sense. It would be putting him fully in the right, and the people completely in the wrong.

Such is the question, rid of all unpleasantness, and as the representatives of the people in this province should look at it to-day.

Has that article been written at the request or at the suggestion of the Right Hon. Prime Minister ?

Mr. MONK. Is it true the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue has just returned to Quebec ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is the first news I have had of it.

COMMUNICATION WITH PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN (Queen's). Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the premier a question to which he promised me a reply in a few days ; I also wish to bring it to the attention of the hon. Postmaster General. The question which is one of very serious interest to my province, refers to the communication at present maintained between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. As I explained yesterday, it is now carried on by iceboats, and when the iceboats reach the main land at Cape Tormentine, there is no special train to carry the mails to Sackville, a distance of 35 miles. This is a great hardship. Hon. members have only to go to the reading room to see that the last papers received from Prince Edward Island are nearly a week old. Any one can imagine what the business men of the province suffer in this matter. I am instructed by a telegram from my province, which I will read to the House :

Before the orders of the day, interrogate the premier every day about island communication.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. A. MARTIN. That is a very hard duty imposed upon me, to stand up every day and interrogate the government about the communication with Prince Edward Island. I think the only thing they can do is to remedy this grievance, and thus relieve me of a very unpleasant duty and at the same time do justice to the province.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). Mr. Speaker, I am extremely sorry that the state of the climate or the weather has interrupted communication between the mainland and Prince Edward Island. This is not the first time that there has been such interruption. I wish I could hope that it will be the last.

Mr. FOSTER. Change the government.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It was worse under the late regime. I can remember in the days that are beyond recall, when a good representative of Prince Edward Island, Mr. Perry, like my hon. friend, announced to parliament how Providence, in view of the government of the day, was smiting Prince Edward Island, as it seems to be doing in a lesser degree to-day, the government of that day did not put on special trains, or even special ships. They allowed the people to get across in small ferry boats and to carry the mails as best they could, very frequently at the peril of their lives. We have endeavoured to improve the service as much as possible, and this year we have two steamers endeavouring to keep open communication. If the floating ice has made it impossible for these steamers to navigate, I suppose the only solution would be to get more powerful steamers, perhaps ice breakers such as are used in Russia. That would be a very considerable expense. I do not say the government would not be justified in undertaking it, but there can be no satisfactory and uninterrupted communication between the Island and the mainland until some means

are devised for overcoming the difficulty of floating ice that becomes congested in the channel. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice has made a suggestion to me that would perhaps commend itself to my hon. friend. The difficulty arises from vis major —something beyond the control of the government.

Mr. FOSTER. Vis inertiae.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, the vis inertiae was in the olden days.

Mr. FOSTER. There are some things that you forget.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There are some things the hon. member for North Toronto forgets, and it would be well to remind him of some of his history. He is a public man with a past. However, I am dealing with the present now. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Martin) is seeking for information in obedience to the mandate of his correspondent, to worry the House each day, in the hope that, like the unjust judge, we may at last yield to his importunity. However, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that we could not establish the precedent of employing special trains to meet every interruption of the mail service. That has never been done, and I doubt if any government would be willing deliberately to undertake it. Therefore, to resume the train of my thoughts when they were interrupted by the hon. friend for North Toronto——

Mr. FOSTER. Very mean thoughts, too.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. What does the hon. gentleman mean ?

Mr. FOSTER. I will tell him when he gets through.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I certainly am utterly at a loss as to the meaning of the hon. gentleman, but if he wants time to invent some substance for what he says, I have no objection. I was going to suggest that this House is not the tribunal which can overcome the operations of nature. We certainly cannot overcome the congestion of ice, and I cannot hold out any hope of the government subsidizing special trains to carry the mails. We endeavour to utilize all the regular trains which the companies choose to establish, and even if they were to put on special trains for other purposes, I am sure we would be glad to use them ; but as to the department subsidizing special trains to carry the mails, I would hesitate before inaugurating any such policy.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has, as usual, been giving free rein to his imagination, and the length to which that imagination can carry him is immeasurable. He conjured up a condition of things which never had any existence, and which he must know was purely imaginary. He painted that imaginary condition in vivid colours, and then endeavoured to show by contrast how much better he and his government had done. But there never was a time under the late administration when we depended on ferry boats to carry on navigation between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, there was.

Mr. FOSTER. There never was a time in the late administration when that was done ; but, of course, if the hon. gentleman wants to go back to pioneer times, he will find that at one period the only communication between the island and the mainland was by canoe.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am referring to a time when the hon. gentleman was in this House.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is utterly at sea. He is in the habit of drawing on his imagination——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is a fact.

Mr. FOSTER. He is in the habit of painting an imaginary condition and then using that as a foil to show how much better things are done now. The people of Prince Edward Island have a perfect right to ventilate their grievance. When their facilities of travel are interrupted, they have a perfect right to ask their representative to plead their case before the government. But when they do so they receive but scant sympathy or mercy from this administration. In fact, some hon. gentlemen on that side were good enough to suggest that the constituents of my hon. friend should get up and use their shovels to clear away the railway tracks. I believe it was the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Some hon. MEMBERS. It was the Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson).

Mr. FOSTER. That shows you how the Liberal party regards the grievances of the people. It is the old story. All they look at is what will benefit the party. The hon. gentleman was good enough to say that I was a man with a past. Has he a past ? Who does not remember ; who that was here in the days before 1896, does not remember how my hon. friend, in the long weary years when he was in opposition, was a prominent figure, and not a very creditable one in many ways, in this House ? Who does not remember how he looked up at the galleries and swore eternal opposition on any kind of a salary like $50,000 for the Governor General ? Can any one fail to recollect how he tried to make capital with the farmers by posing as a patron and introducing a Bill providing that no member of this parliament should have a pass and travel upon railways by the favour and option of the railway companies ? Who

does not remember how he advocated economies which he has since repudiated ? Why did he do this ? Either because he was honest and had convictions, or because he was seeking to deceive the public with the object of gaining their votes and getting into power. Well, he got into power, and what happened ? Do we not all remember how eloquent he was in opposition against members sitting in this House with promises of offices and emoluments in their pockets ? So far did his convictions carry him that he introduced a Bill to make it impossible for any one who had been a member of this House to obtain an office of emolument of any kind until he had been a certain number of years out of parliament. Yet that gentleman, who tells us that he has no past, and who twits another hon. member with his past, sat in this House through two terms of parliament after 1896—the year the present government took office—and when he had come to the end of the two terms, he had before his eyes a list of fifty members of parliament and senators who had, in the course of these two years, been given offices of emolument by this government and had sat and voted in this House with promises of these in their trousers' pockets. Who does not remember the gentleman from Quebec who sat yonder with a promise from the First Minister of either a lieutenant governorship or a judgeship of a higher court in the province of Quebec in his pocket, voting for measures which, in his heart, he did not believe in, and which, with his lips, he said he did not believe in, but for which he voted because of the promise he held in his pocket ? That was wrong in itself, but, worse yet, the fulfilment of that promise was kept back by the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues for one and a half or two years, in order that they might still keep that supporter in his seat. The hon. gentleman thinks there are some things we would like to forget, and twits us with wishing to forget them. He may forget for himself a display of lack of conviction, want of sincerity and disregard of principles, which is without precedent in the public records of this country.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. As the hon. member for North Toronto has spoken twice on this motion, perhaps the House will be similarly indulgent in my regard. Of course, my hon. friend must be allowed some latitude, and it reminds one of olden times to see him take his stand and, with that digit finger of his, threaten any one against whom he directs his spleen and disappointment. He, of course, may claim some indulgence. If I had it in my composition—and I thank God I have not—to nurse during four years feelings of animosity and take the first opportunity to give vent to them, I might follow the example of my hon. friend, and, on each occasion when I rise to address the House, endeavour to misrepresent and torture the record of those to whom I am opposed and excite heart-burnings and vengeful feelings among them. My hon. friend has sought to vent his disappointment on my head by going back into the past. But if I should look up his past, I hardly think it would prove very edifying. I can well remember the platform upon which he secured an entry into political life, and how well he wriggled away from that platform, when he said that if it did happen that at one time he had committed himself to the doctrine of prohibition, that was only in a moment of weakness. After he had started on his public career and won his spurs and his position in this House as an advocate of that doctrine, after he had delivered in this House philippic after philippic to show his zeal for the cause, no sooner did he get into office than he apologized for his mistake and pleaded infancy as his excuse. Well, I am willing to forget his boyhood days and throw the mantle of charity over them, but there are some events of more recent date, in which the hon. gentleman was a prominent figure, and with regard to which he cannot plead the same excuse. He could hardly plead weakness and infancy and inexperience, or even temporary insanity, for what occurred in 1896.

And what occurred ? I remember well occupying at that time the seat now occupied by my hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Morin). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was sitting where the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) sits to-day. There was an histrionic incident in the month of January, 1896, when the ex-premier, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, coming forward to the floor of this House as the Speaker left the chair, stated that for six months he had been sitting with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) and others whom he described as a nest of traitors with the hon. gentleman as their leader. He selected the hon. gentleman as the most distinguished member of that body and said that for six months that gentleman, if he might so describe him, had been endeavouring to cut his throat. What are their relations to-day, between the former prime minister (Sir Mackenzie Bowell) and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster)? Has the hon. gentleman received absolution from Sir Mackenzie ? Has he made amends to him ? Has he ever yet given to the public an explanation and defence of that transaction ? Why, I read in the press during the last campaign that, in North Toronto—I think it was North Toronto—the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was asked to explain and justify his conduct as a public man in having betrayed his leader, and having caused a strike among his friends to prevent that leader from re-forming the government. He was asked to explain and to justify, if he could, his treachery on that occasion. And what did he say ? He said that his mouth was sealed ; that he had given his explanation to His Excellency and he was satis-

fied. There was courage for you. The hon. gentleman showed the high quality of his courage by taking shelter for an indefensible transaction behind His Excellency the Governor of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. And what would my hon. friend (Sir William Mulock) have done?

Sir WILLIAM MULIOCK. I certainly trust I would not have been guilty—as I think no hon. gentleman would ever be guilty—of the offence of my hon. friend. He is teaching us what our political morals ought to be. But what did he himself do? Sir Mackenzie Bowell was a member of parliament long before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) entered this House. He was taken into the government of Sir John Macdonald in 1878. He was Sir John Macdonald's trusted colleague for many years. In 1883 or 1885, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) became a colleague of Sir Mackenzie Bowell under Sir John Macdonald. He sat with Sir Mackenzie Bowell in Council from the time he joined the cabinet until the lamented death of Sir John Thompson. He had ten years association with him in the Council chamber as well in the party organization. And, when it became necessary to appoint a premier in the month of January, or thereabouts, 1895, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) I presume, joined with others in recommending Sir Mackenzie Bowell. He took office under him and served under him—if service it can be called—for a year. He waited until parliament met on the 2nd of January, 1896. After the speech from the Throne had been delivered and the House had assembled to receive that speech, instead of moving in a manly way that the speech should be taken into consideration the next day the hon. gentleman moved for some reason mysterious at the time but afterwards made clear—that the House should stand adjourned until the following Tuesday. Saturday came and then the conspiracy was laid bare before the public, and, for two weeks the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) took up his position in room 16, he and a few more, to prevent Sir Mackenzie Bowell re-forming his cabinet. He endeavoured by the arts of the striker to destroy constitutional government and betray his chief. The hon. gentleman now asks me what I would have done. I ask him if he can find any parallel for his conduct in any parliamentary body? You will search in vain the history of constitutional government in Great Britain and its colonies to find a precedent for such a transaction.

Mr. SPROULE. What about Quebec today?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am dealing with my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). He has asked me to refer to his history, and I am doing so. He refers to me, and he is quite at liberty to refer to me. He mentions certain propositions of mine in days gone by. He knows perfectly well that it is one thing for a member to have individual views, but that it is quite another thing for him to impress those views upon his colleagues. It is true, since he alludes to it—though I never publicly made an observation upon the subject—that I did not approve, so far as I myself was concerned, of a member of parliament travelling upon a railway pass. I never said so before—never expressed an opinion upon the subject. I do not propose to lay down a rule of conduct for the guidance of my fellow-men. They are the keepers of their consciences, as I am the keeper of mine. I have entertained that view and have lived up to it strictly throughout the whole of my public career. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) means to insinuate to the contrary, he is not correct in his insinuation. At present the law provides that members of parliament are entitled to travel free. I am under no obligation to any railway company if I travel free now in Canada, for it is my legal right to do so. Moreover if I had used a railway pass every day since I became Postmaster General I should have been within my legal rights, for it is provided in the contract between the railways and the department that the Postmaster General is entitled so to travel. However, I have not happened to make use of that provision. I did not exercise my right in that particular until parliament had placed upon the statute-book a law vesting that right in members of parliament. The hon. gentleman says I supported a measure to prevent members of parliament being appointed to office. It is true that in the year, 1895, I introduced a Bill of that kind. When I introduced it the only person in parliament, who made the slightest inquiry of me as to its meaning was my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). He asked me to explain the Bill. I explained it. He with a very contemptible nod of his head, said, 'that's all.' And that is all he had to say in the way of expressing an opinion on the subject. No member of parliament expressed approval of the Bill, and I am not aware that the sentiments I gave expression to were shared by any member of parliament then or are shared by any member of parliament now. So, what was the use of my pressing an opinion that had no support in parliament, or, apparently out of parliament. There is such a thing as having views, but there is also such a thing as having to submit to the views of others; and, in this age and in the way we do business in this country and elsewhere, organization is essential to accomplish anything in life. If my hon. friend desires to discuss other features of my public life. I am quite prepared to meet him. But, before concluding I would ask him again if he would give the country an explanation—and justification, if he can—of his action in 1896 in betraying his leader, Sir Mackenzie Bowell. He knew that gentleman for 20 years, he was his

colleague for ten years, he enlisted under and served under him, he took the oath of allegiance to him, that he would be loyal——

Mr. HAGGART. Where ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Does not a gentleman who takes office bind himself in honour to——

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Sir William Mulock) said he took the oath of allegiance to him.

Mr. FOSTER. That is his imagination.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Does he think he is living up to his oath of office as a member of the cabinet if the gentleman betrays the premier? However, the matter is before the hon. gentleman. Since he has asked me to discuss his history, I give him this opportunity now to justify to the country, if he can, his action on that occasion. We are all desirous of having his explanation. We want him to tell us why, having with his friends sat for ten years in Council with Sir Mackenzie Bowell, having joined in the formation of his government, having served with him for all that time, he should, between the meeting of the House on Thursday and the following Tuesday, the date of the reassembling of the House to take into consideration His Excellency's address—we want to know why it was that he then sprang that surprise on Sir Mackenzie Bowell, and committed that act which is without a parallel in Canadian history, and I trust ever will remain without a parallel ?

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. It was not my intention to take part in the present debate; I would have been satisfied with the part played by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and my hon. friend the Postmaster General. It was the Postmaster General who commenced the attack. There was no necessity at all for that speech of his, referring to the past history of my hon. friend. He got exactly what he deserved.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I beg your pardon, the hon. gentleman forgets. If we are going to extend this peculiar debate—the hon. member for North Toronto interrupted me by a very offensive observation, which was without foundation in fact.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the offensive observation, I ask my hon. friend?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. 'Hansard' will tell it.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman does not know it.

Mr. HAGGART. I listened carefully to the Postmaster General's reference to my hon. friend, and I think it was totally uncalled for, and he got the dressing which he richly deserved. The hon. gentleman, for the purpose of finishing off my hon. friend from North Toronto, refers to an episode which took place in 1896 and to my hon. friend's part in that affair. He says it was a crime of which history furnishes no parallel, that nothing like it ever occurred in the history of any country before.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Do you know of any?

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman knew all the facts in relation to it he would be one of the first to justify my hon. friend from North Toronto. A correct statement has never been made of that affair, but very likely it will be made shortly. You know, Mr. Speaker, the position of the Conservative party in 1896; you know the difficulties that the hon. gentleman who was at the head of the government had in carrying on the affairs of government. There was a question which arose in reference to school affairs in the Northwest. First of all, we had a gentleman who left the government, left his leader at that time, as the hon. gentleman says, Mr. Clarke Wallace, a member for one of the Yorks. Afterwards Mr. Angers left the government, then two other French gentlemen, Mr. Ouimet and Sir Adolphe Caron, followed suit. They all had a right to do it ; they resigned from the government for different reasons. Afterwards there was an attempt to reconstruct the government. Sir Charles Tupper was in this country. I do not know the reasons why he came out here. My own idea is that he came out at the request of Sir Mackenzie Bowell and of some of his colleagues in the government. But there was no secret about it. It was well known then that Sir Mackenzie Bowell—I have no objections to that hon. gentleman, I have the kindliest feelings for him—it was well known that the party at that time, a party which had a majority in the country in every province, was dying for lack of good management, for want of a federal leader at Ottawa. It was with the consent of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, as well as the rest of his colleagues, that Sir Charles Tupper was asked to form a government. These are the facts. All were loyal to Sir Mackenzie Bowell until it was known by his colleagues that he was a party to Sir Charles Tupper taking the leadership of the Conservative party. From day to day, from time to time, like a sick girl hanging on to life, he did not hand in his resignation as his colleagues in the cabinet expected of him. There was then no other remedy than the remedy that the Conservative leaders, or the colleagues of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, took at that time. They did it, not for themselves. My hon. friend had nothing to gain, he was getting no promotion, nor was I. We may have been wrong, we may have made a mistake at the time, but we did it thinking it was in the best interests of the Liberal-Conservative party and for the purpose of benefiting that party. From that moment to the present day I have never felt sorry for what I did at that time. My

hon. friend performed the same act that I did myself, and I am confident that he did it because he thought it was in the interest of his country, or at least in the interest of the Liberal-Conservative party. There was nothing else left for us to do, and we did it. We may have done wrong, we may have done what the Postmaster General says was not the act of gentlemen. But who has constituted him an authority to say what the conduct of a gentleman should be in reference to that affair? Who has constituted him a censor of the acts of those hon. gentlemen at that time? What I say is this, and I say it for myself and my colleagues, that we acted on that occasion, as we believed, in the interests of the country, and in the interest of the party. For those reasons I now rise for the purpose of defending my hon. friend. When the whole history of that transaction is written, there will not be a single man from one end of this country to the other who can point a finger at any of these gentlemen and charge them with having done wrong.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that I have a right to ask it, but I would like to say about twenty-five words in answer to my hon. friend in a very cool and collected way—not by way of recrimination. It is not an interesting thing, and probably it is not a very pleasant thing, to hurl these recriminations against one another as representatives of a party. My hon. friend opposite has followed me from that time to this with his peculiar version of the affair of 1896, not only in parliament, but to a certain extent in every contest in which I have engaged, like a sleuth hound on my track.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that is out of order.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Like a sleuth hound.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Is that the modern way?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend knows what a hound is for. He is to track his prey by whatever instincts and capabilities Providence has endowed him with. In my contest in North Ontario, my hon. friend did me the honour to track me. He followed me from concession to concession, and his chief stock in trade was this particular version of his as to my not acting as a man and a gentleman in 1896. Now, it is just as well that I should state once and for all in parliament, very briefly, just what I did and just what I conceive I was right in doing. That is all I want to do. From that time in 1896 up to this present moment, although I have been hounded—as I have stated—I do not find fault with any one for doing that if he thinks it is a good piece of party politics—although it has been thrown in my teeth everywhere I have never yet stood up in public when attacked, I have never once allowed myself to give the version plain and clear of my action at that time. Why? Because I did not think it was in the interest of the public life of this country for me to do it. I felt that I would rather take the implications and the charges and whatever penalty came with them than violate what I conceived to be a good maxim in public life, that in these matters we are bound by our oath and our position as privy councillors to give our reasons to His Excellency and to let them bide there. Now, the first charge that my hon. friend brought against me was that I came into this House on the prohibition platform and that I repudiated my principles later. This is incorrect in every particular. I came into this House and I take now the opportunity of stating that I came into this House as a teetotaler in practice, as a prohibitionist in principle, well known because these had been my principles, right or wrong from my youth up. My canvass in the county in which I won my first election was absolutely outside the question of prohibition, and there is no man in this country that can say to the contrary. My published circular to my people, my call to them and my whole canvass were on the question of the policy of the government in regard to trade matters particularly and that alone, and I came to this parliament as an independent Conservative in favour of the National Policy. The hon. gentleman says that a man may have individual opinions, but that when he becomes a member of a government he may not be able to make his opinions effective and he excused himself in two particulars for his not having carried out as a member of the government what he held to be right as a private individual. Will not the same reasoning apply to me?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. But the hon. gentleman abjured his principles.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman abjured his principles? It does not lie in the mouth of my hon. friend to make that statement now nor did it ever. If the hon. gentleman can say that I have violated my total abstinence principles let him stand up and bring the proof. If he can say that I have violated my prohibitionist principles let him stand up and say so. I am not such a ninny or so absurd, or so wanting in common sense as to think, however strongly a man may hold individual prohibition opinions that he is able to put them upon the country unless the majority of the electors will stand behind his back. I never thought so, never said so, and never tried to. My hon. friend justifies himself by saying that he could not carry out in the government individual opinions because he could not impress them upon the majority of the government. It is within the judgment of the

House whether there has ever been a time in the history of this parliament when I or any other prohibitionist could impress our views on the majority of the House with sufficient strength as to bring about the enactment of a prohibitory law.

My hon. friend says that I was no gentleman in that I swore an oath of allegiance to my premier and broke it. I was not aware of swearing any oath of allegianc to my premier, nor do I think my hon. friend is aware of having sworn any oath of allegiance to his premier. Am I not to be allowed to leave the government if I differ from it on points of policy or principle ? Is a man to be branded as no gentleman because, differing from what is the policy and principle of his government, he leaves it ? Did not Mr. Angers, Mr. Ouimet, Sir Adolphe Caron and Mr. Clarke Wallace leave the government ? Were they no gentlemen ? There have been gentlemen who have left the government of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). And why ? Because they differed upon points of policy and upon principle from his government. Did they violate their oaths of allegiance to the premier or were they no gentlemen because they left ? The statement of my hon. friend will not hold good in that respect. At whatever time a member of the government feels that he is out of accord with his premier and the government of which he is a member on points of policy or administration, he has a perfect right to send in his resignation and he retains all his attributes of a gentleman and an honourable man in doing so. I did not leave the government for financial preference or personal emolument. When I left the government I left my position and I left my salary. I gave my demission in to the Governor General. I justified, as we all did, my resignation by the explanations which I made to the Governor General. I presume the Governor General who heard our explanations and received them did not apparently come to the conclusion that we were no gentlemen or that we had violated our oaths of allegiance as was stated by my hon. friend for that very same Governor General made us again members of the following government without stain and without reproach. Now, what does my hon. friend wish me to do ? What would he have done, I venture to ask him, if he were in the same position as I, not that I think he is apt to be in such a position ? He hangs on pretty thoroughly and pretty closely, but suppose my hon. friend came to the conclusion that he could not agree with his premier on some line of public policy, would he have violated his standard of gentlemanly conduct if he had frankly told the premier so and left ? Before I or any of my colleagues left the government, our premier knew our position and had it within his own hands. Would my hon. friend be not acting the part of a gentleman because, if he disagreed with his premier to-day or to-morrow, he left the government, or, if he said : As an honest man I cannot agree with you on this question of policy or principle, and I hand in my resignation ? He will not say so. Therefore, the charge he urged against me in this respect has no force at all.

By what right did he call this a conspiracy ? Does the hon. gentleman, himself, know the circumstances of the case ? A reasonable man or a careful man will not make a statement of that kind except upon thorough knowledge. What thorough knowledge has my hon. friend of the circumstances of the case ? Has he any ? Was he within the secrets of the Council ? Has he been made the bosom friend and confident of any member of the government of that time ? I venture to say that he has not. On what authority does he stand up here and say that this was a conspiracy, not knowing the facts of the case, not knowing a single one of the facts of the case ? So when you come to reason fairly and carefully on the premises of my hon. friend they do not hold water. So far as I am concerned that is the statement of my position. I make it here in the House and I apologize to the House for having had to take up their time to make it, but it has been often urged outside of the House and up to this time I have never taken occasion to vindicate myself by making a statement. When it was brought up and elevated to the dignity of what I might call a front bench question, I thought it was only fair for me to ask my right hon. friend and the House to indulge me in making this plain statement of the affair.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman has asked me a question and I presume I shall be allowed to reply to it. I am pleased to recognize the more moderate manner in which he has endeavoured to express himself and I shall try to follow that worthy example.

Mr. FOSTER. That is right.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. See the effect of good example and of bad example. My hon. friend asks me on what authority I stated that there was a conspiracy. I made the statement upon the authority of Sir Mackenzie Bowell.

Some hon. MEMBERS. None better.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Sir Mackenzie Bowell made a public statement—he did not make it to me—which appeared in the press of the day charging these gentlemen with being a nest of traitors. I do not know what authority that is but it is sufficient for me because he was the premier. I would call attention to the violence of my hon. friend's remarks. No one questions the right of any member of a government to resign. It is his duty to resign if

he is not in harmony with the policy of the government, but my hon. friend has not explained this point. The question is not whether a man may or may not properly resign ; the question in this case is to explain the coincidence of seven members of a government resigning after the House was called together, after the speech from the Throne had been presented and before it had been taken into consideration; and during the time the government was in that chaotic state these seven gentlemen using their best endeavours to prevent the leader reforming his government. These are things that have not been explained.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made a motion to-day asking for two days now occupied by the private members of this House, so that we might get through with the business rapidly. The opposition cheerfully granted the motion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Cheerfully ? My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) did not hear my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk).

Mr. TAYLOR. It was done cheerfully ; your motion carried. One day of the government has been taken up by an hon. member, friend of the government in making an attack upon the opposition which was quite unjustified.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I did not make an attack.

Mr. TAYLOR. And in his last statement he makes a charge against Sir Mackenzie Bowell that I do not think he can justify. He said that Sir Mackenzie Bowell stated that his former colleagues were a nest of traitors.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Not all of them.

Mr. TAYLOR. I never saw that statement published and I think the only justification he had for saying that was some words that escaped Sir Mackenzie Bowell here in this House, after the Speaker had left the Chair, when he was in a passion. I wish to corroborate a statement of the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart). I was then as now whip of the Conservative party. I was the go-between between Sir Mackenzie Bowell and the ministers who had left his cabinet. I had consultations with both of them. There was a deadlock ; the cabinet had resigned as they had a right to do. My hon. friend (Sir William Mulock) has no right to charge these gentlemen with trying to prevent Sir Mackenzie Bowell from forming a cabinet. I was in the confidence of both parties and it was at the request of Sir Mackenzie Bowell that I saw Sir Charles Tupper and got them together, and they arranged between themselves and made a bargain that Sir Charles Tupper——

Some hon. MEMBERS. What was the bargain ?

Mr. TAYLOR. There are two or three young members from the eastern part of the Dominion who have seen fit to-day several times to insult gentlemen on this side of the House when speaking. I will ask you, Mr. Speaker, to draw their attention to the fact that they are quite unparliamentary in their conduct.

Mr. LENNOX. And they are not at all discouraged by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want you to inform them—or I shall through you—that it is not the intention of the opposition to put up with it very long. If they want the business of this House to be proceeded with, they must conduct themselves as the opposition always do and treat them respectfully. It was at the request of Sir Mackenzie Bowell that I had an interview with Sir Charles Tupper and brought these two gentlemen together. They made the arrangement that Sir Charles Tupper would conduct the session and then he would become the Prime Minister. That was the agreement that was made and these gentlemen had nothing to do with the arrangements, further until after the arrangement was fully concluded between Sir Mackenzie Bowell and Sir Charles Tupper.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Public buildings—Antigonish, $15,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is a vote for the purpose of erecting a building in Antigonish to take the place of the building there which is very old. It has been there for a number of years and it has been reported by the architect of the department to be in a very bad state of repair, so bad, in fact, that it would not be in the public interest to attempt to repair it. Therefore I am asking a vote of $15,000 towards the erection of a new building.

Mr. FOSTER. Before this goes through there are certain items of information we would like to have. In the first place what has been spent on that so far ?

Mr. HYMAN. No expenditure has yet been made.

Mr. FOSTER. What is this public building to include ?

Mr. HYMAN. This will house the post-office and customs, and will also include a residence.

Mr. FOSTER. What building is there at present ?

Mr. HYMAN. The old building I spoke of, a frame building 50 feet by 32 feet, two and a half stories high.

Mr. FOSTER. Owned by the government?

Mr. HYMAN. Owned by the government.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that to be pulled down?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes. I think the intention in this case is to use the site on which the old building stands.

Mr. FOSTER. Are the plans made for this building?

Mr. HYMAN. The plans are in course of preparation and are nearly completed.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the estimate of the minister, formed on those plans, as to the cost?

Mr. HYMAN. The estimate for the building is about $25,000 complete.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister read the different items ? It is well to have these on 'Hansard,' so that in another year we can have them to refer to.

Mr. HYMAN. The estimates are : for the building itself, $16,000; heating, $2,000; electric wiring and fixtures, $600; fittings and furniture, including letter-boxes, $3,000; fencing and sidewalks, about $500; clerk of works, $1,000; and the usual sum for contingencies, making $25,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population and the postal, customs and internal revenues of Antigonish?

Mr. HYMAN. The population is about 1,900, the postal revenue for 1903-4, $3,702, and the customs revenue, $7,780.

Mr. FOSTER. What do you pay the postmaster there?

Mr. HYMAN. With regard to that question the same duplicity arises from the Public Works Department acting practically as the agent for the other departments. That is information which I have not got.

Mr. FOSTER. We must have that kind of information. We have always had it previously. The ministers have been going along in a very slipshod way in the matter of supplying information for the committee. I want to serve a notice, a very kindly notice, on the ministers that they must not come here and attempt to put their estimates through on information which is altogether insufficient for the committee to accept. We are to be treated as a serious House who have the revenues of the country in their keeping to a certain extent, and it is not just because a minister puts a sum of money before us and says he is going to put up a building of stone or wood, that it must go through. We always had this kind of information in my time, and if the minister hasn't it, he had better shut his book, and let some other minister who has the information that we require take the floor, and we will go on.

Mr. PATERSON. I think the hon. gentleman is asking rather too much. He has a perfect right to ask what the revenue of the post office is; but when he proceeded with the further question as to the salary of the postmaster, it seems to me that he went outside of what has been customary. It would lead to a discussion of how the Post Office Department is conducting its business, and whether it is paying postmasters more than it should, which are questions which can only properly come up when the Post Office estimates are before the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman knows a great deal of what other people's ideas and motives are. He will allow me to state my own motive in asking this question. I had no such object as he has intimated. Here is a town of 1,900 people in which it is proposed to spend $25,000 in erecting a post office. We have a great many towns of 1,900 people which have no public building at all, and what I am trying to get at is what the revenues of this town are at present, and what the cost of the administration of this building will be after it is constructed. You are going to have a different kind of post office arrangement, I presume, after you get this building, and it will be more costly. What I am trying to get at is whether it is a wise proceeding to put up a $25,000 building which will afterwards have all these excesses of expenditure which the present building does not have. Another point I want to get at is whether there is any principle in this matter at all—whether every town which has 1,900 inhabitants and is fairly situated in comparison with Antigonish, is to have a public building. I remember that the opposition of former days, among them my hon. friend himself, went very actively into this question of the principle that underlay the policy of erecting public buildings, and protested most vehemently against erecting them in towns of a certain population when other towns of larger population were without them, saying that they were granted by favour and not on a broad public principle. They went so far as to propose a resolution, which was moved by Mr. David Mills, then a member of this House, in which they laid down certain principles that should guide. The names of these public buildings are legion, and we ought to arrive at some kind of policy or principle underlying these expenditures.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not want to intervene in the discussion; but the hon. member made a remark giving notice to all the ministers, and I thought I would draw at-

tention to the matter. I was not imputing any motives to him—quite the contrary. But when he asked a question as to the cost of the management of the post office, I pointed out that that was a subject on which the Minister of Public Works could not be expected to be informed; that would properly come up under the post office estimates. The hon. gentleman says he supposes the cost of collecting the revenue will be increased. I do not think that will be the case. I do not suppose it will be altered at all by the fact of the post office being in a building instead of in a rented building. It was to that one point that I directed my attention, not to the other questions of the hon. gentleman, which he had a perfect right to ask. The remuneration given to the postmaster for the services he renders does seem to me an unreasonable question to ask of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman's point is that this is not relevant to the estimates. I would regard it as rather difficult to take that position, and I am sure that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has over and over again answered questions which have been very much less relevant than that proposed by my hon. friend from North Toronto. We have got somewhat into the habit, during the past few years when the estimates are being discussed in committee, of accepting the stereotyped answer from the minister in charge that he is not in a position to give the information required as that comes under another department. That is one way of getting the estimates through, but perhaps it is not the best after all, and it should be the duty of ministers of the Crown to be present while the estimates are going through ; whether they happen to be in charge of the particular department whose estimates are being discussed or not, so that the House may get all the information required.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. What is wanted ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The salary of the postmaster. It is not at all an adequate answer for the Minister of Public Works to tell us that he is not able to furnish the information asked for. The minister of the department who can furnish the information ought to be here to give it.

Mr. FOSTER. The drift of my question is this. What is the position of the post office there now as regards salary and what changes, if any, will be made when the new building is finished and the post office moved into it ? Will the postmaster be put on a different footing and the expenditure increased ?

Sir WILIAM MULOCK. The information will be found in my report in the Appendix, letter ' C.' The items for Antigonish are as follows :

Gross postal revenue..	$ 3,702 01
Number of money orders issued..	1,349
Total amount of money orders..	18,151 50
Total commission received from public	102 26
Number of money orders paid..	2,754
Amount of money orders paid..	66,347 08
Amount of postal notes paid..	1,659 84
Compensation paid the postmaster on money order business..	113 46
Compensation paid to postmaster on saving banks business..	19 23
Compensation paid to postmaster on postal notes business..	13 09
Salary..	1,129 88
Forward allowance..	300 00

Mr. FOSTER. When the new building is completed, will the postmaster's pay be exactly the same ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, that will not affect his salary.

Mr. FOSTER. What population must a town have to entitle it to a public building ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There has been no rule laid down by any government. I have no desire to provoke any discussion or to blame any government, but I can remember quite well when we in opposition took very serious exception to the erection of a public building at Lapraire.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And at Farnham You held up the House two days on that item.

Sir WILIIAM MULOCK. The Laprairie post office, I think, had a revenue of $500.

Mr. FOSTER. Something like Antigonish.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, Antigonish has a revenue of nearly $4,000, and I think at Laprairie you put up a building that cost some $20,000. I think it is well to put up public buildings in places where they were required for public convenience. Of course it is one thing to have an idea, as my hon. friend says, and another thing to live up to it, but I think after all this item has a good deal more to commend it than some which my hon. friends opposite sanctioned in the past.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is the hon. gentleman now expressing contrition for his past ?

Sir WILIAM MULOCK. I am afraid that remark is out of order. We have agreed, after our little discussion just now, to bury the hatchet for the present.

Mr. FOSTER. What will be the staff that will be housed there ?

Mr. HYMAN. There will be an office in that building for the government engineers and for the Customs.

Mr. FOSTER. What customs officers are there there now ?

Mr. PATERSON. Only one.

Mr. FOSTER. One customs officer, one postmaster and no engineer at present.

Mr. HYMAN. There is a government engineer there now and also his assistant.

Mr. McISAAC. There are the chief engineer, his assistant, a clerk and a stenographer.

Mr. FOSTER. They are not for Antigonish itself, but for a certain district ?

Mr. McISAAC. For the eastern district, of which Antigonish is the centre.

Mr. INGRAM. Have you an engineer in the post office now ?

Mr. HYMAN. I mean the engineer representing the Department of Public Works in that locality.

Mr. FOSTER. You have an engineer and an assistant engineer ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. These have no connection with the building ?

Mr. HYMAN. No, but they will be housed there.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any Inland Revenue office there ?

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Mr. FOSTER. When the hon. minister makes this expenditure of $25,000, which will carry $1,000 for interest besides the cost of a keeper with a pretty large salary to take care of that building and the cost of fuel and lighting and repairs and all that, he is making a pretty large inroad in our revenue. That $25,000 building will have in it, one postmaster, one or two clerks, one customs officer, and an engineer and his assistant. That seems a pretty large sum to invest in a building to house that number of the country's servants.

Sir WILLIAM MUOCK. But it is not merely put up to house the officials. Antigonish has a population of 1,900, and the public will have free access to the post office and the other offices, so that they will utilize the building to a considerable extent.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Can the hon. gentleman give us an estimate of the amount of public money expended in this country on wharfs and breakwaters and for various other purposes in addition to this public building within the last eight or nine years?

Mr. HYMAN. I am afriad if I had tried to prepare that class of information with regard to these votes, it would have taken some time. The question is not such as one would expect to be asked in putting through a vote of this kind, and therefore I am not prepared with the information.

Mr. FOSTER. So far as I am concerned I have all the information I want with respect to this vote. But, as we are considering votes for other public buildings, opportunities may arise for the minister to state what principle or policy he intends to follow hereafter in these matters.

Mr. HENDERSON. Has the minister fixed $25,000 as the entire cost of this building and its fittings, or is this only an estimate which may be exceeded by ten or twenty thousand dollars ? I believe that in the erection of these public buildings, the minister, in the first place, should determine how much money he is ready to expend on a public building in the particular town for which it is intended. It seems to me that he proposes here to spend a pretty large sum for a town of only 1,800 population. However, we will let that go. What I desire to know is whether this amount is the outside limit. Has the minister instructed his architect, or whoever is to have supervision of this work or the making of the plans, that $25,000 must complete the building, with lighting and heating appliances and all its internal fittings ? If the minister has not done so, I think he ought to inform the House that this vote is simply a preliminary step. In bygone years, I have discussed this question. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Sutherland) for whom the present incumbent is acting temporarily, told us last year, or the year before, that he approved of that policy and that public buildings should be erected within the cost given. In other words, the minister told us that he would instruct those in charge of these works that in each case they must cut the coat according to the cloth furnished them—that no more cloth would be furnished to complete the garment. If the acting minister has not given that instruction to the officers, I hope he will be candid enough to tell us that we may know whether this $25,000 is to be the total amount expended on this work, or whether we may expect to be called upon to vote a very much larger sum. I shall feel it my duty to oppose with all my power the estimate for every public building unless that principle is applied. Unless that principle is applied, we cannot tell in what expenditure we are involving the country. Some years ago I advocated this principle very strongly. I also advocated the principle that in small towns the size of Antigonish, public buildings should be erected for a smaller sum than is here proposed. I think that a building sufficient to meet the wants of a town of this size might be provided for a very much smaller sum. When we think of the enormous number of incorporated towns and villages in this country that have not had a dollar of public money expended within their borders—and at the rate at which we are going will not for fifty years to come have a public building of any kind—the condition is alarming. Unfortunately, in the county I have the honour to represent,

we have not a town as large as Antigonish —possibly 1,600 or 1,700 is the largest town we have, and we have five of about the same size. To all appearances it will be many a long day before that county will have the opportunity of having money expended on public buildings within its borders, though, I am sure that it is just as important a county as Antigonish. I would be glad if the minister would take all these matters into consideration, and would not be guided simply by some special reason for giving one town a public building and, because that reason did not apply, refusing it to another town. Now, in the case of Clinton, I have it on the authority of the late member for West Huron that when he spoke to the architect of the Public Works Department with reference to the estimate for a post office in that town—a post office which the former Minister of Public Works, Hon. Mr. Tarte said, was to be erected as a model post office at a cheap rate, to include a postmaster's residence and so do away with the necessity for any caretaker besides the postmaster—the officer of the department said that the policy of the department was not to make plans and specifications for a building costing less than $10,000. I would like to know who runs this government and this country. It does not seem to be even the ministers. The country seems to be run and the expenditure fixed by the departmental officers. I do not think it lies in the mouth of any officer of the government to say that he will not make plans and specifications for a building costing less than a certain sum, even though parliament may consider that sum all that is necessary. If that is the rule of the department, I am sorry that the minister has not better control of the affairs committed to his charge. If I were Minister of Public Works—which I never expect to be—I would quickly tell that officer that I had no further use for his services, and that I would put in a man who could make plans and specifications for a building costing whatever sum I thought necessary to spend upon it. Of course, we must hold the minister responsible for the conduct of his officers. As I have said, if the departmental officers will not conform to the requirements of the ministers, it will be a very difficult matter indeed for this House to control the public expenditure. I do not know who the officer was who made the statement to which I have referred, but I think the time has gone by, if it ever existed, when officers of the department should dictate to this House or to the minister what the cost of public buildings should be. The minister should lay down as a principle that the estimate for a public building must be adhered to. And we must hold the minister absolutely responsible for carrying out the construction of public buildings within the estimate, or we can exercise no control over public expenditure.

Mr. HYMAN. I am sure there must have been some misunderstanding as between the late member for West Huron and the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), if the impression was conveyed that officers of the department would not draw plans for any building for which the minister had given orders. It may be, in the case which was under discussion, that the chief official of the department who has control of the erection of buildings, thought that it would have been impossible to construct a building for the services which it was proposed to make it for, at a less sum than $10,000. In the case to which the hon. gentleman refers, the town of Clinton, the actual construction of the building cost $9,650. So far as the estimate of the building is concerned, I want to say this, which is general in its character, that when this House has given its fiat by a majority that a public building shall be constructed in a certain place, it behooves us to put up a building of such a character that it will be a credit to the place in which it is erected. It is well understood that public buildings cannot be built of the same character as many others. Possibly, the officers of the department may err occasionally in making a building too heavy, possibly they are putting too much money into it. But, speaking with the responsibility of acting Minister of Public Works, I may say that I think that is a good fault, in the long run it saves an expenditure upon the buildings in the way of future repairs. I think, taking everything into consideration, it is in the best interest of the country that when we erect a public building it should be of a character which will do credit to the government. So far as the estimates are concerned, I have taken great care in having them properly prepared. I was assured by the officers of the department that a building such as is requisite here can be erected for the sum of $16,000. I have already given to the House, and it is on the 'Hansard,' the estimates of the officer for that building. Now, it is to be remembered that the cost of a building of that character, for a custom-house and post office, with the cost of furnishing the building separately, may be much larger than the cost of any other building in the locality where it is erected. I acknowledge that when this House is voting money they are entitled to all that information, and, so far as I am concerned, I hope to be able to keep the expenditure within the estimate. There may be circumstances in a large public building which may require the expenditure to exceed the estimate, but I can assure the House that special care will be taken to keep the expenditure within the estimates which are voted by the House.

Mr. FOSTER. When was this Antigonish building decided upon ?

Mr. HYMAN. The question of erecting that building has been pressed upon the attention of the department for some time. For two or three years there was a question as to whether it would be better to repair it or to build a new building. The last reports we have say that the sills are so rotten that portions of them can be pulled away by hand. The building has been getting into a bad shape. The government own both the site and the building.

Mr. DANIEL. Of what material is the new building?

Mr. HYMAN. It is to be a brick structure on a stone foundation.

Mr. GANONG. Now that the government own the site, I think this proposition is still more unjustifiable. A more ridiculous expenditure, it seems to me, could scarcely be conceived of. We are not here merely to build a monument to the respected gentleman who has the honour to represent Antigonish. Here is Antigonish, not even an incorporated town.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, yes it is.

Mr. GANONG. Then the census lies. It gives the population at 1,838 souls, and we are taking $25,000, in addition to owning the land, to build a custom-house, which, I understand, is also to be used as a post office. We had better put $10,000 into the building, and get accommodation outside for the engineer and his assistants. As the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has said, we have hundreds of towns needing accommodation more than this one. I have two or three in my own county, and I do not ask for one-half the amount the government is expending in the county of Antigonish. There is the town of St. Andrews, a very important watering place on the Atlantic sea-board, with a population very nearly equal to that of Antigonish, with a very large revenue indeed; and it has a post office and custom-house in a small wooden building that certainly is no credit to the government. Then there is the town of Milltown, with a population of 2,044. If the Postmaster General would come down there he would be ashamed of the public building in that town. I think this amount should be divided in two, and half of it be given to some other place, if it is desired to do justice. I have in my hand a little circular, I am not sure it was not got up with the complicity of the acting Minister of Public Works. It says 'Vote for a new building for St. George; vote for Mr. Gilmour.' St. George is in my county. I do not see anything in the estimates for that St. George building; but I trust the minister will see his way to carry out the suggestion made in that circular when the supplementary estimates are brought down.

Mr. McISAAC. In many towns with a smaller population than that of Antigonish, in various parts of Canada, public buildings have been provided; at the same time, I am free to admit that many towns with a larger population than Antigonish have not yet been provided with public buildings. But it is a fact that has been recognized by both political parties that Antigonish, according to its population, is a much more important town than many others in Nova Scotia or elsewhere with a greater population. It is the shire town of the county of Antigonish, and has a university, the only university in eastern Nova Scotia. The importance of Antigonish has been recognized, not only by this government, but recognized by hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in power. Away back, some twenty-five years or more, when the policy of erecting public buildings was being inaugurated, Antigonish was recognized as a place where the government should erect a public building. The only difference, therefore, between the two parties in regard to Antigonish is that the Conservative party went about putting up a public building in the wrong way, and the Liberal party has gone about it in the right way. In 1882 the late Conservative government purchased in the town of Antigonish, for the purpose of a public building, an old wooden building used as the St. Francois Xavier College. The authorities of the college undertook to build a brick building in a different part of the town and sold the old building to the then government. I am not finding fault with that at all, except with the way in which it was done. They sold to the government of the day the old building with the lot, for a very moderate sum indeed—But I say the late government went about it the wrong way. They should have done what the present government is doing—built upon that lot a new building of brick suitable for the requirements of the town at that time. But what did they do? They bought the building and the lot, and undertook to repair the old building, and year after year appropriations were placed in the estimates by the late government for purposes of repair, tearing down the walls and building them up again, tearing out the rotten sills, and the roof, and remodelling it, so that it has cost nearly as much, at least half as much, as it would have cost to put up a new building. What is the result?

Notwithstanding all the expenditures that were made year after year and the interest charges accumulating, the result has been that, through age, its condition and wear and tear it became absolutely unsuited to the needs of the post office or of the officers who are occupying the building. I brought the matter to the attention of the government for several years and they refused to do anything. At last they were compelled to send an officer from the Department of Public Works to examine the building, a thorough examination was made of it and it was condemned; so that it be-

came absolutely necessary to erect a new building in Antigonish. As to the cost, as to the dimensions and as to the kind of building that should be put up in Antigonish I desire to say a few words. This is a very important point. Nobody who knows the conditions which prevail there can deny that. It is important that we should have a large building because the resident engineers for the eastern section of the province of Nova Scotia have been located in Antigonish for the last thirty years. The province is divided into two districts as far as public works are concerned. The engineers of the western part are located in Halifax while those of the eastern part have their residences and offices at Antigonish. Therefore this is not used as an ordinary public building for the accommodation of the postmaster and his staff, and the collector of customs and his staff, but a building must be provided to suit the growing requirements of the resident engineers and their assistants not only for the county of Antigonish but for the eastern part of the province of Nova Scotia. The sum which it is estimated this building will cost is not at all a large one. It will be a very respectable building indeed and will afford ample accommodation to these various public officers to which I have referred. The cost of maintenance will not be any more than it was before. We have had to keep a janitor for the last twenty-two years in charge of the old building which, on account of its age, is a very much more difficult building to take care of and keep in proper condition than an up to date modern building will be. I think the estimate for the new building is not a large one. The building will be a very modest one for the requirements of the town.

Mr. GANONG. I think it would be very difficult for any one to get a justification out of that speech. I would like to know if the hon. gentleman had anything to do with the distribution of this circular :

Vote for a new public building in Antigonish.

Mr. McISAAC. No, I never deemed it necessary to refer, even in my elections, to any appropriations made for public buildings or any other work. It was so difficult for the Conservative party to get a man to run against me in the county that they had to import a man from another county for appearance sake.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Well then, you do not need a building.

Mr. McISAAC. No. I do not need a building or a public work of any kind to get votes. But, the town of Antigonish needs it and it is only right that they should get a fair share of the good things that are going.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Being a new member I am not very familiar with these estimates, but in looking over the appropriations for Manitoba, a country in which the conditions are changing very much more rapidly than they are in the east, I find that outside of the amounts put down for the constituency of the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) who represents the riding north of mine and outside of the city of Winnipeg, his right arm, there is only $15,000 in the estimates for public buildings for that great province which is developing so rapidly. I am surprised that any business government——

An hon. MEMBER. You need not be surprised.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Perhaps it is because I am a new member—but I am surprised that $25,000 should be placed in the main estimates for a public building in Antigonish, a town of 1,800 inhabitants. I think the population has been 1,800 for some time, it will likely be 1,800 for the next twenty-five years, and it is not likely that they will want any additional buildings. I believe this is not a fair estimate for a building in a town of that size in the eastern country. In estimating the probable requirements of a town in the next twenty years with the view of erecting a public building there is no possible comparison to be made between the east and the west. The development of the west is going ahead so rapidly that such comparison is impossible. While a town in the west may to-day have only 1,800 inhabitants the prospects are that in ten years the population will be ten times as great. And we should therefore prepare for the future, but there can be no justification offered for erecting a building in the expectation of an equally rapid development in old Nova Scotia.

Mr. HYMAN. I presume the hon. gentleman (Mr. Schaffner) who has just taken his seat knows that these estimates are not the estimates in which new expenditures are initiated. These are the main estimates. These are revotes and consequently it is impossible to say what may appear in the estimates for the province which the hon. gentleman represents.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Well then they do not mean anything.

Mr. GUNN. May I ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if it is the intention of the department to provide for the erection of a post office in the town of Seaforth. The post office revenue exceeds the post office revenue of the town of Wingham in the constituency of my hon. friend from East Huron (Mr. Chisholm) yet a new post office was erected in Wingham at a very large cost—$15,000 or $20.000. I am not finding any fault with the expenditure of that money because I believe it was necessary, but I would like to know if the hon. minister has in contemplation the erection of

a post office in our town. I have just arisen to endeavour to obtain this information because many of my constituents are interested in knowing whether the hon. minister intends to erect such a building. I may say for the information of the hon. minister that the post office at present in use in our town is a very old building indeed. It has been in existence for more than a third of a century and a new one has become a public necessity. Complaints are frequent in our town that the present building does not afford the necessary facilities for handling the business there. I am sure that if the hon. minister understood the necessities of the town of Seaforth he would at once conclude to erect a building in that town worthy of the position which it holds in the county. As far as the policy of erecting public buildings is concerned, I see by the estimates that a post office is to be erected in the village of Antigonish in the province of Nova Scotia at a cost of $25,000. It is not my intention to ask the hon. minister to erect a building, costing anything like that sum of money, nor do I believe the people of my constituency desire it. We will be very well satisfied with an expenditure of, say, $10,000. We have a population in the neighbourhood of 2,600, and I am perfectly confident that if the hon. minister would see to it that an amount of $10,000 was included in the estimates our people would be very well pleased and the probabilities are that when the next general election comes around they would not return a Conservative representative, but would send a follower of the government.

Mr. HYMAN. I shall be very glad indeed to take into consideration any representations which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gunn) may make as to the necessity of a public building in the town of Seaforth. Speaking from memory I do not think that the county of Huron has done so badly in the way of public buildings.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It is a large county.

Mr. HYMAN. Quite true, but there are other large counties. There is a public building at Goderich, another at Clinton and another at Wingham.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. But, the hon. minister——

Mr. HYMAN. May I be permitted to say a word once in a while without being interrupted?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I will not interrupt the hon. minister if he is so fastidious.

Mr. HYMAN. I am not fastidious at all. On almost every occasion on which I rise to speak I am interrupted. Surely the hon. gentleman can allow the county of Antigonish a public building. There are three in Huron and if the hon. gentleman has any representations to make in regard to a public building at Seaforth I shall be glad to listen to those representations.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I was going to remark to the minister, who is very fastidious—he is not always so fastidious—and if he was not so fastidious we might make better progress——

Mr. HYMAN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I was going to suggest to him that in enumerating the public works carried out in Huron he omitted to mention some harbour improvements in Goderich. That is a very convenient omission. I would take the opportunity of pointing out that Seaforth has an income from the post office of $1,000 more than Antigonish and the minister might properly see his way to spending $1,000.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to put on record the customs revenue of Antigonish. The receipts were $1,024.03. You can add that to the post office receipts and you have the grand total.

Mr. HYMAN. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the customs receipts are only $1,000 ?

Mr. INGRAM. That is the amount given at page 745 of the Auditor General's Report. If this report is not correct he can settle that with the minister.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The minister was in Brantford during the recent election campaign and viewed our post office at that time. It cost about $25,000 according to competent experts. We have a population of about 19,000 and we have received no additions to the post office since its erection. It houses the Post Office Department, the Customs Department and the Inland Revenue Department, which together produce a revenue of about $350,000 per annum. We have had no expenditure there on public buildings for a great many years. The avenues for Dominion government expenditures in Brantford are very limited and we think that on the two services which we have, the militia and the post office, we are not receiving at all what is due us. In bringing this matter before the attention of the Postmaster General the other day I was referred to the Minister of Public Works, and as the estimates of that minister are now under discussion I would like to ask him if during his recent visit to Brantford he thought that post office commensurate with the size and importance of Brantford, and if he thinks that coat of paint applied to the outside and some little alteration on the inside of the post office are sufficient for a city the size of Brantford, producing a revenue I have mentioned ? I would also ask him if it is his intention to afford increased accommodation there ? I think we are entitled to a better building there and I would ask the hon. gentleman

if after his recent visit he does not agree with me ?

Mr. HYMAN. While we are wandering rather far afield I shall briefly discuss with my hon. friend the question which he has raised. I did visit Brantford, I did see the public building of Brantford. I would not like to say that it is such a building as I would like to see the Department of Public Works erect in Brantford. There have been some expenditures made on that building. I interviewed, I think, the proper parties there, that is the custom house officer and the postmaster, and they assured me that if these expenditures were made upon the building it would vastly improve the service they were able to render. The hon. gentleman forgot to tell the House that the Department of Public Works are making a large expenditure in Brantford. He says they are practically making no expenditure there. I was pleased to see the drill hall there, I think it is a credit to the city of Brantford. There is an expenditure on that building and in these very estimates we are asking a vote for a continuation of this work. I think if the hon. member (Mr. Cockshutt) wants to be fair he should thank the Department of Public Works in reference to that public building. I did not suppose it would be fair to proceed with the two public buildings at the present time, but I do not hesitate to say that I think the time is coming when it would probably be to the public interest to have a better public building at Brantford. In the meantime certain expenditures are being made on the building and I was told by the officers there that, temporarily at any rate, they will meet the requirements of the people.

Mr. PATERSON. I find that the customs duties collected at Antigonish last year were $7,702.17.

Mr. HYMAN. That is the figure I gave the House.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The question I raised was not in connection with the drill hall or armouries, but with the post office. I stated that there had been an expenditure to provide for increased accommodation in that building. I did not refer to the other. I think the hon. minister (Mr. Hyman) misunderstood me. I am willing to admit that there is quite an expenditure going on in connection with the armouries but I was referring particularly to the post office building, housing as it does that department as well as the Department of Inland Revenue and the Department of Customs.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the amount of the customs collections at Antigonish for 1903-4 ?

Mr. PATERSON. I just read it, $7,000 and something.

Mr. INGRAM. For what year ?

Mr. PATERSON. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman turn up the Auditor General's Report ?

Mr. PATERSON. It would not make any difference, these are the figures.

Mr. INGRAM. It makes some difference to members of the House. These are the figures given in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. PATERSON. You will find the figures in the trade and navigation returns for the different ports.

Mr. GUNN. While the Minister of Customs is looking into that matter I would like to return thanks to the Minister of Public Works for the promise that he has made me that he will give this matter some consideration. As I said a moment ago. I am perfectly satisfied that if the minister was familiar with the conditions in our town he would give us a post office. So far as I know—and I have lived in Seaforth nineteen years—there has not been a cent of public money spent in Seaforth in that time nor for many years before that. I would like to ask the minister what course I should take in order to bring this matter up for intelligent discussion and I desire to again thank him for the kindly way in which he has treated my remarks and the hope he has inspired in my breast.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the trouble in reference to the Auditor General's Report is that the figures in the line above should be opposite Antigonish. It is exactly the amount my hon. friend said. I think there is a line left out and that the figures that are opposite Annapolis should be opposite Antigonish.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before leaving this subject I desire to say a few words with reference to another post office, and I take the opportunity of doing so while the Postmaster General is in his seat—although of course I do not mean to insinuate that he is not always there. I refer to the post office at Sarnia. On a former occasion, I advised the Postmaster General to erect a post office in Sarnia, putting up a respectable building on a prominent site. As far as the site is concerned he did select the site that in my judgment was preferable, an excellent site fronting the river. A building has been erected there but I do not suppose the Postmaster General is responsible for the size of the building. I am not aware either how much it cost definitely but I was informed last summer when visiting Sarnia that it cost $70,000 to $80,000. What I complain of is that I cannot for the life of me see where $70,000 or $80,000 is put in that building.

For an expenditure of $70,000 or $80,000 we ought certainly to have a building of large capacity. The town of Sarnia is a growing town, a town which will probably double its population within the next ten years, and its requirements will far exceed

those of the present time. During the last summer when I was in Sarnia I went into the post office, and I was astonished to find that the portion of the building alloted to the public was, to my mind, entirely too cramped and narrow and quite unsuited to the needs of a town of a population of 8,000 or 9,000. I was anxious to see where the officers did the sorting, and after being allowed to look in, I was astonished to find that it was equally cramped. The whole building was entirely too shallow. As a matter of curiosity I asked what kind of an office the postmaster had, and I succeeded in having a look into a little box of about eight feet square. I said: ' When I see the Postmaster General I am going to tell him that he ought to be ashamed of himself to put a public postmaster into such a cramped space.' The bulding is not at all in keeping with the town of Sarnia or the site on which it is erected, a site fronting on the River St. Clair, where probably more shipping passes during the year than crosses the Atlantic ocean. On such a site a handsome building of large dimensions would be an ornament and a splendid advertisement to Canada, but I am sorry to say that even with the expenditure of $70,000 or $80,000 that has not been accomplished. I do not say that the government did not spend enough money, but I say that there is some thing wrong in the construction of these public buildings when the people of the Dominion do not get the worth of their money. The result in this case is not what I would expect from an expenditure of so large a sum of money.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not know how the building is laid out. I suppose my officers were consulted. I was in Halifax some time ago and went into the postmaster's office there. I do not know who erected that building, we or our predecessors, but the postmaster's room was no bigger than an ordinary box stall; I do not think it was more than six feet square. However, I suppose the real point of my hon. friend's remarks is that we have not a large enough building at Sarnia. His complaint is practically that we are too economical. So that it is hard to please him.

Mr. HENDERSON. No, I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I did not complain that the government were too economical in the expenditure of the money, but too economical in getting results for the expenditure.

Mr. HYMAN. The building was constructed in the usual way, by public contract. I have never before heard the first breath of complaint against the building. I have always understood that the people of Sarnia are pleased with it and consider it a credit to the town. As a matter of fact, the building itself cost $65,000, and was built by public contract let to the lowest tender. It is a solid stone and brick building. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman that it would be better to construct these buildings more lightly in order to provide more room for the same money.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 11) respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 13) respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Gauvreau.

Bill (No. 18) respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 15) to incorporate the St. Mary's and Western Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. McIntyre.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 39) respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 40) respecting the Niagara-Welland Power Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Regina and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 42) respecting the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 43) respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.—Mr. Gervais.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Mail subsidies and steamship subventions—ocean and mail service between Great Britain and Canada, $260,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Paterson) explain, before we go into the details, what change there has been in this subsidy as compared with last year.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I understand there has been no change in this item.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. No chance, then, of an improved mail service between Canada and Great Britain ?

Mr. PATERSON. When the turbines are running, faster time will be made.

Mr. MACLEAN. One turbine will not effect that.

Mr. PATERSON. There will be two.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When does the hon. gentleman expect the new steamships to be in operation ?

Mr. PATERSON. One on the 23rd of March and the other in April.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What are the terms as to speed ?

Mr. PATERSON. Seventeen knots.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. How many days for the trip ?

Mr. PATERSON. Six in summer and six and a half in winter.

Mr. DANIEL. Has the new style of steamer been tested yet ?

Mr. PATERSON. I believe so.

Mr. DANIEL. Was the result satisfactory ?

Mr. PATERSON. Quite so, I understand.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will any of the vessels subsidized under this item be fitted up with cold storage accommodation for the carriage of perishable products ?

Mr. PATERSON. All are so fitted up.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will they be made serviceable, or will they be no improvement on what we had last year or the year before ?

Mr. PATERSON. I have here a memorandum from the Allans saying that they have been improved.

Mr. HENDERSON. I ask because we remember that last year an hon. gentleman who, I regret, is not in the House at the present time, and who was very conversant with the shipping interests of this country, especially the shipping of perishable products, made a very serious complaint on the floor of this House, against the character of the equipment for the purpose of carrying perishable goods from Canada to the old land. I am glad to hear the minister say that an improvement has been made and that better facilities will now be afforded the fruit-growers and agriculturists of this country for the carriage of these perishable products.

Mr. PATERSON. I think it was with reference to the very statement made by the hon. gentleman that has been alluded to, and who was a member of the House at that time. The Allans were communicated with, and perhaps I had better read the answer that he received to his communication calling their attention to what had been said. It was addressed to Mr. O'Hara, of the Department of Trade and Commerce :

Montreal, October 4, 1904.

F. C. T. O'Hara, Esq.,
Department of Trade and Commerce,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—We duly received your various communications in this matter. We have also read carefully the printed sheets containing the debates in the House of Commons on this subject, and more particularly the statements made by Mr. Smith, M.P.

When we entered into contracts with the government to furnish refrigerator stowage, the temperature most suitable for butter was thought to be about 30 degrees of Fahr. and this temperature was provided. Within a short time, however, after the system was in operation butter exporters commenced an agitation for 10 degrees lower temperature. After considerable demur we met this demand by altering all former arrangements, giving additional power and a larger service of freezing pipes.

These alterations involved an outlay of $23,-910.72 as by the specifications and vouchers now before the department, one moiety of which is reasonably due us by the government.

There is now provided on the vessels of our Montreal service refrigerator facilities for the better conveyance of perishable cargo as follows :—(1) compartments for frozen goods at a temperature varying from 20 to 30 degrees; (2) compartments for cheese, bacon, fruits, &c., with a temperature of from 35 to 40 degrees, higher or lower as may be wanted by the shippers of the goods, and (3) compartments with forced currents of external air (inlets and outlets) operated by steam-driven fans.

Details of these various facilities are explained more fully in our recent circulars to shippers, copies of which we inclose for your information. Still more detailed information is given in the typewritten memorandum sent herewith prepared by our Glasgow friends and bearing the date of March 22, 1904.

As stated above, the arrangement to give a temperature below 30 degrees was on the demand of butter shippers. Few of these merchants, however, furnished their goods to the ship at any such degree of cold. We inclose official statements given to us by the Montreal government officers having the matter in charge, from which you will note that out of 31 separate shipments made in July of the current year, only six were delivered to the ship at or below 32 degrees, that six were delivered at and above 52 degrees and that the average temperature of the whole 31 shipments was above 41 degrees. We have more than once suggested that a rule should be promulgated by the department requiring that all shipments should be delivered to the ocean ship at or below the temperature which is to be maintained in the compartment wherein they are stowed throughout the voyage.

The machinery of these compartments is arranged to maintain the required temperature, but is not calculated to reduce the temperature of butter delivered at or above 52 degrees down to the minimum. Such reductions should be made in city refrigerators prior to delivery being given to the ship.

As regards deliveries of refrigerator goods to consignees at British ports, we have (broadly speaking) to complain that consignees are extremely dilatory in receiving their goods; not infrequently they are left on the wharfs for a full day after they have been discharged, and occasionally even two days. We receive occasional statements from our British friends giving details of these delays which we communicate to the shippers.

Respecting the returns made to the department of the temperatures registered by the thermographs, it should be borne in mind that we not infrequently make an agreement with

the shipper fixing the temperature which is to be maintained throughout the voyage in the compartment containing his goods. It may thus occur that while the thermograph registers 40 degrees in a compartment containing butter, our agreement with the shipper may nevertheless have been carried out. We have explained this matter to your Montreal agents who called our attention to the circumstances that butter was being carried at a higher temperature than our contract with the government required.

We return the papers sent us by you whereon we have penciled the information asked for.

Any further information you may require in the premises will be cheerfully furnished.

Yours truly,

(Signed) H. & A. ALLAN.

Then follows particulars of the shipment, which I need not read. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) will observe that it was owing to the comments that were made last session by the late member for South Wentworth (Mr. Smith) that this letter is written, and these are the explanations they give. It would appear from this that improvements have been made at additional cost to themselves. But they point out that the steamers cannot be held alone responsible, that the shippers themselves are partly to blame, as they deliver goods at a higher temperature than they should.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Did the government pay half of that increased cost?

Mr. PATERSON. No, it was not entertained; they had to pay it themselves.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am rather pleased at the statement made by the minister, so far as it goes. It seems to meet the case very well. However, in my recollection, one of the serious complaints made by the late member for South Wentworth, and which we are very glad has been taken notice of by the shippers, was that these agreements or conditions were not carried out during the entire voyage across the ocean; that whilst butter was put on board ship at a certain temperature, which was maintained for a day or so, this temperature was not kept up during the entire voyage, and the result was disastrous to the shipper. Now, to my mind, the Department of Trade and Commerce should give special attention to that point, and see that all the requirements which entitle them to this subsidy and all the promises made are carried out through the entire voyage, so that butter, for example, will not be put on board ship at a temperature of say 30 degrees and be brought down during the first day or two to a temperature of 20, but that that temperature should be maintained during the entire voyage, instead of allowing it to run up probably to 30 or 40 again, to the injury of the goods. I am glad attention has been drawn to the fact that when goods are landed on the other side consignees have been neglectful in looking after those goods. I scarcely see that the department could be held responsible for that, providing due notice is given of the arrival of those goods. It is certainly, to my mind, the duty of the consignee at once to take the goods away, and not allow an article such as butter to remain upon the dock at Liverpool for possibly ten or eleven days. I think, in some circumstances, goods were allowed to remain that length of time, of course to the great injury of the article, and to the detriment of the entire Canadian industry. I hope the department will take steps to see that these conditions are complied with throughout the entire voyage, and that we will not have a renewal of the complaints that were made last year—that that feature of the contract was overlooked. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture if he is still of opinion that 20 degrees of cold is sufficient for the transhipment of butter? I understood last year he had arrived at the conclusion that it was necessary to bring it down to 10 degrees. It seems that the provision here made is for 20.

Mr. FISHER. From the investigations I have made, I am of the opinion that 20 degrees is a cold enough temperature in which to carry butter from Canada to England in a steamship. The butter is put upon the market as soon as it gets to England, and there is no particular reason in having it below 20 degrees.

Mr. HENDERSON. There seems to be one other matter that requires the careful attention of the department, and that is that ample provision should be made for forwarding these perishable products to the place of shipment. I do not know what arrangement has been made with the railway companies, but it would certainly seem very essential that some method of refrigeration be provided, so that the goods will arrive at the port of shipment at the degree of temperature at which the shipowners, Messrs. Allan, have referred. If butter or other delicate articles are presented to them for shipment at a temperature which will be almost destructive, we can hardly expect that they can provide means by which their quality or utility will be restored. I am not aware whether the hon. minister has any system of providing refrigerator cars for the purpose of forwarding goods, such as have been referred to, to the point of shipment.

Mr. FISHER. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I would say that we have, but perhaps it would be better when my estimates come up to go into the details of that question.

Mr. SPROULE. There is another thing disclosed by this correspondence, which, it seems to me, is worth while referring to. That is the complaint that there were no thermographs in the various chambers. There is nothing said about them in the

correspondence, listening casually, as I did, to it being read. The question was asked if all necessary provision had been made in that direction and strenuous complaint was made by my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Smith), that there were only a certain number of thermographs provided for each vessel, that they were placed in some of the chambers but not in others, and that there were no means of registering the temperature from day to day in these chambers. Then, the correspondence discloses this further fact that the Messrs. Allan claim that they have fulfilled their agreement in regard to the temperature at which they were to keep the chambers for butter. They were to keep the chambers at thirty degrees but they point out that the government, after making the contract, found out that ten degrees lower would be a better temperature for butter, and the hon. minister told us last year that down as low as eleven degrees would be a better temperature. If that be the fact then the government are to blame because their expert must have known before the contract was entered into which was the most suitable temperature. It turns out that thirty degrees is not the best temperature by any means, and while there is a difference between the hon. minister and those who complain regarding these arrangements the two facts which are brought out by that letter are that the Allans have fulfilled their contract and that the fault was with the hon. Minister of Agriculture in entering into the contract without providing for a proper temperature but in providing for a temperature about ten degrees above what it ought to have been.

Mr. PATERSON. I am told by the deputy that the hon. member for Wentworth, last year, in giving his figures had taken the records of vessels not subsidized by this government at all—not all of them but a good many of them. He quotes as instances of vessels not properly equipped, some of those which were not subsidized by the government at all and therefore the government would be in no way responsible and have no control over them. If a shipper saw fit to ship on a tramp steamer or a regular Trans-Atlantic liner, many of which were not subsidized by us at all we would not be responsible under those circumstances. If that were so the statement of the hon. member for Wentworth would have to be dissected in order to find out whether we were paying public money by way of subsidy to steamers that were not carrying out the contract. If they were getting no public money we would have nothing to do with them.

Mr. SPROULE. If my memory is not at fault the question was asked: What steamers are we paying subsidies to and which are operating under government contract? We were certainly dealing with these though there might have been some others included that were not under government contract. The hon. minister was defending what was being done and giving explanations. What we wanted to know was what steamers under government contract were violating their contract and why, if they were violating it, the government did not hold them to it. In the next place we wanted to know why the government allowed their expert to stipulate for a certain temperature as being the proper temperature although the government afterwards came to the conclusion that it was not the proper temperature. There is here disclosed a want of knowledge in connection with this contract that otherwise never would have been admitted by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, because, if there is one thing more than another that has impressed itself upon this House it is that everything is stamped with perfection that emanates from his department.

Mr. FISHER. I may explain that there were two sets of contracts, one made by the Department of Trade and Commerce for vessels which are subsidized by the department and which vessels by these contracts now are required to provide adequate cold storage. There was another set of contracts entered into by my department some years ago with vessels that were subsidized and some not subsidized by the government under the ordinary class of subsidy. But I entered into contracts as the Minister of Agriculture to induce them to equip themselves with cold storage. These contracts lasted for three years. At the end of these contracts these vessels were free of any control by the government. The subsidy contracts made by the Department of Trade and Commerce have been continuous and the vessels operating under these contracts are still controlled to a certain extent by the government. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) has spoken about temperatures. I do not know that at the present time it is worth while going into that question but I would point out that a temperature of thirty degrees which was provided for when we first made the contracts for cold storage was the temperature which at that time the dealers in butter wanted, expected and asked for the carriage of their butter. As time went on it developed that butter could be more securely carried at a lower temperature and from time to time we urged upon the steamship companies to make their temperature lower, which they did, as far as they could, with the equipment they then had. Our contracts ceased. We had no control over them. They, however, in view of the demand made, lowered their temperature for butter. They have in most of these steamers two or three different compartments. In a great many vessels they have one compartment for the carriage of butter or other articles which can be

frozen. The temperature of that compartment is brought down to about twenty and sometimes a little below. They have another compartment for products that, while they want to be carried cold, cannot bear to be frozen—cheese and fruit, for instance and many meats which the people do not wish to have frozen but want to have chilled. The temperature of these compartments has been maintained at from 32 to 36 degrees. Then, they have another set of compartments which are described in the Messrs. Allan's letters. Those are compartments through which chilled air is forced. The temperature in these compartments is not required to be as low as that of the compartment to which I last alluded. I forget for the moment what the exact temperature is but I think it is expected to be below 45, speaking, subject to correction, from memory. In any discussion of the temperature in a compartment it is absolutely necessary to know what the contents of that compartment are before you judge the temperature. I do not wish particularly to enter into a discussion but a statement has been made in regard to what was said by the hon. member for Wentworth last session. He made some statements here in regard to what the temperatures were in certain compartments and pointed out that they were higher than they ought to have been.

Unfortunately I was not present in the House when that statement of his was made, but afterwards I had that statement analysed and I found that in a great many instances, not absolutely all but I think I am safe in saying in a large majority, of instances which he quoted where the temperature was too high, he was quoting temperatures of chambers in which not butter was being carried but fruit and cheese, which would have been destroyed if the temperature of the chamber had been kept as low as he demanded it should have been kept, and he did that with the fact recorded on the very records which he was quoting that these chambers contained fruit or cheese and not butter. I went carefully over the statements that he made and I regret to say that I found that difficulty in connection with the quotations that he made. I am quite willing to go into that matter at greater length later on and prove conclusively what I am saying if necessary. I point this out now as a quotation has been made from what was said last session.

Mr. SPROULE. In reply to the hon. minister I would say that I saw some of the answers which the minister made and I thought they were rather evasive and not very conclusive. I am not prepared to say that in quoting the temperatures the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) in every case specified the contents of the chambers. I was looking over it afterwards and comparing it with the reports and the impression on my mind was that they were pretty accurate. There are two species of contracts here with regard to steamships and the minister tries to shield himself behind the one contract, that made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in which a provision is made for cold storage, and he says: 'I cannot be held responsible for these contracts because they are made by the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce.'

Mr. FISHER. I beg pardon, I am not shielding myself at all.

Mr. SPROULE. That was the inference, 'and therefore those made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce are not up to what they should be.'

Mr. FISHER. I did not intend to convey that impression at all although I may have done so.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the inference that could fairly be drawn.

Mr. FISHER. That is not what I intended.

Mr. SPROULE. When the subsidies were voted to the Minister of Trade and Commerce for steamships he was questioned as to whether or not there would be provision for cold storage for the carrying of the perishable products of this country. His answer was: Yes. And on what basis? After consultation with the Minister of Agriculture and according to requirements as given by him. That is my recollection of the answer. Therefore it must fairly be assumed that the Minister of Agriculture would give him correct information as to the requirements of cold storage and the nature of the cold storage that the country required and that the contract would be made on the basis of these requirements, so that these vessels, whether subsidized by the Department of Trade and Commerce or by the Agricultural Department, would be required to provide cold storage adequate and suitable for the requirements of the country. Another thing about that which struck my attention as well was the large number of cases where perishable products went into the vessel at a higher temperature than that which the minister declared to be a suitable temperature.

Mr. FISHER. That is true.

Mr. SPROULE. He had his inspector at Montreal to see that it was properly done. The inspector was appointed for that purpose and is paid for that purpose and it was his duty to report to the Minister at once if these vessels were not carrying out their contract, and then it was the duty of the department to call them to account. Nevertheless we find this in the report of the department, and no effort was made to remedy

this evil so far as I can find. No information was given to the House that any effort was made to secure the carrying out of the contract. In that respect I think the Minister of Agriculture was at fault. I blame him more than the Minister of Trade and Commerce because it does not appear in my judgment to be exactly the duty of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to look after the cold storage chambers in which the perishable products of Canada are shipped.

Mr. HENDERSON. Perhaps we are digressing somewhat from the subject, but I scarcely think that the Minister of Agriculture has been quite fair to the hon. gentleman who represented South Wentworth, who I regret is not in his place in the House as he has been asked to stand aside. My recollection is that Mr. Smith was very careful to obtain all his information from the Minister of Agriculture and if there was anything wrong in the statements made by Mr. Smith I think it must have come from the Minister of Agriculture himself. Mr. Smith was careful to lay his plans for his speech. He put frequent questions on the order paper and obtained the desired information, the data from which he made his remarks. Now I feel quite sure, although it is a matter of recollection only, that the then member for South Wentworth spoke from information which he had obtained from the Minister of Agriculture. Certainly all these thermograph records were obtained in that way—in fact I do not know any other way in which he could have obtained them—and these were the chief foundation for his criticism. I remember quite well that the Minister of Agriculture was not present on one occasion when Mr. Smith delivered a very forcible speech on that subject and we all regretted his absence very much because we would have been glad if the minister had been present to hear what was said and to reply to Mr. Smith. I understood the minister to say that there are two sets of vessels. The Minister of Customs leads us to understand that the Department of Trade and Commerce only have control over such vessels as are subsidized by the government, but I understand that other vessels not subsidized were aided in the fitting up of these cold storage chambers by the Agricultural Department, and therefore they were in receipt of government money and should be responsible to this House for a proper fulfilment of any contract entered into with the department here. I regret that the minister should have cast a reflection on Mr. Smith in his absence because I think on further reflection he will realize that if Mr. Smith was led astray at all it was owing to the fact he had used information obtained from the Minister of Agriculture himself.

Mr. FISHER. I think my hon. friend is doing me a great injustice. I would not have brought up Mr. Smith's remarks if the hon. gentleman had not quoted these statements of Mr. Smith's on this occasion. I did not wish to say anything about Mr. Smith in his absence although he said a good many things against my department in my absence last session.

Mr. HENDERSON. It was not his fault.

Mr. FISHER. It may not have been but I was often present when he did not say these things. He said he based his statements on records in my department. He did, but he did not give the whole statement which these records show ; on the contrary he gave statements which these records did not show, and therefore did not tell the whole truth about the matter. I am prepared to bring these records before the House and to put the matter before the House as I did before the country last fall.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When did Mr. Smith make the statements ?

Mr. FISHER. When I was in Winnipeg last summer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I want the time.

Mr. FISHER. I cannot give the date.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When was the hon. minister at Winnipeg ?

Mr. FISHER. I have not looked it up to see.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How long was it before the end of the session that Mr. Smith made the statement ?

Mr. FISHER. Quite shortly before the end of the session.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What does the hon. gentleman mean by shortly ?

Mr. FISHER. A couple of weeks.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to point out to the hon. Minister of Agriculture that he was present when Mr. Smith made the statements in the House, and he did not contradict the figures given by Mr. Smith on that occasion. Mr. Smith complained that the contract did not contain certain things which it should contain in the interest of those shipping in cold storage, also that the tests provided by the department were made at the beginning of the voyage, but were not carried out to the end. I am surprised to hear the minister say that he had no opportunity to reply.

Mr. PATERSON. That is a question that pertains to the Department of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The Minister of Agriculture made a statement reflecting upon an hon. member on this side of the House, and I do not think it is the intention of

this party to let it go by until the matter is settled. The hon. member for Wentworth has never been challenged for having made an untrue statement in this House or out of it. I am sorry that we cannot say that of all the persons concerned.

Mr. PATERSON. I have a great many items to be passed, and as the vote for this subsidy appears to be all right, why not let me get on? That subject will come up again.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It appears to me that the Minister of Agriculture has said either too much or too little.

Mr. PATERSON. It will come up again. It is extraneous to this vote.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Better settle it now.

Mr. PATERSON. I will not be able to get on with my estimates.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is the fault of the hon. gentleman's colleague introducing matters that did not apply.

Mr. PATERSON. I think the hon. leader of the opposition will agree with me that in order to get on with some work——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman will have to control his colleague. He had better send him out of the House while he is passing his estimates.

Mr. PATERSON. I think he was led into making the remarks he did. It will come up again.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Let him get up and apologize.

Mr. PATERSON. So far as the Allan line of steamers is concerned, I think hon, gentlemen are satisfied with that. I have some details I could give.

Mr. FOSTER. The trouble seems to be that the discussion has gone on to a certain extent, in which the Minister of Agriculture has reflected pretty severely on an absent member. That is now in 'Hansard' and is going into the papers, and it seems to be unfair for the other side of the case not to have the whole matter discussed at the present time, so that all will go on 'Hansard' and to the public together, as it ought to. I think my hon. friend will have to take the disadvantages as well as the advantages of colleagues. Sometimes they are a great help, but sometimes they are a sad hindrance.

Mr. PATERSON. In all seriousness my hon. friend will see that if what he proposes now is adopted, it will take the committee away altogether from the subject under consideration to discuss an item which must come under investigation on another day.

Mr. FOSTER. But my hon. friend will see that there is butter as well as salt sea in connection with this estimate, because the subsidy carries two things. The vessels have to sail the vast deep, and they have to carry butter and other things in a certain condition, and both are parts of the same contract.

Mr. PATERSON. Quite so, but I think it is not contended that the vessels for which I am asking this vote are not up to the requirements. If that be the case, that disposes of this vote and we had better get on, and the Minister of Agriculture and the other gentlemen can discuss the other matter at the proper time.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that we were to have cold storage for carrying perishable products. Are the vessels to provide cold storage or not?

Mr. PATERSON. Certainly.

Mr. SPROULE. Then it is absolutely necessary for us to know what kind of cold storage they are going to provide, and whether the government have made a proper contract. The Minister of Agriculture contends that they have done that. We contend that he has contradicted the statements made by Mr. Smith on the basis of the minister's own reports and on the thermographic readings of minimum and maximum temperature given in this House. We believe that Mr. Smith's statements were based on reliable and authentic information. These statements are contradicted by the minister now. Consequently we ought to have it settled whether Mr. Smith or the Minister of Agriculture is right.

Mr. PATERSON. I think the whole matter arose from a remark I made. When attention was called to Mr. Smith's statements, the deputy had just informed me that there were facts taken by Mr. Smith from vessels that were not subsidized by the government, and therefore the government could not be held responsible for them. That remark led to this discussion. But now we are discussing the Allan Line steamers, and perhaps I may as well read the provision for cold storage in the 'Bavarian.'

The compartment No. 5 lower between decks has been divided by a bulkhead on the centre line of the ship, and the starboard chamber thus formed has been subdivided by a bulkhead athwartships. The space forward of the hatch to the water-tight bulkhead, of a capacity of 5,418 cubic feet, should be capable of being maintained at a minimum temperature of about twenty degrees, while the remainder of the space on the starboard side of a capacity 3,211 cubic feet, together with the whole of the compartment on the port side, of a capacity of 8,958 cubic feet, should be able to be maintained at a minimum temperature of about thirty-two degrees as above. In addition to the above, there is also the compartment in the centre of No. 5 main between decks, of a capacity of 4,780 cubic feet, capable of being maintained at a minimum temperature of about thirty-two degrees as before. The arrangement

of piping is such that each of the chambers can be maintained independently of the others, or cut off altogether if required. Total capacity, 22,367 cubic feet.

I have also the particulars with reference to the 'Corinthian,' the 'Hungarian,' the 'Ionian,' the 'Numidian,' the 'Ontarian,' the 'Pomeranian,' the 'Pretorian,' the 'Sardinian,' the 'Sicilian' and the 'Tunisian.' So that the hon. gentleman will see that it is all right so far as this vote is concerned.

Mr. SPROULE. Oh, no, it is all wrong; that is the trouble. We have no information, or comparatively none. The hon. minister reads what should be on one vessel; but does not tell us how much space or what temperature is provided for on the various boats. According to the minister's own statement some products require to be carried at a temperature of 11 degrees, yet the lowest provided is 20. We have not got the contract or any information as to what it contains, which was made with these steamship companies. All that the minister gives us is the spaces contained in one steamship.

Mr. PATERSON. I only gave that as a sample. I said nothing about 11 degrees.

Mr. SPROULE. But I did; and that is just where I say the hon. minister shows they have not made proper provision. The Minister of Agriculture has told us that butter could be kept better in a temperature of 11 degrees than in a temperature of 20 or 30, but the Minister of Trade and Commerce told us that in some of these compartments the temperature is kept down to 30 degrees and in others to about 20. Does the contract bind the company to keep the compartments at any temperature; and if so, what is the temperature, and how much space are they to provide with one temperature and how much with another? What provision is made for the thermographs? How many of them are there, and are they self-registered? Will there be one in each chamber? Where it is possible a register should be kept of the temperature of every day in the voyage, and where the proper temperature is known which perishable fruits and other commodities require, surely it is the duty of the government to provide in their contract for that temperature during every day of the voyage, and for a thermographic registration every day in each compartment. If that were done, and these charts taken out, we could tell whether the temperature is proper or not, and whether the government has made proper provision to carry the farmers' produce as it should be in order to have it on the market in proper condition.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I find that the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) made observations on the 29th July other than those to which the hon. Minister of Agriculture referred.

Mr. FISHER. I could not say positively without looking up 'Hansard.' Mr. Smith spoke more than once on this question, but the particular occasion referred to by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) was that on which he took the thermographic records and quoted them. Afterwards I was able to take the same thermographic records and compare them with those quoted by Mr. Smith, and I found that he made this mistake, that he did not take into account the fact that in many of the vessels there was more than one thermographic record.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. My hon. friend should quote Mr. Smith's statement.

Mr. FISHER. I cannot do so just at the moment, but I am speaking in general terms.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It would be better for the hon. gentleman to defer any observation until he has the records with him. I find that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) rose and answered Mr. Smith on that occasion, and I do not find that any application was made to delay the reply of the government until the advent of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, although he seems to think it was a most unfortunate circumstance that the defence of the government should have been entrusted to Sir Richard Cartwright rather than to himself. However that may be, I do find that the hon. gentleman was in his place answering questions on the 1st August, and had from that time until the end of the session to make, in the presence of Mr. Smith, the observations he has seen fit to make in his absence. It would have been far better if the hon. minister had not waited until Mr. Smith is not here to make what were undoubtedly intended as very serious reflections upon him.

Mr. FISHER. I would not have alluded to the matter in any way whatever if Mr. Smith's observations had not been quoted to-night.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman could have referred to them in a different spirit and tone and without making reflections on Mr. Smith, and could thus have justified the decision of the government equally as well. There was a little too much spite in his remarks.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Smith obtained the thermographic records from the Minister of Agriculture by asking questions across the floor. From these reports I read his statement. If there is anything wrong in the statement Mr. Smith made which is the subject of criticism, it is because the minister furnished him with incorrect information. I hold that Mr. Smith was perfectly justified in using the information he obtained from the report of the Minister of

Agriculture and the questions answered across the floor. I cannot conceive for a moment that Mr. Smith presumed to give information to this House which he had not obtained from that authentic source. I say this in justification of an old friend who is not with us at this time. I regard the speech made by Mr. Smith then as one of the most important speeches delivered during the whole parliament. It showed a breadth of knowledge in the matter of transportation of perishable products which I believe was not possessed by any member in this House. I listened to the speech very carefully and have read and re-read many parts of it, and the one thing I felt I could rely upon was the correctness of the statement made by Mr. Smith, knowing the source from which he obtained his information.

Mr. FISHER. I shall defer making any more remarks until my own estimates come up.

Mr. INGRAM. Where the hon. Minister of Agriculture did the hon. member for Wentworth an injustice was in making the charge that Mr. Smith had reference to the ventilation of defective apples and not defective butter and cheese. That statement cannot be borne out by the record, because on page 794 of last year's 'Hansard' you will see that Mr. Smith asked the Minister of Agriculture whether the government inspector had examined the compartments in certain vessels, and what system of mechanical ventilation was in each. Again, on July 11th, 1904, he asked about mechanical ventilation on steamers, and the hon. gentleman answered the question. Again, on April 18th, he put this question :

1. In answer to question of April 6th, the Minister of Agriculture said :—
The steamship 'Lake Champlain' had the ordinary system of Cowl ventilation.
2. Has the government examined these Cowl ventilators and found them in proper order and of sufficient size on this boat on each outward voyage when perishable cargo was on board ?

To these questions the hon. minister replied :

One of the inspectors for the Department of Agriculture has reported on each outward voyage of this steamship, both from the port of Montreal, both during the past season of navigation, and from the port of St. Johns, N.B., during the winter season, and in each report the ventilation is described as follows.

Then he went on to give the very statement quoted by Mr. Smith in this House. Yet, he now says that Mr. Smith's statements are incorrect. Mr. Smith, however, quoted the very information he got from the minister himself, and the minister is not justified in complaining about the conduct of Mr. Smith, because every one knows that there was no hon. gentleman in this House more conversant with the question than the hon. member for Wentworth, and I do not even exclude the hon. minister himself.

Mr. HENDERSON.

Mr. DANIEL. Are these steamers supplied with wireless telegraphy ?

Mr. PATERSON. The turbines are, and so are some of the others.

Mr. SPROULE. We require more information than has been given. We want to know something about the contract, so that we may satisfy ourselves——

Mr. PATERSON. It is precisely the same contract.

Mr. SPROULE. But we were told that the contract was right in every respect. May we not be allowed to exercise our own judgment as to whether it was right or not? Why should we not be allowed to know what it actually provided for? Though we were assured that it was perfect it turned out to be very loosely drawn.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There was an observation in the report of Messrs. Allan respecting the condition in which goods were placed on board these ships. An hon. gentleman on this side has referred to the fact that a staff of inspectors is kept by the department of Agriculture at Montreal. I observe that that very circumstance is adverted to by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) in his speech of last year in reply to the member for Wentworth, Mr. Smith. The Minister of Trade and Commerce said:—

As regards what the Department of Agriculture has done, the department has furnished me with this memorandum. They state that the department maintains a staff of inspectors at Montreal to observe and report concerning the condition of Canadian food products when loaded in the steamers, including the shipments carried in cold storage.

Well, it seems a rather extraordinary condition of things, if the government have a staff of inspectors in Montreal, that they should be unaware that these goods were put in the cold storage apartments at too high a temperature. How does it happen that the attention of the government was not called to this fact by the government inspectors ?

Mr. FISHER. A good deal of the information has been in the hands of the government. The fact, that goods, especially butter, arrive in Montreal at a higher temperature than they ought to have when put in the cold storage chambers in the ships is true, unfortunately. We have had our inspectors carefully watching that trade, and they have made reports. I have drawn the attention of the people who handle this butter to the difficulty, and have explained to them the wrong they were doing to themselves and their neighbours. At the same time, we have not power to force people to keep their butter at a low temperature, nor have we power to prevent this butter from being put in the cold storage chambers. It may be that we ought to take that power

and it may be that parliament would give it to us. But, at present we have not that power. I have a pretty complete report of the season just past and also of that of a year ago. I have pointed out to the handlers and shippers of the butter how foolish their course was, and have begged them and encouraged them to do better, but I have not power to compel them to do better.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) take any steps in consequence of the reports of the inspectors ?

Mr. FISHER. I even went so far as to threaten, in the dairy conventions last winter, that if conditions did not improve during the season just past, I might have to ask parliament for this power of compulsion. I am glad to say that the reports of last season show an improvement—not so great as I would like, but still an improvement. I confess that I have hesitated to go to the extreme of asking parliament for the power to refuse admission to the cold storage chambers of goods under certain conditions. It would be going rather far. The steamship companies themselves would hesitate before agreeing that such power should be taken, because in certain seasons there is not enough freight to fill the cold storage chambers, and the companies are glad to get the goods, and they take them. We had this difficulty to contend with as well as with the carelessness of shippers in allowing their butter especially to get warmer than it ought to be. A considerable quantity of the butter brought to Montreal to be put in the cold storage chambers runs as high as fifty degrees, and I have no hesitation in saying that butter cannot reach a temperature of fifty degrees without being harmed. It does reach that temperature, and at that temperature is put into the cold storage chambers, so that it must not merely be kept cool but actually cooled. That is one of the causes of variation in the recorded temperatures of the cold storage chambers. If you put a couple of hundred boxes of butter in a cold storage chamber at a temperature of say forty degrees when the temperature of the chamber ought to be, and is, twenty degrees, you raise the temperature of the chamber at once, and it will be a day, or perhaps two days, before the temperature can be brought down again to the proper level. As I have shown, the question is surrounded with difficulties, as hon. gentlemen will understand, and I confess that I have not been able to solve these difficulties completely.

Mr. AMES. Is the butter that comes in at a high temperature generally delivered as package freight in Montreal, or does it come on through shipment by rail?

Mr. FISHER. Most of it, I think, comes by short-haul. That which comes from a long distance comes in refrigerator cars and is generally fairly cool; but that which comes from a distance of one hundred miles or less from Montreal often does not come in refrigerator cars, although the cars are there, if the shippers would take advantage of them. But the great difficulty is in the carriage of butter from the creamery to the station and keeping it at the station for several hours, sometimes for half a day, before it is put in refrigerator cars. The refrigerator car cannot cool butter. If the butter is put in reasonably cool, the car will keep it so, but, with the refrigerator capacity they have they cannot reduce the temperature of the butter to any great extent. The railway and steamship companies say, with a good deal of justice, that it is not their business to cool the goods but only to keep them as cool as when they were put in. So, there is a good deal of difficulty in managing this trade. We have been trying to educate the people to their true interest and to get them to work the business to the best advantage, without using any absolute coercion.

Mr. AMES. Has the hon. minister conferred with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with a view to establishing cold storage compartments in the new sheds which are being erected in Montreal, more especially for the short-haul freight that he speaks of in the way of perishable goods?

Mr. FISHER. I have not. I may say that in Montreal the cold storage accommodation provided by private concerns is fairly complete. There is no difficulty for people who ship goods on through bills of lading to have them arrive in Montreal a day or two before they need to be put on the ships that they may be put in cold storage and properly cooled.

Mr. AMES. But I was speaking of the short-haul freight.

Mr. FISHER. That appears to be the difficult question. But the goods can be very easily kept in the cold storage houses in Montreal and at a trifling expense.

Mr. AMES. I refer to the goods that are carried by short railway haul and shipped directly to the steamer, and that do not go into cold storage in Montreal. Is provision being made for that business in connection with the new sheds?

Mr. FISHER. Not that I am aware of. I have not had any representations made to me, either by the handlers of this produce or the shippers, asking for that. Of course that kind of thing would interfere with the business of cold storage warehouses in Montreal, there would be opposition to it, though I do not say it ought to succeed, if the arrangements are advisable. This question has been discussed by the trade to a certain extent, not particularly in connection with the new sheds in Montreal, but with the whole handling of goods. I may

say that in England most of the cold storage stores are on the docks and very convenient for handling. What I have seen of them in England has led me to think they give satisfaction.

Mr. AMES. The tendency of the additional accommodation which is to be provided in the port of Montreal when the new improvements are completed, will be to create a larger amount of railway freight and a smaller quantity of local package freight. It will probably be necessary for the minister to make provision for cold storage accommodation on the wharfs themselves for the short haul railway freight that may be brought there.

Mr. SPROULE. There are some things that we ought to know before this passes. First, what is the temperature required and provided in the various chambers, and the capacity of these chambers for different kinds of fruit ? What is the proper temperature for carrying apples, pears, grapes, tomatoes, butter, cheese, meat and eggs ?

The officers of the department must know what is the proper temperature for carrying these various commodities. Then does the contract provide that there shall be suitable accommodation in these chambers, and sufficient capacity to carry the goods offered in those lines in chambers of the right temperature? Then, what will be the additional cost of freight on account of the cold storage they provide? I think we ought to have that information so as to enable us to understand whether the government has or has not made proper provision for cold storage in giving these subsidies to the steamship company.

Mr. PATERSON. The contract requires that they should provide cold storage to the satisfaction of the minister, with adequate space and at the different temperatures required. These are to be to the satisfaction of the minister. The vessels are running and I suppose the minister is perfectly satisfied with the facilities provided. The Allans, judging from their letter, prove that the facilities are adequate, and that whatever complaints have arisen they were not responsible for. That is where goods have been handed to them at a temperature higher than they should have been. I have before me a circular of one of the steamships, giving the space, one temperature of 50 degrees and another temperature of 20 degrees and a certain number of cubic feet. Shippers know what goods will go into the 30 degree compartment and what into the 20 degree compartment. There is no doubt that these points are fully guarded by the Minister of Agriculture. I do not know that the hon. gentleman himself can say that he has heard complaints with reference to freights. Of course, we could not govern the rates they charge for freights, I suppose they vary.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. SPROULE. A few years ago the freight was to be so many shillings or so many cents above the ordinary rate on vessels without cold storage.

Mr. PATERSON. A movable rate, but so much above.

Mr. SPROULE. There is one satisfaction in that information, and it is that we will know where to place the blame if we find out afterwards there is blame. From the information we have, there is blame, because the minister has just given us some information that our contract provides there shall be adequate cold storage according to the judgment of the Minister of Agriculture. If, therefore, the cold storage proves not to be adequate or suitable, then the Minister of Agriculture must be to blame, because he has an inspector there to see that the goods are put on the vessel in proper condition and that the cold storage is provided as required.

Mr. PATERSON. I think the Minister of Agriculture will attend to the hon. gentlemen when his items come up.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the average speed of these vessels we have been paying for?

Mr. PATERSON. The 'Bavarian,' between Moville and Rimouski, a 17-knot steamer, 6 days during summer and 6½ days in winter. The 'Tunisian' and the 'Bavarian' should not exceed 7 days in summer and 7½ days in winter.

Mr. HAGGART. I am not asking what they intend to do but what they have done.

Mr. PATERSON. They are not in service yet.

Mr. HAGGART. Those we had the contract with last year, what was their speed?

Mr. PATERSON. The contract is for 7½ days in summer and 8 days in winter. They have complied with the contract.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You mean the contract is for a certain number of days, not for a certain number of knots?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Trade and Commerce gave us last year the speed of each vessel. I want to know the speed on the actual voyage.

Mr. PATERSON. I have not that with me.

Mr. HAGGART. Can't you give it within a knot or two? Is it 12 knots or is it 17 knots? If I remember rightly, it was somewhere between 12 and 14, instead of 17.

Mr. PATERSON. These turbine steamers are about 17. The 'Tunisian' and 'Bavarian,' speaking from memory, average about 14 knots on the voyage.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the speed of the others ?

Mr. PATERSON. The others would be slower, probably 10 or 12.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister be kind enough to have his clerk make out a list of the actual sailings of last year of each one of these vessels? What I want to get at is the actual speed they accomplish. We are paying $260,000 under this vote for what is called a fast line service, at least it is the fastest we have. Now, what is the real speed that has been accomplished? The minister last year, my colleague informs me, gave a table of these speeds. We may be getting an actual voyage service of 10 or 12 knots, or it may be 13, but it may not be as many knots as those knots I have spoken of indicate. But what we would like to know is how many knots we are getting, not how many days it took a boat to carry the minister over.

Mr. SPROULE. Will any of them reach a higher rate of speed than the 'Minnie M.'?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall this item be carried ?

Mr. FOSTER. It is understood that we will get that information ?

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman will accept the statement that will be handed in to-morrow ?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

Mr. SPROULE. To what extent do shippers avail themselves of cold storage for the transportation of their goods ? It is said by some—I do not know whether correctly or incorrectly—that the rates for cold storage were so high that many of the shippers decided to take the risk of sending their goods not in cold storage but in the ordinary way at the lower freight rate.

Mr. PATERSON. I am told by the hon. Minister of Agriculture that practically all of these shipments have gone by cold storage.

Mr. SPROULE. We have no information yet as to what the additional freight rates are to be over and above the movable rates. Have you provided for that in the contract ?

Mr. PATERSON. The rates are not controlled at all.

Mr. SPROULE. They were originally.

Mr. FISHER. They were in the contract which I made when I subsidized vessels to induce them to put in cold storage. Those contracts were closed long ago and we have no further contracts.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you not think the government were derelict in their duty when they were giving steamships large subsidies if they did not provide for freight rates ?

Mr. PATERSON. Competition will regulate that.

Mr. SPROULE. We leave too many things to competition and we do not have competition afterwards. There is a great deal of complaint regarding it. The rates for shipment in cold storage were so high that a great many people thought it better to run the risk of their stuff spoiling.

Mr. PATERSON. Competition regulates that.

Mr. SPROULE. This is not competition. There seems to be an absence of business ability and astuteness on the part of the minister who makes this contract. It is failure on his part to make a suitable contract so as to secure the people who produce this stuff and the commercial men who ship it. In the interest of these producers and shippers it seems to me that something ought to be done ; otherwise they are at the mercy of every vessel on which they put their goods.

Mr. PATERSON. I will call the minister's attention to the suggestion.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the machinery for knowing that each one of these boats keeps the temperature at the required point during the whole voyage ? Have you an inspector on each vessel ?

Mr. FISHER. There are self registering thermographs—generally two in each compartment.

Mr. FOSTER. And they are fixed at the commencement of the voyage and inspected at the end ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, they are locked by my officer in Montreal, taken out by my officer in Liverpool and sent back.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there no possibility of tampering with them ?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, 'my officer' must have been sadly derelict in his duty last year because the information we got was that there were only a few on each vessel and that there were not two in each chamber.

Mr. FISHER. Speaking from memory we have about 130 of these thermographs. Under ordinary circumstances they would serve our needs, but last year there was a large number of vessels fitted up with what is called cool storage. We did not know of that until the season was on and we could not get these thermographs in less than four months. They have to be made especially and we did not have enough of them in each of the chambers last year, both cold storage and cool storage, but they were put in just as rapidly as they could be got back. I think I may hazard a guess that eighty per cent of the chambers

of vessels which went out of Montreal were provided with thermographs.

Mr. SPROULE. It is rather an unsatisfactory way of providing for these things in a contract. Now, we are making a new contract. Has the hon. minister provided that there shall be enough thermographs this year ?

Mr. FISHER. I have ordered more.

Mr. SPROULE. But the hon. minister knows the number of compartments these vessels contain.

Mr. FISHER. I do not know at the present time how many vessels are going to run from Montreal with cold storage chambers.

Mr. SPROULE. But the hon. minister knows how many will get the government subsidies.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Then I assume he knows the number of chambers he will require thermographs for ?

Mr. FISHER. I guarantee my hon. friend that there will be a thermograph in every cold storage chamber in every vessel subsidized by the government.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the hon. minister see that thermographs are placed on the deck of the vessel so as to take the temperature of the sea air ?

Mr. FISHER. We have not done that.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is that not essential?

Mr. FISHER. My officers who have dealt with this matter have not thought so. I know that Mr. Smith brought that question forward and it was discussed, but my officers have not thought that is would be of any great value because the variations of the temperature on deck are so great that the instrument would hardly indicate them.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am afraid the hon. minister's officers are hardly up to date as practical men.

Mr. SPROULE. In the contracts made with these vessels will there be any provision regarding freight rates ?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. SPROULE. It should be given out beforehand what the rates are to be so that shippers would know what they would have to pay for these cold storage chambers.

Mr. PATERSON. The contract is made and it is not in it. It is left to the regulation of trade competition.

Mr. SPROULE. The department has not shown good business ability.

Mr. PATERSON. We cannot regulate the price of commodities.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it of such little account that it is not worth while for the government to pay any attention to it ? When we were told some years ago that it was an essential elemeut of the contract that they should pay so much more if they availed themselves of this cold storage, shippers knew whether it would be advisable for them to avail themselves of cold storage or not. Many shippers tell us that they did not avail themselves of cold storage because the rates were so high. The contract which was made by the old government or by the present government—I forget which—was allowed to run out and was not renewed by this government. The South African war was on and freight rates went up. They said that they could not get the same freight rates and they did not provide for the equipment of these steamers until it was too late. Another year has elapsed since then. Have the government made no effort to get the freight rates fixed so that shippers may know where they stand? If not they have been derelict in their duty and they are censurable for their failure. Surely they ought to have made provision this year for freight rates. There is now no South African war on and they ought to know that freight rates, let them be what they may, could easily have been provided for so that those availing themselves of cold storage would not pay more than so many shillings or so many dollars or cents beyond the ordinary freight rate.

Mr. PATERSON. I will call the attention of the minister to the suggestion of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Both last year and on previous occasions there has been some discussion upon items of this character as to alleged discrimination—it is called discrimination, at least—as against Canadian shippers. The question arose in this way : It was alleged, with what truth I do not know, that upon some of these steamship lines—I do not say upon the lines of the Messrs. Allan—rates were given to shippers in the United States which were lower than those given from Canadian points of a corresponding inland distance. That is to say, from Chicago, for example, you can get by some of the subsidized lines a lower rate for United States shippers than you can get for Canadian shippers from a point equally far west. Therefore, we complained with respect to some lines—I do not think there was any complaint with regard to the line of the Messrs. Allan—but with respect to some lines, which eventually resulted in a certain provision being inserted in some of these contracts with other steamship owners which forbade any such discrimination, if that is the term to use. The question was discussed during the past session, and, I think, during the session previous to that, and my recollection is that difficulties were fairly acknowledged on

both sides of the House. It was, of course, pointed out, I think by the Minister of Trade and Commerce on one occasion at least, that at Chicago these lines had to compete with lines running to New York, which had quite as good railway communication with Chicago as Montreal or St. John would have, and it was said that some of these owners could not avoid making offers of low rates where that was necessary for the purpose of competition. The Minister of Trade and Commerce last year, I think, promised us some further information on the subject, and I have no doubt that it has been under the consideration of my hon. friend the Minister of Customs before he undertook these estimates. I would be very glad indeed to know whether or not he has any information on the subject which he would like to impart to the committee, especially as to whether or not there have been any complaints made by shippers with regard to this particular line. I think we were told last year that there had been no complaint so far as this line was concerned.

Mr. PATERSON. I remember myself, not in connection with this, but I remember that two or three years ago a person wrote me from St. John charging that a subsidized line—I do not exactly remember the name, and therefore I will not mention it—were carrying goods cheaper from Boston than from St. John, although the boats were subsidized by this government from St. John. I understood from his complaint that they would bring the goods to St. John and then forward them to Boston, and yet, with this extra charge added, the rate was lower from Boston. I thought this was a matter that demanded attention, and I mentioned it to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I think he immediately took steps to ascertain whether the charge was well founded or not. I presume there is not much in that, but I am told by the deputy that the question has arisen, as the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has said, with reference to some large Chicago meat houses that were able to make a contract with every ship that went out giving them a very large consignment, and that under these circumstances—the Minister of Agriculture says that they were special cold storage chambers, not the cold storage chambers prepared by us, and that for these large shipments and steady sources of freight the Chicago houses were given better terms than were given to the shippers who were not able to offer the ship-owners as much freight at a time or as regular supplies. Otherwise, it is thought that the steamers would have gone with not half a load. I suppose that if they can get a full ship load they can afford to carry cheaper for the Canadian shipper in proportion than if they had only half a load.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There are, of course, considerations of that character which we very frankly admitted should have weight with the government, but, at the same time, where we are paying out subsidies to a line such as this, or any other of these lines, it does seem a little incongruous that shippers in Canada should have to pay higher freights to such a subsidized line than the rates paid by shippers in the United States by the same line.

Mr. PATERSON. I am not sure whether there are complaints as to any of the subsidized lines; they say there are none in reference to the Allan Line.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand there has been no complaint with regard to them. I know that last year the Minister of Trade and Commerce admitted it, and justified the action of certain steamship companies, and there was very considerable weight in what he said. He took the position that they could not get the freight unless they gave these lower rates, because these lower rates were given via New York, and that it was no injustice to the Canadian shipper, but indeed tended to maintain the line that the ship-owner should take the freight at these low rates. That was from the standpoint of the steamship-owner. From our standpoint it presented itself in this way. We were paying large subsidies to these ship-owners to maintain a line, and it seemed, as I said, incongruous that our own shippers should be paying more freight and higher freight rates than those paid by United States shippers.

Mr. PATERSON. Something like through and local freight by rail.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the government made any effort in the last year to develop the chilled meat or frozen meat trade?

Mr. FISHER. We have not taken any steps about it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The Minister of Trade and Commerce made a promise to me for two or three successive years that he would furnish the House with a statement of the local rates and also the general rates by rail to Canadian ports and also the rates from Canadian inland points to foreign markets, and the American western rates to these same foreign markets. I have never heard of this information being laid on the table. I do not suppose it belongs to this department, but inasmuch as this question of subsidies to steamships is up, I think it would be well for the Minister of Customs, as a business man, to look into the matter, and have a guarantee that while the freights rates from western points over our lines and by our subsidized steamships to Britain might possibly be regulated so that while the long haul to western points might be reduced, yet in no case should the short haul, viz., to and from Canadian points, be greater than the long haul. I

presume the minister knows, as every one knows, that the rates from Liverpool to Chicago or any western point are much lower than to our Canadian points.

Mr. PATERSON. Proportionately lower.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No ; actually lower. They can ship more cheaply say from Belgium right into the western country west of the lakes than to points in Canada. I think it woud be a very proper thing for the minister to impress on his colleague—the Minister of Trade and Commerce is the one particularly interested —the necessity of having it enacted that no local rate should exceed in price the through rates.

Mr. PATERSON. Do you mean to make that a clause in the contract ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In granting a subsidy, to provide that the local rate to a point in Canada should not exceed the through rate. I do not want it necessarily lower, but it should be as low.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I hope that the statement made by the hon. gentleman just now will induce him to assist me in compelling American roads to give the same rates to Canadian as to American shippers.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We do not control the American roads.

Mr. DANIEL. Last session the Minister of Trade and Commerce took an increased grant towards providing aids to navigation, especially, I think, in connection with the St. Lawrence. He mentioned a system which could be installed in vessels which would give them notice when they were approaching shallow water, rocks, &c. It was some sort of telephonic arrangement under water. I would be glad to know if anything of that kind is being done in connection with these subsidized steamers. I think it is a matter of great importance, especially to steamers coming up the St. Lawrence in the summer months to Quebec or Montreal.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not feel at liberty to say that he has made a contract as to that, but I am warranted in saying that it has been seriously under consideration, and negotiations have been going on in reference to it.

Mr. HAGGART. I understood the minister to say that all the conditions of the contract made with the Allan Company have been performed. There have been no forfeitures ?

Mr. PATERSON. I think there have been no forfeitures.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like to know whether they have performed the provisions of the contract, or, if not, whether there has been an enforcement of the penalty.

Mr. PATERSON. No deductions have been made and therefore no penalties have been incurred.

Mr. HAGGART. That is not a consequence of the statement of the minister. A penalty may be incurred but not collected, and there may have been a forfeiture. I want to know whether there has been or not.

Mr. PATERSON. I am assured that the practice of the department has been, what I would expect it to be, that if there were any deductions to be made, they would be made at the time the cheque was given ; but that there have been no deductions, and therefore the full amount must have been earned.

Mr. HAGGART. Can the minister not state whether the voyages have been performed according to the contract or not ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, and paid for.

Mr. HAGGART. Then, there is a new state of affairs this year as compared with last year, according to the statement then made by the minister.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know what was stated last year. I am stating what I am informed by the deputy.

Mr. GANONG. The minister will find on page 62 that $70,000 is provided for a submarine signal apparatus.

Mr. PATERSON. I think that is what the hon. member for St. John has been referring to.

Mr. BERGERON. On this item I would like to ask the hon. gentleman for some information. Where do we stand now in regard to the fast line ? When I left here we were in the bottle-necked business ; where are we now ? Has there been any improvement in the communication between England and Canada ?

Mr. PATERSON. There has been a good deal of improvement. There are two turbine steamers going on in the spring which will make seventeen knots. They will make the crossing in six days in summer and six and a half days in winter.

Mr. BERGERON. With what companies have we contracts for carrying the mails between Canada and England ?

Mr. PATERSON. The Allan Line.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the contract price ?

Mr. PATERSON. £2,000 for each full round trip between Liverpool and Quebec or between Liverpool and St. John by the seventeen-knot steamers ; £1,000 for each similar round trip by the 'Bavarian' and 'Tunisian'; £500 for each round trip by the 'Parisian,' 'Ionian,' 'Sicilian' and 'Pretorian,'

when employed between Liverpool and Quebec; and £750 for each round trip by the 'Parisian,' 'Ionian,' 'Sicilian' and 'Pretorian' between Liverpool and St. John. One per cent is deducted for every hour by which the voyage time is exceeded.

Mr. BERGERON. Was that contract given after tenders had been asked from different companies?

Mr. PATERSON. That is a contract made on November 7, 1903.

Mr. BERGERON. Were tenders asked from different companies plying between Canada and England?

Mr. PATERSON. I could not say.

Mr. BERGERON. What proportion of the Canadian mails are carried by Canadian vessels and what proportion through the United States?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I gave the figures at the close of last session in reply to a question put to me by the hon. member for Centre Toronto.

Mr. BERGERON. This is a case in which it seems to me that we are spending a great deal of money for which we do not get benefit. Seven or eight years ago a contract was made by another administration for a fast line which would have carried not only our own mails, but probably a great part of the mails of the western states. The present government did not carry out that contract. Since then they have been insinuating that they were preparing a contract for a fast line, but it has never been carried to a successful issue. We are paying $260,000 a year or probably more for having our mails carried by a slow line; for in present conditions a line of fourteen or fifteen knots is a slow line. I know business men in Montreal to-day who send their mails through the United States instead of using the Canadian lines. There is no reason for that. With the progressive government we have, and the growing times, when the supplies we are voting amount to about $65,000,000 compared with $35,000,000 or $40,000,000 eight or nine years ago, there is no reason why we should not have a Canadian line between Canada and England which would carry not only our own mails but the mails of the western states as well. It is the fault of the government if we have not a fast line to-day, and if we are obliged to delay the hon. gentleman's estimates by making these criticisms. I see the hon. minister looking at last year's Hansard, but I want something more fresh. I want information regarding what has happened since.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is impossible for me to give the weight of the mails carried since I spoke in this House in July last, but I shall be very happy to get the information and give it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BERGERON. What I want to know is the proportion of mail matter carried by Canadian and American vessels?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I shall get the information and have it brought down on Tuesday or Wednesday next.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the arrangement about the steamers in winter time? Last year there was some change in the programme about calling at St. John and Halifax.

Mr. PATERSON. They call at Halifax in the winter en route for St. John.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the rule followed with regard to the sailing of all these subsidized steamers in winter time?

Mr. PATERSON. I will have that information when we are discussing the other item.

Mr. FOWLER. Last year the contract with the Allan Line was varied so that some of the sailings to St. John were cut out. Have those been restored?

Mr. PATERSON. I am not aware that any were cut out. Here is the contract.

Mr. DANIEL. Perhaps I may give both the minister and the hon. gentleman a little information on that point. The contract was not varied, but as a matter of fact the Allan steamers did not call at St. John on several of their trips. It was stated by their agent that they did not obtain freight with sufficient ease at St. John and it was thought they could do better by loading at Halifax. I remember speaking of this last session. My hon. friend will remember the hon. member for Annapolis, Mr. Wade, told us that the result of that experiment was that the steamers got barely enough freight in Halifax to give them steadiness in the sea-way, so that the experiment was not a success. This year they are loading at St. John. They always call at Halifax and leave their mails and generally passengers—not always all the passengers, generally the first class, but sometimes the immigrants are brought on and landed at St. John. That is the way the contract is being carried out this year. They are calling at Halifax both ways, leaving the mails and passengers and finishing their voyage at St. John, where they get their freight.

Mr. FOWLER. That is very true, but, I understand they have the authority of the department for doing this.

Mr. PATERSON. The contract under which they are working now commenced in April last, and I am told they have been calling at both places since then.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Was there not another line of steamships that had a subsidy for carrying the mails?

Mr. PATERSON. I see that the next item is a subsidy for a line to St. John's, Newfoundland and Liverpool. I would ask that item 189 be taken up.

Mail subsidies and steamship subventions—steamboat service between Canada and Mexico, $50,000.

Mr. PATERSON. The memorandum I have on this subject says that negotiations are under way for the establishment of this service, and definite announcement may be made before the House prorogues. The Postmaster General has been carrying on negotiations and no doubt can give any information any hon. members may desire.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The Mexican government has agreed with the Canadian government for a subsidized line of steamers on the Pacific and Atlantic. Last spring they agreed to go as high as $50,000, we doing the same. It was hoped that that amount would get us a line on the two oceans; but when tenders were invited it was found that the whole amount would practically be absorbed by one line.

Mr. FOSTER. A monthly service?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes. Last December I had negotiations with the Mexican government and they agreed, subject to our doing the same, that they would give another $50,000. This would mean a total of subsidies from two governments of $200,000, which would give us two lines, provided we could get them at that amount. But I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce is hardly likely to secure an Atlantic line for the sum here voted. The Mexican government will not give more than $50,000 extra, or $100,000 in all. It is probable that when the supplementary estimates are brought down the House may be asked to increase the subsidy. The amounts here voted will give us only the one line. I think that the tenders show it would cost about $100,000 for the Pacific line—I cannot give the figures exactly.

Mr. FOSTER. Which would be the more expensive?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The Atlantic line.

Mr. BERGERON. What are the lines now?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Between Canada and Mexico there are none.

Mr. BERGERON. But between the United States and Mexico?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There is such a line but I do not recall the name.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would this be given to a British or an American or to a Mexican line?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We were to advertise and the vessels were to carry the British flag. The Mexican government have no ships carrying there flag.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Oh, yes.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The president of Mexico so informed me, and I suppose he ought to know.

Mr. BERGERON. How are the mails carried between Canada and Mexico?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. They go through the United States.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the extent of the mails between Canada and Mexico?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There are no statistics to show that. This is not a matter of mails.

Mr. GANONG. What would be the ports of departure and call in Mexico and in Canada?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. In summer the vessels would leave Montreal and in winter some maritime province port or ports. They would call at a place called Progresso, the outport of Yucatan, which is part of the republic of Mexico. At Yucatan they raise great quantities of sisal fibre, which is used to mix with manila in the manufacture of binder twine. There would be a large import of this material, which at present we buy mainly in the New York market. The ship would then do some coasting and call at Coatzacoalcos, which is intended to be the gulf port of the Tehuantepec Railway, a railway crossing the peninsula from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific ocean. At present the only port that is available is Vera Cruz, but it is a good distance away and the Mexican government is at present making a harbour at Coatzacoalcos. There will be a railway 196 miles across the peninsula to Salina Cruz, a harbour on the Pacific ocean now being improved by the Mexican government at very great expense. It is not in a backward state, and the contracts have been made for the expenditure of about $25,000,000 Mexican, which is about $12,000,000 gold. The next port would be Vera Cruz and then Tampico. That is connected with the interior of Mexico by a railway, just as Vera Cruz is. There are two railways going from Vera Cruz to the interior. So, if the Atlantic vessel were to call at each place it would be comparatively close to the interior of Mexico.

Mr. BERGERON. How long would it take a vessel to go from Montreal to the first port the hon. gentleman mentioned?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. At what rate of speed?

Mr. BERGERON. If it were like the 'Gauss' that came here from Germany, I suppose it would take seven months. But I mean an ordinary vessel of 14 knots.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not think you would put a cargo on a ship of 14 knots, it would be too expensive. I think it would be about 3,500 knots from Montreal to Vera Cruz.

Mr. MACLEAN. Have you got a wharf there ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, you would have to use lighters.

Mr. BERGERON. How long does it take a vessel to go to these ports from New York ? The Minister of Customs says it is not so much a question of carrying mails as of bringing trade from Mexico to Canada. We do not want to pay $50,000 or $60,000 a year for a line of steamers which would not attain that object. If it takes a much longer time to carry the mails between Canada and Mexico by the proposed subsidized line, than to carry them by steamers plying between American ports and Mexican ports we would be throwing away our money, because our mails would go by the American line. Of course, if the hon. gentleman is not in a position to answer now, he can take means to obtain some statistics and bring them down.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think the hon. gentleman has had his answer from the Minister of Customs. It is not a question of carrying mails at all. Under no circumstances would Canadian mails such as letters go by this line so long as they can go by rail. When you can go from Ottawa to the city of Mexico by rail in five days, letters will be carried by the shortest route. This proposition is for the development of trade for bulky articles of commerce that cannot afford to pay a large haul, but which may be transported a long distance by a cheaper route. I think there is a large market in the republic of Mexico that Canada can supply, and there is a reciprocal trade.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the hon. gentleman state what we might export there, and what we might import ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. As to imports, I mentioned a moment ago the article of sisal fibre. I think we consume in this country about 12,000,000 pounds of binder twine, into which sisal enters, I do not know in what proportion.

Mr. BERGERON. Worth how much ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The raw material might be worth a cent and a half, perhaps, I do not know the price per pound. But it is a necessary article in Canada where we have a number of factories manufacturing binder twine. It is a growing industry, and we shall use more and more every year. We have to have that raw material. Canada does not produce it and Mexico does. Then coffee is grown in southern Mexico, tobacco, sugar and cotton. It is an excellent country for growing raw cotton. As you are aware, grazing is carried on to a large extent in Mexico, and they export large quantities of hides of all kinds. In the mountains and central parts of Mexico where the country is rough, instead of sheep they have great flocks of goats, and the skins of goats are largely used in trade. I believe that is the raw material used in making fine leather. Then there are fruits. I do not know that we could do a banana trade, bananas being perishable. I think that trade is controlled by a company largely, and I do not think we would be able to do much in the banana trade. But we would be able to do something in many other fruits, oranges, lemons, nuts, cocoanuts, pineapples and so on. So far as our exports to Mexico are concerned, we could sell to them I think great quantities of Canadian products in the rough. We could sell them such things as coal on the Atlantic and on the Pacific. Mexico does not produce good coal to any extent. There are some coal deposits in the northeast part of Mexico, but they import great quantities of coal. Some of it comes in by rail into the northern parts, and portions of their coal are supplied from England and the United States by water. I think there is some continental coal also consumed in Mexico. We ought also to be able to sell them pine. They have no white pine in Mexico. We could sell them products of pine, such as household furniture and woodenware of various kinds. I was in conversation with a gentleman in the city of Mexico, who is a representative there of a Canadian house for boxes, which are shipped there in great quantities in what I think they call the knockdown state. Then there is a good market for railway ties. These are very valuable and very expensive. I was told by Mr. Brown, president of the National Railways that there would be no difficulty in marketing a million ties a year in Mexico, not to supply new roads but merely to make up the waste on existing roads. As to foods, I am pleased to say that I found there a favourite cheese, the Imperial cheese. I believe we all know where that comes from.

Mr. HENDERSON. Anything else imperial ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Well, I am willing to admit—though I am not supposed to be an agent here for Canadian houses, but when the question is asked I am willing to admit that the first thing I saw when I entered the Buena Vista station—I am not making any confession, merely telling what I saw—but on leaving the Mexican Central station the first sign I saw on reaching the street was on an establishment just opposite the station, and it was one of Walkers' advertisements—Canadian Club. I found on inquiry there was a house there which sold large quantities of that brand.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did the hon gentleman find it the real article ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is a leading question.

Mr. BERGERON. We do not ask the hon. gentleman to incriminate himself.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I would not know it even if I were to try it. My hon. friend will have to get an expert to answer that question. Then I am glad to say that we could sell them another article of food. My hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Maclaren) would perhaps have some information on what I am about to say now. There is a very large wholesale and retail grocery establishment in the city of Mexico, and the enterprising owner of that House informed me that he sold large quantities of American hams and bacons throughout Mexico in the city and elsewhere. He said that he only regretted that he could not get it in Canada and that he would be able to obtain the supplies from his own country—he is a native of our country—if we had a direct line of steamers. He is taking a great interest in this enterprise in the hope that this direct line of steamships may be the means of developing a trade of the kind I speak of. Butter is imported into Mexico in considerable quantities but it comes from France chiefly and it comes in tins. There is no reason why we should not capture the butter trade of Mexico if we put the goods up in the proper way and have proper transportation facilities. I was in conversation with a representative of some Toronto manufacturers and I found that a Toronto firm had captured the trade of the city of Mexico in what is known as neckwear. I do not know the details of that business, but I suppose it includes cravats, ties and so on. I also found that in the chief shops of the city of Mexico, Canadian leather goods were on sale in large quantities and that they came from establishments engaged in the manufacture of these goods in the city of Toronto —such goods as trunks, pocket books, purses and small articles made of fine leather.

Mr. HENDERSON. Gloves or anything of that kind ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I did not happen to hear of those but there is no reason in the world why we should not get the glove trade to a large extent if our people are enterprising enough and we have the transportation facilities. But you cannot send anything like heavy freight by rail from here to Mexico. From where I am speaking now I suppose it would be nearly 3,000 miles by rail to the city of Mexico. That is a long distance to carry goods by land.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the trade today between Mexico and Canada ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Practically nil.

Mr. PATERSON. About $200,000.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think if you turn up the Trade and Navigation returns of the republic of Mexico you will find that they are importing more and more every year. Speaking from memory—I may be wrong about this and I do not want to be held to these figures, but I can give the statistics as I think I have some copies of their trade returns——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Have they a high protective tariff ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, I think they import about $100,000,000. They are a growing and a coming people, and now is the time if we are going to get that trade before other countries get their lines of communication established. It is a very difficult thing to dislodge trade after it is once established. It is better to try and get it in its infancy.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. minister was good enough to tell us that the president told him that they had no shipping.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No mercantile shipping.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Perhaps the president knows, but in going over Whittaker's Almanac and every other return given I find that they spend upwards of $2,000,000 in equipping their navy every year and that they have a mercantile marine of 23,817 tons.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Small coasting boats.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Even so.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. They have no shipping in the sense of the subject we are discussing. The president informed me so and so did the Secretary of Finances, Mr. Limantour. They may have some small coasting vessels, but not ocean-going vessels such as are required for this traffic and they very readily assented to our controlling the flag.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is what I wanted to make clear in the matter.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. Last year there was some talk of tenders being invited for this service. Will the hon. minister say what was done in connection with that ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The Department of Trade and Commerce invited tenders. They only got one tender for the Pacific coast service and that was from Messrs. Weir & Co., of Glasgow. There were conditions coupled with it. The company sent a representative to Canada to try to obtain some modifications of the terms, and he left here intending to go to the city of Mexico to consult with the

Mexican government. He has not returned to Canada yet and the Department of Trade and Commerce has not had any advice as to whether he has met with any success. As to the Atlantic coast service I think there was a tender from Messrs. Pickford & Black. The Elder Dempster Company did not put in a tender in answer to the advertisement but they are in negotiation with the department to see if they can make arrangements for that service.

Mr. INGRAM. Last year when this matter was before the House a gentleman in Boston wrote me in reference to this service. He wanted to know what the department intended to do in the matter. I consulted with the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) but the information he gave me was so indefinite that it was of no use to the party in Boston. Therefore the matter dropped, as far as that firm was concerned. I understood from the indefinite way in which the hon. minister made his statement that the service they intended to establish was a Pacific coast service and not an Atlantic service. That being the case these Boston parties had no further interest in it.

Mr. PATERSON. The first effort was for a Pacific coast service, but it is hoped, I believe, if the House sanctions it, that services may ultimately be established between Canada and the Mexican republic on both oceans.

Mr. HENDERSON. But the present intention is only to establish a service on the Pacific coast ?

Mr. PATERSON. No, the Atlantic is more alive now than the Pacific. It started with the Pacific but obstacles presented themselves there. The representative of Andrew Weir & Co. who was here in connection with the contract on the Pacific coast, went to Mexico but he has not come back yet and it is at a standstill meanwhile.

Mr. INGRAM. What steps did the department take to draw the attention of the public and of those interested in shipping to the contracts ?

Mr. PATERSON. Advertisements were inserted in the papers of the maritime provinces and then copies of these were sent to the High Commissioner with instructions to distribute them among the shipping ports of England.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Can the hon. minister tell us how much coal is shipped from the Pacific coast or from the eastern coast to Mexico ?

Mr. PATERSON. I have not looked up my trade and navigation returns. What about the thirty-nine items between the one we carried and this?

Mr. DANIEL. I have some remarks on one or two of them.

Steam service between Halifax, St. John's, Newfoundland, and Liverpool, from July 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906, $20,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Who has that contract?

Mr. PATERSON. There is no change. The date of the present contract is October 10, 1904, and it expires June 30, 1905. The contractors are Messrs. Furness, Withy & Co.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that a satisfactory service.

Mr. PATERSON. We have no complaints. The round trip is made in seventeen days.

Mr. FOSTER. I mean as far as the carrying trade is concerned.

Mr. PATERSON. We have no complaints and we therefore judge that it is satisfactory.

Steam service between St. John, N.B., and Glasgow, during winter of 1905-6, $15,000.

Mr. PATERSON. There is no change in that ; the contractors are the Donaldson Line and the Robert Reford Line. They are paid $750 per round trip or $15,000 per annum and the carrying of mails is stipulated for.

Steam service between St. John, N.B., Dublin and Belfast during the winter of 1905-6, $7,500.

Mr. PATERSON. There is no change here. The date is October 20, 1904, and the contract expires with the opening of navigation, 1905. The contractors are the Ulster Steamship Company, the Head Line. The contractors have the privilege of calling at St. John's, Newfoundland, on the western trip. The subsidy is $750 each round trip. They carry mails but cold storage is not stipulated for.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In connection with this have the government taken any steps to have it made possible for these steamers to carry cattle? At the present time they cannot carry cattle even for slaughter on landing, because the British government will not allow cattle to be landed at any but certain few points even for slaughter. It would tend to increase trade to the old country, without detriment to British trade, if it were possible to allow these steamers to carry cattle.

Mr. PATERSON. We will look into that but if the policy of the British government is to prevent the landing——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. But the whole world centres around this government now and the government has only to wave its hand to have the matter attended to.

Mr. PATERSON. I think the hand should be waved.

A line or lines of steamers to run between St. John, Halifax and London, $40,000.

Mr. DANIEL. I would be glad if the minister would explain the present condition of this line and state the intention of the government with regard to asking for tenders. I may say that the Board of Trade of the city of St. John sent a memorial to the Governor General in Council with regard to this steamship service, with which I presume the minister is familiar. It was to the following effect :

That according to the records of the trade between St. John, Halifax and London which has been carried on for a number of years past by the Furness line of steamers subsidized by your government, the results have been extremely disappointing, more particularly in connection with the imports and exports of western Canadian goods (statements of which are inclosed herewith), in consequence of whch, and of the unsuitable and unsatisfactory steamers employed in the trade——

Particulars concerning which I will also give directly.

——there have been numerous strong complaints on the part of both importers and exporters by the line ;

And whereas the Board of Trade has been informed by other responsible steamship companies, that they would be willing to tender for the service commencing on 1st of July next, if allowed the opportunity of doing so ;

The St. John Board of Trade therefore respectfully requests that your government will, as soon as convenient, issue a call for tenders for the following services to commence on 1st July next, viz. :—

A line or lines of steamers to run during the summer months between St. John, Halifax and London, and during the winter months between St. John and London direct and Halifax and London direct, and that the steamship companies be allowed until the 1st April next for submitting their tenders to the government.

(Signed) H. B. Schofield,
President.

With regard to the statement of the steamers referred to, I may say that when this line was first subsidized, between 1894 and 1900, the service was principally maintained by the following three steamers: The 'St. John City,' and the 'Halifax City,' which were both new steamers, and the 'London City,' which was built in 1891, and therefore was only three years old at that time. They were good steamers but they were sold by the Furness Line, after which the service was carried on by the following inferior steamers: the 'Ulunda,' 'Madiana,' 'Dahome' and 'Dalton Hall.' In November, 1900, the new steamer 'Evangeline' came on, and in February, 1901, the new steamer 'Loyalist,' after which the service was maintained by the 'Evangeline,' 'Loyalist' and 'Dahome.' In January, 1902, the 'Evangeline' and 'Loyalist' were sold by the Furness Company, and the service has been carried on ever since with inferior steamers.

That is the statement of the Board of Trade, composed of merchants and shipping men well acquainted with this trade ; and I would like to ask if the communication which that board sent to the government has received any consideration, and whether it is the intention of the government to see that in future the company puts on such vessels as are competent to do in a satisfactory manner the work which it has contracted to do. The service has certainly not been satisfactory for the business men of St. John. I therefore take this opportunity of bringing this matter to the notice of the minister and to tell him that there are other shipping firms which are quite able and willing to tender for this service, and which would, in the opinion of the Board of Trade of the city of St. John, carry it out in a more satisfactory manner than it appears to be done by the Furness Company under their present contract.

Mr. PATERSON. May I ask what is the date of that statement ? And did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that a copy of it had been sent to the department ?

Mr. DANIEL. This copy does not give the date. The communication I got from the Board of Trade is dated January 20, 1905, and the letter of the president is dated January 19.

Mr. PATERSON. The deputy of the department has unfortunately been ill for some time, and has not been able to give any assistance in preparing the information. The acting deputy is not aware that that memorandum has come to the department, but he has no doubt that it has from what the hon. gentleman has said. He has made a note of it, and the hon. gentleman may rely upon it being brought to the attention of the minister. There are two contracts running for those ports, one by the Canadian Pacific Railway Line and one by the Furness Line.

Mr. DANIEL. It is the Furness Line I am speaking of.

Mr. FOSTER. This item had better stand, because there are other matters to be discussed in connection with it.

Item allowed to stand.

Steam communication between St. John and Digby, from July 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906, $12,500.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to ask the minister if the government have received any communication with regard to this line from the Maritime Board of Trade ?

Mr. PATERSON. Not that the acting deputy remembers.

Mr. DANIEL. Then I would like to read the following resolution which was passed at the annual meeting of the Maritime Board of Trade held at Moncton, N.B., on August 17, 1904.

Whereas, the increased requirements of commerce in the southwestern section of Nova Scotia, coupled with those of the Annapolis valley, demand greater transportation facilities and in particular a daily passenger and freight service between St. John and Digby, N.S., which it is understood the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company will operate for a pro rata increase in the subsidy now paid.

Resolved, That the Maritime Board of Trade urge the federal government to provide daily steamboat communication between St. John and Digby by granting such pro rata increase in such subsidy;

Further resolved, That as the four previous requests of this board for an improved bay service have been overlooked by the government, the present be submitted with the respectful request that it be dealt with immediately.

I may say that this Maritime Board of Trade is composed of business men of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick. The hon. minister will notice that increased accommodation is asked for on behalf of several counties in the province of Nova Scotia. This service, I understand, is intended especially for the accommodation of those counties in Nova Scotia which border on the Bay of Fundy or which do business largely through the Bay of Fundy ports; and if there were a better service between St. John and Digby, I think there is no doubt that the business would grow very greatly, and it would be a real boon to the people of those counties. I would be glad to know whether the matter has received any consideration from the government; if so, what consideration it has received; whether the government intend to act on the request of this memorial; and, if so, how soon?

Mr. PATERSON. The matter has been brought to the attention of the department, and is receiving their consideration. Under the present contract full round trips are made daily during June, July, August and September, four trips each week during October, November, December, March, April and May; and three trips each week during January and February. If I apprehend it rightly, what the hon. gentleman read asks for a round trip daily all the year round.

Mr. DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON. The contract has not been varied in that respect. It is dated June 1, 1904, and expires July 1, 1905, and is renewable for another year at the option of the minister. The minister, having that power, would I suppose, be able to take into consideration the wishes of the maritime board. He is not asking for a vote for that purpose just now; but when he sees the remarks of the hon. gentleman and the expression of his belief that it would be beneficial, he may perhaps bring down a supplementary vote, though I cannot of course say anything about that.

Steam service between Victoria and San Francisco, $5,000.

Mr. PATERSON. This is an old item since confederation.

Mr. FOSTER. Why is it kept on?

Mr. PATERSON. I believe the contract has expired and may not be taken up again. The original amount was $17,000, and was the result of an agreement entered into with the province of British Columbia when that province entered confederation.

Mr. FOSTER. We dropped that.

Mr. PATERSON. I am afraid not very effectively. According to the Post Office Department, the value of the service is very trifling, and if another contract should be given it will no doubt be less than the amount of this item. The minister apparently asked to have this amount of $5,000 put at his disposal, but will be at liberty not to make a contract if he sees fit.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to be no good, commercially or otherwise.

Mr. PATERSON. From the information given me it would seem so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then the minister should not ask for the vote.

Mr. PATERSON. My deputy thinks there might be a question as to whether we can drop it. If the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Foster) is right in saying that it was dropped, of course that would disprove that contention. Better let the item pass, and the minister will only make a contract if he finds it necessary.

Steam communication between Halifax and Newfoundland via Cape Breton ports, $2,000.

Mr. FOSTSR. What ports does this take in?

Mr. PATERSON. It is between Halifax and the west coast of Newfoundland, calling both coming and returning at St. Pierre, Grand Narrows, Baddeck, North and South Sydney and some other ports. I believe the contract has expired.

Mr. INGRAM. How many trips does the steamer make?

Mr. PATERSON. A regular fortnightly service.

Steam communication during the season of 1905, i.e., from the opening to the closing of navigation, between the mainland and the Magdalen Islands, $15,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What vessels are doing that?

Mr. PATERSON. The steamers 'Amelia' and 'Lunenburg.' Regular steam weekly service, making each week two full round trips. The contract expires on July 7th, 1908. It is with the Magdalen Island Steamship Company, Limited.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to bring to the notice of the hon. minister another resolution with regard to steamship service with the Magdalen Islands, passed at the same meeting of the Maritime Board of Trade, held at Moncton, the 17th August, 1904. I do not know whether this resolution was formally sent to the government or not, but I presume it must have been :

Resolved, That the federal government be respectfully requested to grant a subsidy of $200 per trip for a steamer to make a weekly service between ports on the north side of Prince Edward Island, Miramichi, Magdalen Island and North Sydney, the distance on the whole route being about 625 miles.

I am not in a position to advocate the matter very strongly, because I am not so familiar with the ports on the north side of Prince Edward Island as are the members from that province. Perhaps the hon. member for Queen's will be able to give us a little information on this matter, but I take this opportunity of bringing this resolution before the minister, in order that he may give it his consideration.

Mr. PATERSON. The steamers now ply to Stewart and Georgetown, Prince Edward Island. What other ports are proposed ?

Mr. A. MARTIN. Stanley and Rustico. I am very glad my hon. friend has brought this matter up. I think that when we look over these estimates we find that the province of Prince Edward Island receives very scant justice. The resolution moved by the Maritime Board of Trade only asks a very small measure of justice for this province, and I hope it will be acceded to and the requisite sum put in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. PATERSON. That would extend the trip and would make a difference in the subsidy asked.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. GANONG. I think the request they make is for $200 a trip for a weekly service.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know whether that is before the department or not.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I would point out that the proposition in this resolution of the Maritime Board of Trade is not for the extension of the present route between Pictou and the Magdalen Islands, a service performed by the Magdalen Islands Steamship Company; it is a separate proposition for a new service. I have a copy of the resolutions and they involve a steamer starting from Miramichi, calling at points in the northern part of Prince Edward Island and going to the Magdalen Islands, then coming to North Sydney and returning. The distance of the whole route would be about 625 miles. That would be apart from the service now under discussion, a service that has been in existence, I believe, ever since confederation, involving a connection between the Magdalen Islands and Pictou as being the most available point on the mainland, the calling at Souris and Georgetown being mere incidents of the trip to the Magdalen Islands.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I am glad the Minister of Trade and Commerce appears to take a friendly view of this, and I hope there will be an item in the supplementary estimates for the establishment of a separate service.

Mr. PATERSON. I understand now. It is an entirely new service. Apparently the minister has not decided upon it, as there is no item in the main estimates. Whether he will ask for an item in the supplementary estimates I cannot say. The acting deputy has taken a note on it and will call his attention to it.

Mr. FOSTER. It is growing late, and I think we might rise now.

Mr. PATERSON. I think we should show more progress to-day. Hon. gentlemen opposite were responsible for wasting a good part of the afternoon.

Mr. FOSTER. No, it was the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) who did that.

Mr. PATERSON. We might take these items as far as the bottom of the page. There are no changes and there need be but little discussion.

Mr. FOSTER. If there is not much discussion we can get through them very quickly another time.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman will have to bear the responsibility for accomplishing so little.

Mr. FOSTER. At half past eleven I am willing to take the responsibility.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Paterson, House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 13, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Canada-Middlesex Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Railways and Canals for the year ending 30th June, 1904.—Hon. H. R. Emmerson.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 45) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company.—Mr. E. M. Macdonald.

Bill (No. 46) respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. E. M. Macdonald.

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Century Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 50) to incorporate the Calgary and Battleford Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

QUESTIONS.

95th BATT.—REDUCTION AND DISBANDMENT.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON asked :

1. After the rebellion in 1885 what was the reason for reducing the strength of the 95th Battalion, Manitoba Grenadiers, from 432 to 266?
2. Why was the said battalion disbanded ?

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

1. Because, on the 5th of August, 1887, the corps was changed from a city to a rural corps and reduced by two companies.
2. Because it was inefficient.

RELIEF TO MANITOBA FARMERS.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON asked :

1. What is the amount still due on the loan made by the Dominion government for the relief of the Manitoba farmers during the grasshopper scourge in the years 1874 and 1875 ?
2. Is it the intention of the government to remit such amount ? If not, why not ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The amount still due upon the loan made by the Dominion government for relief during the grasshopper scourge of 1874-75, is about $34,000 exclusive of interest. The government do not see any reason for departing from the policy of the previous government, and think that this money should be repaid.

AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS FROM AND EXPORTS TO UNITED STATES.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

What were the imports of the following, imported into Canada for home consumption from United States, and the exports of same from Canada to the United States, and the duty on the same both ways, in the years 1903 and 1904 : (1) Amount of pork, bacon, hams, shoulders, &c.? (2) Apples ? (3) Wheat ? (4) Corn ? (5) Beans, raw, canned and otherwise ? (6) Cattle (7) Horses ? (8) Wool ? (9) Hides ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). My deputy informs me that this would require an answer at such length as to make it inconvenient to give it to the House in this manner. If the hon. gentleman will let the question drop, we will hasten a return in every way.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I ask for a return.

LOBSTER LICENSES.

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

Is it the intention of the government to issue any more licenses to can lobsters in district No. 1, New Brunswick, for 1905, than those named in a reply to a question on February 6th, viz.: J. Ingersoll, E. A Holmes., Connors Bros., Burnham & Morrell ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). As at present advised, it is not the intention of the government to issue any more licenses.

GRAIN SURVEY BOARDS.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Who are the members of the grain survey boards of Toronto and of Montreal, appointed by the Governor in Council, under the authority of clause 32, 4 Edward VII., chapter 14?
2. Of those appointed for Toronto, who were so named on recommendation of the Board of Trade of Toronto '?
3. Of those appointed for Montreal, who were named on the recommendation of the Board of Trade of Montreal ?
4. Were any of the appointments for Montreal named by the government without the recommendation of the Montreal Board of Trade ?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Minister of Customs) :

1. For Montreal : Thos. A. Crane, C. B. Esdaile, Alex. McFee, J. S. Norris, A. G. Thomson, E. S. Jaques. For Toronto : Thomas Flynn, W. D. Matthews, Hedley Shaw, C. W. Band, J. L. Spink, John Carrick, H. N. Baird, J. D. Flavelle, J. C. McKeggie, W. E. Milner.
2. Thomas Flynn, W. D. Matthews, Hedley Shaw, C. W. Band, J. L. Spink, John Carrick, H. N. Baird, J. D. Flavelle, J. C. McKeggie, W. E. Milner.
3. C. B. Esdaile, A. G. Thomson, E. S. Jaques.
4. Yes.

PURCHASE OF COAL FOR INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. DANIEL asked :

1. How much coal was purchased by the Intercolonial Railway from the Beersville Coal and Railway Company during the year ending December 31st, 1904, and at what price per ton?
2. What was the quality or value of this coal for steam purposes, as shown by its use on the Intercolonial Railway ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. 1,246¾ tons. $3.25 per ton.
2. Fuel inspector has not had the opportunity of testing the quality or value of this

coal, but in speaking to engineers and firemen, they say it is fairly good steam coal.

BLANK BALLOTS FOR DOMINION ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPROULE asked :

1. What is the custom of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery in issuing the blank ballots used in the Dominion elections ? How many ballots are contained on each sheet of paper ?

2. Is the paper on which the ballots are printed issued direct from the Printing Bureau to the several returning officers throughout Canada, or does it go through the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery ?

3. Are the sheets of ballot paper carefully counted before being sent out, and is a record kept of the number of sheets sent to each returning officer ? If so, under whose supervision was this done ?

4. After the issue of the sheets of ballot paper to the several returning officers for the last Dominion elections, was any complaint made to the Department of Public Printing and Stationery, or to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, by any returning officer, or by his subordinates, or by any printing establishment, that the requisite number of sheets of paper for such constituency or constituencies had not been furnished, or that the actual number of sheets was less than that which the returning officer was credited with having received ?

5. If so, in what constituency or constituencies did this occur, and what action was taken on such complaint ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

1. The main principles are : (a) To deal with no one but returning officers. (d) To have no broken packages. The ballots are issued in sheets of 4 and 2 according to the sample which I lay on the table.

2. The ballots are issued direct from the Printing Bureau to the returning officers throughout Canada without the intervention of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

3. The sheets are carefully counted before being packed. They are sent out in closed packages of three sizes only, viz : Packages of 2,000 in fours and of 1,000 and of 500 in twos. The packages are not opened after being counted. The smaller packages are used for uneven or broken thousands. The counting is done in the bindery, after cutting, by skilled hands and under the supervision of the foreman of the bindery. The packages are then finally closed and pasted up.

4. After the issue of the ballots, applications were received by the King's Printer from returning officers where the supply was insufficient. In all such cases the additional ballots required by the returning officer were sent to him, but always in whole packages. No ballots whatever were sent to any printing office but they were sent cut in sealed bags by registered post to the returning officers. No communications from others than returning officers were entertained.

Mr. EMMERSON.

5. Two complaints were made that the count of the ballot paper was wrong. One was from South Lanark the other was from Ottawa. In the case of South Lanark no additional supply was asked for. It was a question of count. In the case of Ottawa an additional quantity of 1,000 ballots was delivered to the returning officer.

DIPPER HARBOUR BREAKWATER, N.B.

Mr. DANIEL asked :

1. Who is doing the work of construction of Dipper Harbour breakwater in St. John's County, N.B. ?

2. Was the work let by tender ? If so, who were the tenderers, and what was the amount of each tender ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works):

1. Messrs. Lyons and White.

2. Yes. The two following tenders were received, viz:

Lyons and White..	$45,485
Flood and Bates..	45,800

LIFEBOAT CREWS, N.S.

Mr. SINCLAIR asked :

1. How many life boat crews, under the management of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, are stationed on the coast of Nova Scotia ?

2. What are the names of the places where so stationed ?

3. What is the name and address of each cockswain in charge in each case, and what is the number of each crew ?

4. What amount was expanded during the last fiscal year to maintain each of the said ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

1. Thirteen.

2. Blanche, Devil's Island, Clarke's Harbour, Duncan's Cove, Herring Cove, Mud Island, Pictou Island, Port Mouton, Seal Island, White Head, Yarmouth, St. Paul's Island, Scatarie.

3. Blanche ; W. A. B. Smith, crew 7, address Blanche. Clarke's Harbour ; Thomas W. Nickerson, crew 7, address Clarke's Harbour. Seal Island ; H. Hitchens, crew 7, address, Seal Island. White Head ; H. P. Munroe, crew 7, address, White Head, Duncan's Cove ; J. W. Holl, crew 7, address, Duncan's Cove. Herring Cove ; J. Gorman, crew 7, Herring Cove. Mud Island ; supplied and kept up by Mud Island Lobster Company. Scatarie ; J. T. Martell, crew 7, address, Scatarie. Baker's Cove ; A. Kane, crew 7, address, Yarmouth. Devil's Island; Geo. D. Young, crew 7, address, Devil's Island. Port Mouton ; Walter Cook, crew 7, address, Port Mouton. St. Paul's Island ; kept up by light-house staff. Pictou Island ; Alex. Currie, crew 7, address, Pictou Island.

4. Blanche, $305.96 ; Devil's Island, $237.22 ; Clarke's Harbour, $248.84 ; Duncan's Cove, $276.60 ; Herring Cove, $485.56 ;

Pictou Island, $317.69; Port Mouton, $272.97; Seal Island, $1,316.47; White Head, $316.44; Yarmouth or Baker's Cove, $276; Scatarie, $532.90.

EXPORT OF GRASS SEEDS.

Mr. COCKSHUTT—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. What was the quantity and value of our exports of red clover, alsike and timothy seed, respectively, for the years 1902, 1903 and 1904?
2. From what ports was said seed exported?
3. To what country or countries was said seed exported?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

The statistical reports make no distinction as to the classes of kinds of clover or grass seeds exported, they being classed simply as clover seed or grass seed as the case may be.

1. The quality and value of Canadian clover and grass seed exported during the fiscal years 1902, 1903 and 1904 respectively were as follows:

Fiscal Years.	Clover Seed.		Grass Seed.	
	Bush.	$	Bush.	$
1902.....	192,825	1,201,678	107,765	88,193
1903.....	113,496	839,459	65,324	75,464
1904.....	230,484	1,337,139	101,853	77,825

2. The ports from which these seeds were exported were: Montreal, St. Armand, Coaticook, Abercorn, Winnipeg, Niagara Falls, St. John, N.B., Halifax, North Sydney, Prescott, Sault Ste. Marie, Bridgeburg, Kingston, Picton, Windsor, Sarnia, Stanstead, Hemmingford, Victoria, Charlottetown, Quebec and Wallaceburg.

3. The countries to which exported were: Great Britain, Belgium, United States, Denmark, Germany, Australia, Holland, New Zealand, France, Newfoundland, Norway and Sweden, St. Pierre.

LEASE OF PROPERTY IN MONTREAL FOR IMMIGRATION SERVICE.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. Has the government recently purchased, or is it about to purchase, a property on St. Antoine street, in St. Joseph's ward of the city of Montreal, for occupation in connection with the Dominion immigration service, or for any other purpose?
2. If so, what is the street number, the cadastral division and subdivision, and the area of said property?
3. What was the purchase price paid or agreed upon?
4. From whom was the property purchased?
5. Who negotiated the sale, and what commission was paid, and to whom, on the transaction?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works). No. The premises, No. 306 St. Antoine street, Montreal, have been leased from the Rodier Estate for fifteen months, from January 21, 1905, at a rental of $1,000 per year. The immigrant hospital for the treatment of trachoma will be located therein.

STEAMER 'DE LEVIS.'

Mr. LEWIS asked:

1. Who is the owner of the steamship 'De Levis,' employed by the government in connection with the hydrographical survey of the River St. Lawrence?
2. What was the total amount paid by the government for the use of the said steamer during 1904?
3. How many days was she in use by the government?
4. What officials of the Department of Marine and Fisheries were employed in this work; how long was each in service and what remuneration did each receive?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries:

1. The government of the Dominion of Canada.
2. The government being the owner, nothing was paid for use.
3. About 210 days or the whole season of navigation.
4. Mr. P. E. Parent, $2,000 per annum, employed since 1898; Mr. Chas. E. McGreevy, $1,500 per annum, employed since 1898; Mr. Arthur Amos, $1,800 per annum, employed since 1898; Mr. A. R. Decary, $1,500 per annum, employed since 1900; Mr. John Houliston, $1,200 per annum, employed since 1901.

DOMINION LIGHTHOUSE DEPOT, KINGSTON.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. What is the total area and the cadastral designation of the property acquired by the government for the establishment of a Dominion lighthouse depot at Kingston?
2. What were the prices paid?
3. Who were the vendors, and what were the commissions on the sale, and to whom paid?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries:

1. The government has no lighthouse depot at Kingston.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Answered by No. 1.

PURCHASE OF CARBIDE.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. What quantity of carbide for acetylene gas lighting has been purchased or manufactured

by the Department of Marine and Fisheries since July 1st, 1903 ?

2. From whom have the purchases been made?

3. What have been the prices paid ?

4. Were tenders called for by public advertisement ? If not, why not ?

5. Do any contracts exist for future supply ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries :

1. 187 1-5 tons purchased; none manufactured.

2. From the Ottawa Carbide Company.

3. $65 per ton.

4. No; tenders were not called as carbide was purchased at wholesale rates in small quantities as required.

5. No.

LIGHTHOUSE DEPOT, KINGSTON.

Mr. LALOR—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Were the buildings and constructions of the government, in connection with the Dominion lighthouse depot at Kingston, erected by contract ?

2. If so, were public tenders called ; in what newspapers, and on what dates were they advertised ?

3. What tenders were received ; what were the offers, and who received the contract ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries :

1. I have again to repeat that the government has no lighthouse depot at Kingston.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Answered by No. 1.

SITE FOR MAIL DISTRIBUTING STATION, MONTREAL.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Has the government recently purchased, as a site for a mail distributing station, property in the city of Montreal, opposite the Bonaventure station of the Grand Trunk Railway ?

2. If so, what were the cadastral numbers and subdivisions of said property ?

3. What was the total area purchased ?

4. Who were the previous owners ?

5. What price was paid ?

6. Who was the agent through whom the transaction was carried on, and what was the amount of his commission ?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works):

1. Yes.

2. Cadastral lot 731 and northeast half of 732, St. Joseph's ward.

3. Area 13,395 feet.

4. Owner of lot 731, Mrs. McCrory, of lot 732, Mrs. Myler.

5. For lot 731, $25,000 and for half lot 732, $12,000.

6. U. H. Dandurand, of Montreal, commission 5 per cent. His work, however, was not confined to the simple purchase of the property, as in the case of the Myler property he had to look up the title, attend the judicial sale. as on account of the substitution, which called for court intervention, obtained information re: tenants, value of surrounding property, age and value of buildings on site, &c.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Copies of all correspondence, petitions, resolutions, reports, memoranda, in possession of the government, or any member thereof, relating to the survey and construction of branch railway lines in the province of Prince Edward Island. Also the number of surveys made in the province since 1900, the routes survey, and the cost of each.—Mr. A. Martin.

Copies of all correspondence, and despatches between the government of Canada and the Imperial government, in regard to the establishment of a branch of the Royal mint of Canada.—Mr Monk.

Return showing the respective dates of appointments of the commissioners and working staff of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Commission and the total amount expended thereon to December 31, 1904, under the heads : (a) salaries of commissioners ; (b) salaries of staff ; (c) expenses ; (d) rental of quarters.—Mr. Foster.

Statement showing the amount of money expended by the Dominion government since the first day of July, 1873, for constructing, equipping, and subsidizing railways and canals, separately, in Canada ; adding thereto the value of land given as subsidies, on the basis of one dollar value per acre ; and adding further thereto the total estimated liability incurred by Canada on account of the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. Also a statement showing separately the part of such expenditure made or to be made as above, on railways and canals separately in each province of Canada, and the Northwest Territories, deducting any sums that may have been charged any of the provinces or the Northwest Territories in their debt account with the Dominion of Canada.—Mr. A. Martin.

Copies of all correspondence in reference to the building of a new boat to be employed to maintain winter communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland of Canada. The engineer's and inspector's report of the present condition of the ss. 'Stanley' now on that route ; the repairs made ; the damage sustained by contact with heavy ice ; and any other information in regard to her age, class, &c., in any of the Government departments.—Mr. A. Martin.

Copies of all correspondence had with the government, or any member thereof, or any official under the government, relative to the appointment of returning officers for the county of Dorchester, Quebec, for the general election of 1904, and relative to the resignation of any one so appointed.—Mr. Morin.

Return showing what contracts for public works, or for supplies, have been awarded since July 1st, 1903, to other than the lowest tenderer, in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, by the authority of the Governor in Council, in the manner set forth in clause 6 of the Act 55-56 Victoria, chapter 17. Also for the names and offers of all unsuccessful tenderers in every such case, and for the reasons why any such lowest tenderer was passed over.—Mr. Lewis.

Return giving unabridged copies of all applications for the improvement of the lighthouse service, the establishment of additional aids to navigation and cognate matters received by the Lighthouse Board since the said board was constituted ; setting forth what action has been taken by the board upon each application, and also indicating what recommendations of said board have received the approval of the Honourable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.—Mr. Lewis.

Return showing the names of all persons added to the pay-roll of the Meterological service, permanently or temporarily, since June, 30, 1904, and the amount received by each to date.—Mr. Monk.

Copies of all correspondence between the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Submarine Signal Company, of Boston, U.S.A., including all contracts or agreements which may have been entered into between the aforesaid parties.—Mr. Monk.

Return showing all contracts which have since July 1st, 1903, been made or renewed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, with any person or company, for the placing, maintenance or care of harbour buoys ; giving in each case the name of the approved contractor, the annual amount of his contract, and time of its expiry ; and further indicating in what instances public tenders were not called for, and in what instances the lowest tenders were not accepted.—Mr. Ames—by Mr. Monk.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY PLANS.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (Algoma West) moved :

For a return containing a copy of the plan or plans deposited by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company with the Department of Railways and Canals, showing the proposed terminal point or points on the Pacific coast. Also for a copy of the plan or plans deposited by the said company for terminal points at Port Arthur, Fort William and Winnipeg.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). There are no plans deposited and approved in the Department of Railways and Canals. Therefore this motion could not very well pass.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) did not say 'approved.'

Mr. EMMERSON. They cannot be dealt with unless they are approved. It would not be proper to bring them before the public ; that might very well serve the interests of those who wished to indulge in speculation, but I do not think it would serve the public interest.

Mr. BOYCE. Have any plans whatever been deposited whether approved or not ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They have not been approved.

Mr. BOYCE. I asked if any have been deposited ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, some plans have been placed there, but they have not been approved.

Mr. HAGGART. Did I understand that this question was to stand or is it refused ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The attitude of the government is that as these plans have been deposited, but not approved, they cannot be brought down. I supposed this would commend itself to the sentiment of my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) and therefore I understood that the hon. member would not proceed with his motion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We would like to consider that a little ; there may be something in what is said, but I am not absolutely sure that this is right.

Motion allowed to stand.

LABOUR UNION LABELS.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 10) respecting Labour Union Labels.—Mr. Ralph Smith.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When this Bill was in committee before, I understood from the Minister of Justice that he had some observations to make on the subject, and also that he would prepare and put in proper form certain suggestions which had emanated from some members of the committee and which my hon. friend who is moving the Bill (Mr. Smith) seemed prepared to accept rather than have any further discussion. I observe that the Minister of Justice is not here this afternoon.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The observation of my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) is quite correct ; the minister (Mr. Fitzpatrick) was to look into the point which was suggested to the House by my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers). Unfortunately the Minister of Justice has to be absent from the House to-day and therefore I would move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES.

On the order :

Second reading of Bill (No. 44) to amend the Act respecting certificates to masters and mates.—Mr. Lancaster.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would ask to have this order stand.

Mr. LANCASTER. I suppose that in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And the Minister of Justice also.

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes, it would not be advisable to go on with this Bill. As two private members' days have been taken and as we are anxious to have a discussion on this Bill, although of course in the absence of the ministers, we could not very well have it to-day, I would ask the Prime

Minister to assist me to have it discussed at some future date if the taking away of the private members' days should interfere with it ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Most certainly.

SUPPLY—FREE TRANSPORTATION OF HAY ON I.C.R.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. Before we go into Supply, I would ask the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) if he will kindly facilitate the return to an order of the House in reference to the hay transported on the Intercolonial Railway. We would like to have it as soon as we possibly can.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON. I may say that the papers very largely were at Moncton and the certificates have to be gathered up at the different points all along the line. This requires considerable work, but we are expediting it.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. Before we go on I would like to suggest to the minister that it would be well to take up first those departments on which we have the Auditor General's Report. The other night we went on with some of the subsidies as to which that was not the case, but I think it was with the understanding that we should confine ourselves to those until we had worked out the departments on which the Auditor General had reported. The Department of Public Works is in this category. With regard to some at least of the steamship subsidies, we would like to have the Auditor General's Report before we pass from them. Of course, if the minister has a mind to go on with them, and let such items stand as we want a little more information on, the House having the privilege of taking any of them up again when the Auditor General's Report is down, I think that would be satisfactory.

Mr. PATERSON. If the hon. member will agree to take up the steamship subsidies to-day, I think it will please the Minister of Public Works who is very busy in his department to-day, and who asked me as a special favour to go on with these. To-morrow he will be ready to go on with his estimates. We will take what we can, with the full understanding that we may go back, as the hon. gentleman suggests.

Steam communication during the season of 1905, i.e., from the opening to the closing of navigation, between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, $12,500.

Mr. LANCASTER.

Mr. PATERSON. There is no change. The date of the contract is the 15th of March, 1900; it expires the 31st of December, 1905. The contractors are the Charlottetown Steam Navigation Co.. The steamships are the 'Northumberland,' of 1,255 tons gross, and the 'Princess,' of 541 tons gross. The terminal ports are Charlottetown, P.E.I., and Pictou, N.S.; Summerside, P.E.I., and Point du Chene, N.B. The speed of the 'Princess' is 12½ knots and that of the 'Northumberland' 15 knots. They provide a daily service between the points mentioned and a full round trip and they carry the mails.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Has the department any proposals with regard to putting on a new boat and increasing the subsidy?

Mr. PATERSON. Communications have passed between the company and the department and they are under consideration, but no change is involved in the vote now asked for. If another boat were put on or a new contract made, it would be necessary, I think, to have a supplementary vote.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Is the contract renewed?

Mr. PATERSON. I suppose the contract could be renewed during the summer.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I may state that the Board of Trade of Charlottetown passed a resolution complaining of the high rates which shippers and passengers have to pay on these boats. They also complain that while the company has a very good boat on the Summerside route, the 'Princess', which at present runs between Charlottetown and Pictou, is one which has outlasted her usefulness to a great extent, and that the large increase of trade between those two points require a much larger boat. I understand that the company are willing to put on a much larger boat, but they cannot do it with the subsidy now given. I notice that the subsidy immediately preceding this one, for communication between the mainland and the Magdalen Islands, amounts to $15,000. I am not complaining of that, but the minister and the House know that the service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland is one which the Dominion government is pledged by the terms of confederation to maintain, and the sums voted for it are ridiculously small. This steam navigation company has done a great service to the province, but the accommodation at Charlottetown at present is not equal to what the public demands. I may say that the freight on 100 lbs. of goods of the first class from St. John, N.B., to Sydney, a distance of 400 miles, is only 30c, whereas the rate from St. John to Charlottetown, a distance of only 190 miles, is 59c. This large rate is to a great extent owing to the heavy freights charged by this company, but the company says there is no remedy unless the subsidy is increased. I hope, therefore,

that when the supplementary estimates come down there will be a further vote to increase this subsidy. The trade between the province and the mainland is rapidly increasing, and it requires much better accommodation than is at present provided, especially between Charlottetown and Pictou.

Mr. EDWARD M. MACDONALD. With reference to the request of my hon. friend from Queen's, I would like to point out that there is one condition in regard to this proposed vote which seems to be applicable to every proposition that relates to communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. That is the proposition that these boats and services should be conducted entirely in the interests of Prince Edward Island, and for the sole benefit of the people of that province. I may say that those who are interested in the company which owns the boats for which this vote has been given belong entirely to Prince Edward Island. My hon. friend is quite right in stating that the service is inefficient, and that the boat now running between Charlottetown and Pictou is not at all satisfactory or fitted to cope with the large trade which has grown up and the passenger traffic between the two points. But this company has earned large dividends and has a large amount at rest, which it proposes to utilize for the purpose of obtaining a new boat; and those who live on the mainland and have occasion sometimes to visit this garden of the gulf would like to see these gentlemen who own the boats which are earning these large dividends run them with some consideration for the requirements of the people who have not the advantage of living in that favoured locality, and the government should see that they do so before granting any further favours. Should any one who happens to live on the mainland desire to visit the island, he cannot do so in less than three days, both going and returning, no matter from what part of Nova Scotia he may start. Therefore, before this company is given the slightest increase of subsidy, the government should see that it runs its boats from Charlottetown to Pictou in such a way that people living in Nova Scotia will be able to go to Charlottetown and return within twenty-four hours at least. There is no particular reason why that should not be done, and no reason why the population in Nova Scotia and the maritime provinces generally should not receive some attention from the management of this service. I need hardly remind my hon. friend that this particular company, not so very long ago, was very active in opposing before this parliament a proposition to give another company a charter to engage in this same service; and I am therefore not asking anything unreasonable when I ask that the government shall insist, before giving this company any additional subsidy or renewal of contract on its placing upon the route between Charlottetown and Pictou a larger and more commodious steamer than the one it has at present. And further, that this company should be compelled to so arrange the sailings of its boats that it would be possible for any one to leave Pictou in the morning and go to Charlottetown and return at night, instead of following the present system of having both boats leave the island in the morning, thus rendering it impossible for any one to get to and fro in any period less than three days.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I agree with my hon. friend that when the government subsidizes these boats their hours of sailing should be subject to the approval of the government. The allegation that the company is very wealthy, is one that is considerably disputed, and I am not aware that it is a matter of record that it has a large rest. If any company in Nova Scotia is ready to take hold of the service, there is nothing to prevent their getting to work; but hitherto the boat on the Summerside route has given every satisfaction, although I must say that the boat on the route between Charlottetown and Pictou is not at all adequate for the traffic, and should be replaced by a better one. Whether or not the service can be performed with the present subsidy is very doubtful, especially if the freights are kept as low as they are on other routes. We contend that the rates from any point in Canada to any point in Charlottetown should not exceed any charged on the Intercolonial Railway in other parts of Canada. Prince Edward Island has suffered extremely in that respect. The freights on those boats are extremely high. Whether that be due to the fact that the subsidy is not large enough, is one on which I am not prepared to express an opinion, but the subsidy is certainly not large. I see that we give a much larger subsidy to the service to Magdalen Island. I hope, however, that the hon. minister will see that some improvement is effected, and that is the only reason why I call his attention to the matter.

Mr. PATERSON. I take it that no fault was found with the steamer which runs between Summerside and Point Du Chêne, which makes fifteen knots an hour, but that it is the boat which runs between Pictou and Charlottetown, that only makes twelve knots an hour, that is complained of.

Steam communication from July 1st, 1905, to June 30th, 1906, between Grand Manan and the mainland, $5,000.

Mr. PATERSON. There is no change in that.

Mr. FOSTER. What boats are doing the business?

Mr. PATERSON. The Grand Manan Steamship Company are the contractors.

There is only one boat, and it carries the mails.

Steam communication during the year 1905, i.e., for not less than 52 full round weekly trips between St. John and Halifax, via Yarmouth and other way ports, $10,000.

Mr. PATERSON. There is no change in that contract. It does not expire until 1908.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What steamer performs that service ?

Mr. PATERSON. William Thompson & Co., are the contractors. It carries the mails.

Mr. FOSTER. Speaking generally with regard to all these boats, what attention does the Department of Trade and Commerce give to these different carriers so as to be informed whether they are really of service, whether their trade is increasing, and what value they are giving for the money. Some of these are valuable because communication should be kept up between the points. But most of these subsidies are paid because they are in aid of trade and commerce. A number of years ago, we made a very careful revision of the subsidies paid, and considerable changes were made. A number were cut off as not being useful, some were reduced, some were increased, and one or two new ones put on in the places of those cut off. That is, we thought it well to take stock and see whether we were paying money where there was no adequate return to the public. The list is largely increasing, I find. We are paying here $968-000—practically a million dollars in subsidies for services across the Atlantic, to West India and on local routes. I suppose the Trade and Commerce Department in some way gets at the facts with reference to these services, the volume of trade and the increase or decrease in that volume, in order that it may know whether it is right to continue or discontinue the service, or whether it would be better to increase the subsidy—because it is evidently poor policy to pay a certain amount for an inferior service if, by doubling the payment, you can secure an adequate service and increase trade between the ports touched at. Is there any system of gathering information which could serve the department and the House in judging as to the usefulnesss of these subsidies, which of them are paying, what future there is for each and, where a service is not really effective, what means would be taken to improve it ?

Mr. PATERSON. I understand from the deputy of the department that reports are received, but I do not know that they cover the information referred to. I suppose the contract provides for the carrying out of certain considerations, and this is done. But I gather that the only other information is in the form of complaints from parties who object that the contracts are not carried out. I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) to ask if there is any systematic report from which the House could judge whether the subsidy has been effective in promoting trade. I understand that there are no such reports.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Would it not be a good idea for the government, through some minister, to make a statement reviewing this whole vote, so that the House and the country might be able to judge whether it is conferring any benefit. If this cannot be done this year it should be understood that the government will be prepared next year to justify these votes or to suggest some improvement. An expenditure so great as this should certainly be reviewed on the basis of information by the House, that the public may know whether they are getting any thing for their money.

Mr. PATERSON. I may supplement what I said by what the deputy minister now tells me. It does not contradict what I said before but adds to it. Before payment is made the customs officers and postal authorities have to sign certificates that the work imposed by the contract has been properly performed. That, of course, does not necessarily affect the question of increase in internal commerce through the subsidy. It does show that there is some supervision and that subsidies are not paid without assurance that the service has been performed. But I do not think there is any information before the department bearing upon the question of the effect of these subsidies in increasing trade.

Mr. SPROULE. That, however, is the important part of it. Subsidies were given first in hopes of developing trade by that means. I know that, in some cases, the Minister of Trade and Commerce stated to the House that the subsidy was given in anticipation of developing a good trade. If it is found that trade cannot be developed by this means, it would be wise to stop the subsidy. There should be some data presented to the House to enable it to judge of the usefulness of these subsidies, and so to justify our action in voting them.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister will see that the supervision he speaks of is merely mechanical supervision. Certificates are demanded showing that certain trips were made. But whether the vessel sailed light or full laden is not shown. I make the suggestion I do because I think if it were carried out it would help in the intelligent consideration of this question. And the question must be considered sooner or later, because the country will not go on voting a million dollars for steamship services without demanding to know whether value is received or not. Demands are coming in for new services, and, as all demands cannot be met, we must judge for which our money should be spent. There are custom house

officers who could give information, and the officers of the vessels themselves could return the volume of trade from year to year and also the kind of trade, which would be valuable information for the House to have as showing the development of the inter-port commerce of the country. The minister said that complaints have been made as to some of these services. I suppose these complaints have been investigated. If not, they ought to be. Then, by simple process of reporting in answer to questions framed and sent out by the department to the proper officers of the government and of the vessels themselves, much information could be gathered. If that has not been done, I hope that before next year it will be done, for we must look at these things from a business point of view and not give subsidies simply because certain persons ask for them, but because they are in the public interest.

Mr. DANIEL. The steamer that performs this service was equipped specially for this route and this purpose, and I presume that she was built of such a size and character as would enable her adequately to perform the service expected of her.

Mr. PATERSON. Speaking individually, it seems to me that the remarks of the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) are very practical, and I do not see that it is at all an impossible thing to get what he requires. Also speaking personally, and with such knowledge as I have, I should think it would be very important that we should have that information. Is it wise to keep this thing on at all ? On the other hand, if the traffic is greatly increased, do they require as much subsidy as they are getting ? I think the observation is a practical one, and well worthy of consideration, and I have no doubt it will be brought to the minister's attention through the 'Hansard.' Further than that, I cannot say, but it seems to me it is a practical suggestion, and that some way ought to be found of carrying it out.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is not that the very work this Department of Trade and Commerce was created for ? Some years ago a new department called the Department of Trade and Commerce was created at a large expense, and a minister was put in charge of it, and this matter especially was one of those to come under his control. The hon. gentleman in assuming a responsibility of that kind should be prepared to justify all these expenditures, and to give a general report and review of the situation. I hope that next year, if not this year, parliament will be given some information from the Minister of Trade and Commerce in regard to this very item. It is a large item, and concerns the development of our trade, and we ought to have some report from him showing whether the money we are spending is developing our trade or not.

Steam communication during the season of 1905, that, from the opening to the closing of navigation, between St. John and Minas Basin ports, $3,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What boat is that ?

Mr. PATERSON. The 'Brunswick.' There is no change from last year.

Steam communication from July 1st, 1905, to June 30th, 1906, between Pictou, Murray Harbour, Georgetown and Montague Bridge, $1,200.

Mr. FOSTER. What boat is doing that work ?

Mr. PATERSON. The 'Electra.'

Mr. FOSTER. What is the tonnage ?

Mr. PATERSON. I have not the tonnage.

Mr. ALEXANDER MARTIN. I know this vessel, it is not of large tonnage, but she is performing an excellent service. She makes weekly trips, and has been of great advantage to the people on the route.

Mr. PATERSON. She calls at Bridge Point, Murray Harbour north, Murray Harbour south, and Murray river.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister might take a note of it and tell us on another occasion.

Steam communication from July 1st, 1905, to June 30th, 1906, between Quebec and Gaspe Basin, touching at intermediate ports, $8,500.

Mr. PATERSON. That touches at a great many ports. The vessel is the 'Gaspesia', of 490 tons gross, and 287 tons net, 160 feet long by 27 feet broad.

Mr. INGRAM. Have any changes been made in the figures of this item from last year ?

Mr. PATERSON. There was an increase, I am told.

Mr. INGRAM. What was the figure brought down in the estimates last year ?

Mr. PATERSON. $7,500 in the main estimates, and then $1,000 extra in the supplementaries.

Hon. R. LEMIEUX (Solicitor General). The increase of $1,000 in this service was given to pay her for stopping at a greater number of ports. Formerly the boat only stopped at intermediate ports in the county of Gaspé, and last year there was a request that came from several localities in the county of Rimouski to be benefited by her service, and the boat now stops at five or six additional ports, for which $1,000 additional is given. I may say that this boat gives a very good service to that coast. As the hon. gentleman knows, there is no communication from Summit or Métis, on the Intercolonial with the other side of the peninsula, as far as Paspebiac. It is a mountainous region, and there are several little coves on the coast, and settlements of

fishermen, who now can send their fish to Quebec, Montreal and other places by this boat.

Mr. FOSTER. What general work does a boat like that do ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It carries something like 200 passengers, I think 150 second class and 50 first class.

Mr. FOSTER. How many trips does she give ?

Mr. PATERSON. Two round trips a month.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the distance ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think it is something like 800 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. How many knots ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. About 11 knots.

Steam communication between a port or ports in Prince Edward Island and a port or ports in Great Britain, $7,000.

Mr. ANGUS A. McLEAN. I think this service could be greatly improved. There was great dissatisfaction in the province with reference to the time of sailings of these vessels, and the rates of freight charged. The shippers claim that the contract should provide explicitly for same freight rates charged in Montreal, St. John and Halifax. These vessels in many cases charged higher rates than could be obtained at either Montreal, St. John or Halifax.

Mr. PATERSON. I believe only $2,500 were paid last year, because they had not carried out the full requirements of the contract.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Shippers in Prince Edward Island are anxious to obtain boats under the contract to run to Liverpool as that market suits most of them better than Manchester. Is it the intention of the government to arrange for such a service ?

Mr. PATERSON. The subject is under consideration, I am told, now, a decision not having yet been arrived at. The parties who had the contract before were the Manchester Liners, Limited. The steamship was the 'Manchester Trader', 3,318 tons gross. This vessel ran apparently between Manchester and Charlottetown. A subsidy of $7,000 was granted but only $2,500 of this was earned.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. How many trips were made ?

Mr. PATERSON. One trip only.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the contract for a summer service?

Mr. PATERSON. The contract provided for two complete round trips, the first prior to October, 1904, and the second prior to December 15, 1904. But, they only made one trip.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. minister ought to give some reason why they did not make both trips.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I understand that during 1903, only $1,500 was paid for one trip. Why should they be paid $2,500 for the same service last year ?

Mr. PATERSON. It is explained to me that $2,500 was paid last season. The $1,500 to which the hon. gentleman refers was a sum that was held back because of a dispute with some of the shippers. But, the dispute being finally adjusted the claim was paid. The steamship company settled with the shippers and their claim was paid. I suppose the hon. gentleman is more anxious to know what we are going to do in the future.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I do not understand that explanation quite.

Mr. PATERSON. I understand that there were $1,500 claimed by the steamship company.

Mr. FOSTER. On what?

Mr. PATERSON. On subsidy and that there was a dispute between them and the shippers. The $1,500 was held back until they made a satisfactory arrangement with the shippers.

Mr. FOSTER. What kind of an arrangement was that?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman may make it plain by informing the committee as to what is the basis of payment. Is it so much per trip or is it in proportion of the freight carried?

Mr. PATERSON. The basis seems to be, from the information before me, that this was a subsidy of $7,000 to complete two round voyages. It is provided that the freight rates are not to be greater between the ports mentioned than those between Montreal and Manchester and it is probable under that clause of the contract that a question would arise as to that between the steamship company and the shippers. I am supposing that. It looks a reasonable supposition, does it not? Owing to the fact of the shippers not being satisfied in reference to this a portion of the subsidy amounting to $1,500 was kept back until they arranged with the shippers and the matter having been satisfactorily arranged the $1,500 was paid.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the complaint?

Mr. PATERSON. It appears that a large quantity of live stock that was to be sent over in this boat had been taken to certain ports at which the steamer did not call. Therefore a great deal of loss was inflicted upon those parties who expected to ship by the steamer and for that

reason the steamship company had to settle with these people. Complaints had reached the Department of Trade and Commerce and they retained $1,500 of the amount claimed by the company until a satisfactory settlement was made. A settlement having been made they paid the amount.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Have these shippers been paid the losses which they sustained?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes. The deputy thought that the members from Prince Edward Island would know the facts of the case.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I would like the hon. minister to bring down the names of those to whom the money was paid. I am informed that the shippers have not been paid and that a suit is now pending in the courts against Furness-Withy & Co., to recover an amount for the loss incurred. I think this item should be allowed to stand until that information is brought down.

Mr. PATERSON. Certainly.

Mr. INGRAM. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that $7,000 was voted last year and that only $2,500 was expended?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, I am told so. Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. A. McLean) say that it was the Furness-Withy Line?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. The Manchester Line?

Mr. PATERSON. I thought the hon. gentleman said Furness-Withy & Co.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. It is controlled by Furness-Withy & Co.

Mr. PATERSON. This item had better stand.

Mr. INGRAM. There was $3,500 asked for first and the reason given for the increase to $7,000 was that you wanted to increase this service. It is a strange thing that you want more money when you only spent $2,500 of the $7,000 asked for last year.

Mr. PATERSON. This contract has expired and they are expecting to be able to effect a contract which will be better carried out than this one.

Mr. INGRAM. They got the same amount exactly last year, $7,000. Why were they not able to carry out the same service then that they wish to carry out now?

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman. It has been unsatisfactory apparently. The contract may not be made with the same company. The right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, with this vote at his disposal, will be enabled to make a new contract. This, on the face of it looks to have been a very unsatisfactory one.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. minister what was said in regard to the freight rates. I gather from his memorandum of the contract that the freight rates were not to be greater than those between Montreal and Manchester.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is stated by one of the hon. members for Queen's that the rates charged were much higher. Perhaps then the hon. minister will give us some information about that when the item comes up again. It is important to know about that because it seems to be a violation of the contract?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, that was one of the points of the contract.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the port at which she did not stop one of the ports at which she should have stopped under the contract?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, I hope the hon. minister will give us some information as to why, if she did not stop at the ports called for under the contract, the money was paid?

Mr. A. MARTIN. Last year, $7,000 was placed in the estimates in the expectation that there would be a larger number of trips between the province of Prince Edward Island and Great Britain than formerly. Any person can understand that one trip between Prince Edward Island and Great Britain is not what the province should have. Not only was there only one trip made, but the rates charged for that trip were excessively high. In the production of cattle, sheep, bacon, ham, eggs, butter and cheese, there is no similar area in the Dominion of Canada that can equal the province of Prince Edward Island and without adequate shipping facilities the farmers are very much handicapped. We know very well now that Great Britain is our market but what position is Prince Edward Island in? The first thing that our exporters have to do is to ship their goods to Halifax and then tranship them to the vessel from Halifax to the old country. Thus they are handicapped in every way, and I think that in place of having one trip per annum Prince Edward Island should have at least seven trips. Every time that the boat did come to the port at Charlottetown she could not accommodate all the freight that was offered, and the cold storage accommodation was not at all sufficient, and yet they think they are doing a great deal for Prince Edward Island by giving one trip per annum. They are only showing the people of Prince Edward what they are losing by not being in communication with Great Britain and not having the subsidies that the other provinces have. If the Minister of Trade and Commerce would see that these four or five

trips are provided for this service he would be doing an immense service for the province. If you compare the daily market quotations for Montreal and Prince Edward Island you will find that the quotations for pork, beef and ham, are two cents a pound lower in Prince Edward Island, mainly because the farmer of Prince Edward Island has first to ship his produce to Halifax or Montreal and then to ship it back to the old country from there all owing to the fact that they have not the direct accommodation. When you look at this page and see the amount of subsidies it is appalling. I do not believe that it is any too much, but I think the province of Prince Edward Island should figure a little larger and that at least four or five trips should be given to Prince Edward Island. I think you could get a steamer that would perform that service for $1,500 in subsidies for each trip. I would like to know all the particulars of this $2,500 as there seems to be something a little shady about it, but we will get to the bottom of it a little later on. My object is to call attention to the position the province occupies.

Mr. PATERSON. As the item stands I will say very little about it. The hon. gentleman's statement is important if it is only for the purpose of pressing these matters on the minister, and I shall repeat my understanding of his statement to be quite sure that I am correct and to know just what I can say to the minister in charge. The hon. gentleman thinks there is trade enough to warrant four or five round trips in the year ?

Mr. A. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON. He thinks that there will be so much trade offering that $1,500 per round trip would be sufficient payment, that is, that for the subsidy here he thinks the minister would be warranted in the strength of his statement in saying to the steamship people that they would be sufficiently remunerated for making four or five trips for that amount of money, that he would be moderately safe in assuring them that they could have a full cargo for the trip ?

Mr. A. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON. I would ask one more question ; what would be the hon. gentleman's suggestion as to the date of these trips, should there be two in the fall and two in the spring ; or should they all be subsequent to the harvest ?

Mr. A. MARTIN. In reply to that, I remember a few years ago bringing this up in the House. I think the Minister of Agriculture was in the House and that he promised a trip in the spring, but after the farmers of Prince Edward Island had fattened their cattle and got them ready for shipment the boat did not arrive and large loss was the result. There might be one or two trips in the spring and two or three trips in the fall and I think there would be ample freight for this number of trips. As to the question as to whether the $1,500 would be sufficient I have only taken what my colleague says. Freights of course may vary, but I would say that as a general thing $1,500 would be a fair subsidy, but whether the subsidy be $1,500 or $2,000 I think it would be money well spent.

Mr. PATERSON. This is an important service evidently if it can be developed, because it is an export trade, in which, if a good arrangement is made and the foreign market is stimulated, it will be an advantage to all Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. I cannot understand how there comes to be a dispute between the vessel owner and the shipper. Are you dividing this money between them, or are you giving some consideration to the shipper ?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know ; there is a statement to come down giving the whole thing.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I think I can explain shortly. The steamer usually leaves Halifax or St. John and she has to go around to Charlottetown ; that is the reason for the subsidy. She has to go out of her way to get to Charlottetown. The vessel would be partly loaded leaving either of these ports and the dispute with reference to the trade is with the shippers.

Mr. SPROULE. The point I am interested in is whether the shipper gets any consideration for supplying the freight. Do you make a reduction in his freight or something of that kind ? They are claiming damages on account of the boat failing to keep her contract and calling for cargo.

Mr. PATERSON. At the proper port and time.

Direct fortnightly steam service between Montreal, Quebec and Manchester, England, during the summer season, and between St. John, Halifax and Manchester, during the winter season, $35,000.

Mr. PATERSON. We have six steamers engaged in this service, the 'Manchester City,' the 'Manchester Commerce,' the 'Manchester Trader,' the 'Manchester Corporation,' the 'Manchester Importer' and the 'Manchester Shipper.' This service is between Manchester and Montreal, calling at Quebec both ways, and in winter between Manchester and St. John, calling at Halifax. It is a regular fortnightly service ; the steamers carry mails and cold storage is stipulated for in the contract.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They are paid by the round trip ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How much per trip ?

Mr PATERSON. We do not pay by the trip, we pay the $35,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. $35,000 to one particular line ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, but with several vessels.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How many trips ?

Mr. PATERSON. It is a regular fortnightly service and if they fail for a trip the amount is deducted.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. minister mentions a boat, the 'Manchester Trader.' Is that the same vessel which is mentioned in connection with item 166 which we have just been discussing ?

Mr. PATERSON. I would not wonder, after the explanation of the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. A. A. McLean), that the boat does not go from St. John alone, but leaves Halifax and calls there. The Manchester Line apparently does the Charlottetown service.

Mr. INGRAM. So that votes 166 and 167 are related to each other to the extent that by one vote you pay $35,000 and the other $7,000, but the same boat provides the service stipulated for in each vote.

Mr. PATERSON. The information which I have is a little different from what the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. McLean) states. The understanding of the deputy is that the business with Charlottetown is done by a vessel subsidized for that purpose, and not by one of the regular liners between Montreal and Manchester. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the boat that was performing this work came from Halifax or some port partly loaded, and completed her cargo at Charlottetown.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. That is the fact. It was the case with all the boats that called there last fall.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Does this contract cover a period of years or is it an annual contract ?

Mr. PATERSON. It was made on October 6, 1904, became operative on July 3, and expires on July 1, 1905.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the conditions of the contract as to trips ?

Mr. PATERSON. It is for a regular fortnightly service, carrying mails and providing cold storage. In summer the terminal points are Manchester and Montreal, calling at Quebec both ways, and in winter Manchester and St. John, calling at Halifax.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any penalty for mal-performance ?

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, yes. That is stipulated in all contracts. The penalty is a deduction pro rata.

Mr. FOSTER. Have they performed their contract absolutely ?

Mr. PATERSON. Absolutely, I am told.

Steam communication during the season of 1905-6 between Baddeck, Grand Narrows, Iona, Big Pond and East Bay, $5,000.

Mr. PATERSON. There is no change in this contract. It expires April 15, 1906. It is one of our local services and the mail vessels carry the mails.

Steam communication during the season of 1905, that is, from the opening to the closing of navigation, betwen Port Mulgrave, St. Peters, Irish Cove, Marble Mountain, and other ports on the Bras d'Or Lakes, $6,000.

Mr. PATERSON. There is no change in this. The contract runs till the close of navigation this year. It includes the carrying of the mails. Two full round trips are made each week between Port Mulgrave, St. Peters, Irish Cove and Grand Narrows, and four full round trips each week between Grand Narrows and Marble Mountain, two of which extend to East Bay.

Mr. FOSTER. What boats are doing that?

Mr. PATERSON. The steamer 'Bega.'

Steam communication during the season of 1905, that is, from the opening to the closing of navigation, between Gaspe Basin and Dalhousie or Campbellton, $12,500.

Mr. FOSTER. Explain this. What improvements are expected, if any ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. This service was performed by the steamer 'Admiral' until last year. She ran between Dalhousie in the county of Restigouche and stopped at all ports in the county of Bonaventure and the county of Gaspé until she reached Gaspé Basin. Last year it was found that the 'Admiral' could not any longer serve the purposes for which she had been subsidized during the years previous, as she was too old. Therefore a new boat, the 'Restigouche,' was put on by the contractor. She was a good boat, but too slow. Then the department decided, at the request of my hon. friend the Deputy Speaker, the hon. member for Restigouche and myself, to call for new tenders. A company was formed at Campbellton, the Interprovincial Navigation Company of Canada, composed of merchants of New Brunswick, especially of Campbellton and Dalhousie, and others of the counties of Bonaventure and Gaspé. They subscribed a capital of something like $97,000; and, after having obtained the contract from the Department of Trade and Commerce, they ordered a new boat from Scotland, a model of which was exhibited a short time ago in room 16. The new boat has been christened the 'Lady Eileen,' after the daughter of our late Governor General. She is one of the best boats on Canadian waters, and will, I am sure, give satisfaction to all

parties concerned. There is a change made in the terminals. Hitherto the terminal in New Brunswick has been Dalhousie; but it has been decided, at the request of the people, to have the terminal in future at Campbellton, which is on the main line of the Intercolonial Railway, and where new wharf accommodation, with freight sheds, will be provided for the public. I am sure that the Baie des Chaleurs will gain considerably by this new boat. It will attract not only business men, but tourists. The 'Admiral' was so old that tourists would no longer travel in her, but with this new boat that travel will no doubt revive and prove very remunerative to the coast of Gaspé and Bonaventure.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the voyage begin at Campbellton and be interrupted at Dalhousie a whole night?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The boat will start from Campbellton for Dalhousie and then cross to Carleton and will stop at every harbour as far as Gaspé Basin. The boat is the 'Lady Eileen' and her length is 180 feet, and I am sure she will be the best of her kind in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. What I want to know is whether or not she will lay over night at Dalhousie and start from there in the morning?

Mr. LEMIEUX. She will stop at Dalhousie and then go on. She will reach Gaspé at nine p.m.

Mr. FOSTER. What is her speed?

Mr. PATERSON. 12 knots.

Mr. INGRAM. What has been done with the 'Restigouche' and the 'Admiral'?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The 'Admiral' is at the bottom of the sea and the 'Restigouche' was there only to replace the 'Admiral.'

Steam communication during the season of 1905, that is, from the opening to the closing of navigation, between Pictou and Cheticamp, $2,000.

Mr. PATERSON. The contract expires at the close of navigation.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this amount to resuscitate?

Mr. PATERSON. I suppose it is to make a new contract.

Steam communication from April 1, 1905, to March 31, 1906, between Port Mulgrave and Canso, and between Port Mulgrave and Guysborough, and from the opening to the closing of navigation in 1905, between Port Mulgrave, Margaree and Cheticamp, $8,000.

Mr. PATERSON. This contract was made in 1902 and expires this year.

Mr. INGRAM. Are there any complaints now about the train connections with these vessels?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I think the time has come when the contractors should furnish a better boat. The service is performed by two steamers—one from Guysborough to the coast of Inverness, one trip each week, and the other making a direct service between the Intercolonial Railway and the town of Canso, about twenty-seven miles. The service to Guysborough and the coast of Inverness is very satisfactorily performed by a boat called the Malcolm Cann. The other boat plying on the Canso route is an old boat, to which we have been paying a subsidy for about ten years, and while she is doing the work fairly well, the people there think the time has come when we should have a better boat. As the contract will shortly expire, I wish to suggest to the hon. minister that he should communicate with the contractors and ascertain whether they will not furnish a larger and more commodious boat for the Canso route. The trade has grown considerably during the last few years, especially the fresh fish trade. This boat starts in the early morning, meets the express train at Mulgrave, and her cargo of fresh fish is sent by fast express to Montreal. This trade has grown considerably, and sometimes the boat is too small for the business, especially at certain seasons of the year. The passenger accommodation is also poor and the contractors should be asked to improve the service.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population of Canso?

Mr. SINCLAIR. 2,300.

Mr. FOSTER. What was paid for this boat 'John L. Camp?'

Mr. PATERSON. The subsidy to the two was $8,000 and they get it between them. The request of the hon. gentleman with regard to the framing of another contract will be brought to the attention of the minister.

Mr. FOSTER. That adds force to what I said a little while ago. We should have some supervision over all those services. If that fresh fish trade is important, as no doubt it is, and the vessel too small, it seems to me that more ought to be required for that amount of subsidy. You are paying those two small vessels $8,000, as much nearly as you are paying on the Prince Edward Island route for a double service. It seems to be a very large subsidy for two very small vessels and one of them a very old one.

Steam service during the year 1905, between St. Stephen, N.B., St. Croix River Points, Deer Island, Campobello and the inner islands, Passamaquoddy Bay, L'Etête or Black Bay, $3,000.

Mr. PATERSON. There is no change in that, the contract has run out and has to be renewed.

Steam service during the year 1905, between Quebec and Blanc Sablon, calling at ports along

the northern shore of the River St. Lawrence between such terminals, $8,000.

Mr. FOSTER. That seems to be a new service ?

Mr. PATERSON. No, it is not a new service ; it was entered into three years ago. The contract terminates at the close of navigation 1904.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is Blanc Sablon ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Almost at the Strait of Belle Isle.

Mr. FOSTER. How many trips does the vessel make, and what is her size ?

Mr. PATERSON. She makes a semi-monthly trip from Quebec to Natashquan, one trip each season to be extended to Blanc Sablon. The steamer is the 'King Edward,' and the contractors are Messrs. Holliday Brothers. The steamer carries the mail.

Mr. FOSTER. What is her tonnage ?

Mr. PATERSON. I have not that information.

Steam service during the season of 1905 between Sydney, C.B., and Bay St. Lawrence, calling at way ports, $1,500.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is this ?

Mr. PATERSON. This seems to be a new contract, entered into on the 25th of January, but a renewal of an old service on the same terms. From the opening of navigation to the 15th of June, and from the 15th of October to the close of navigation each year, that is, until the ice will not permit of the running of a steamer over the routes, one full round trip between Sydney and St. Ann's bay, calling both going and returning at North Sydney, Breton Cove, Englishtown and North river, and one full round trip each week between Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence, calling both going and returning at North Sydney, Ingonish, Neil's harbour, Aspy bay and Cape North ; and from the 15th day of June until the 15th day of October two full round trips each week between Sydney and Neil's harbour, calling both going and returning at North Sydney and Ingonish, one trip each week to be extended to Bay St. Lawrence, with calls at Aspy and Cape North. The vessel is the 'Weymouth,' and she carries the mails. The contract runs until the close of navigation 1908.

Weekly service between Halifax and Canso, from July 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906, $4,000.

Mr. PATERSON. There is no change in that. The contract runs until the 30th of June, 1908.

Mr. FOSTER. What vessel is performing this service ?

Mr. PATERSON. The 'Lunenburg' and the 'Strathcona.'

Mr. FOSTER. What is the distance around from the Intercolonial terminus to Canso ?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Thirty-seven miles.

Mr. FOSTER. I should think these places would get the mails more quickly from the Intercolonial.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. The vessel calls for mails along the route.

Mr. PATERSON. The ports are Port Dufferin, Sonora, Isaac's harbour, Goldboro' and Whitehead.

Winter steam navigation during the winter of 1905-6 between Quebec and the St. Lawrence harbours down to Murray Bay and River Ouelle, $12,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is this service ?

Mr. PATERSON. The minister is asking to have this vote placed at his disposal to make a contract, but no contract has yet been made. A proper vessel has not been found to take up the service.

Mr. FOSTER. Better let the item stand.

Mr. PATERSON. I am not at the moment in a position to explain the item, so we will let it stand.

Summer service between Murray Bay and River Ouelle, $6,000.

Mr. PATERSON. No contract has been awarded for this yet.

Mr. FOSTER. Better let it stand.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The item will stand.

Steam service between Victoria, Vancouver, way ports and Skagway, $12,500.
Steam service between Victoria and west coast of Vancouver Island, $5,000.

Mr. PATERSON. The same contractors carry on these two services, and there does not appear to have been any change. The contractors are the Canadian Pacific Navigation Company. The vessels are 'Princess May', 'Tees,' 'Amur' and 'Queen City.' There are three routes. Route A is from Victoria and Vancouver to Skagway four complete round trips during June, July, August, September and October ; three complete round trips during March, April and May, and two complete round trips during May, November and December, and January and February. Route B, from Victoria, Vancouver, Naas harbour and Skidegate, calling at way ports, two round trips each month. Route C, Victoria and Ahousset, Quatsino and Cape Scott and way ports, four round trips from April to September, inclusive, as follows:—Two from Victoria to Ahousset, one to Ahousset and Quatsino and Cape Scott. During the remaining months three round trips from Victoria to Ahousset, one to be continued to Cape Scott, calling at way ports. The

vote is for $5,000. There is an increase of $2,500, which is to improve the service.

Mr. FOSTER. What improvement does the minister get for this added $2,500 ?

Mr. PATERSON. He expects to get better boats.

Mr. FOSTER. In what way ? What have we now, and what does the minister intend to demand ?

Mr. PATERSON. The service expires in June of this year, and this vote is taken to enable us to stipulate for a better service.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see that that is a very shadowy explanation. The minister must have a mind of his own He seems to know what the defect is, and what will remedy that defect. When he comes down to parliament asking for blank powers, he ought to tell us in what way he proposes to make the service better before he gets an extra vote. I suppose there is trouble in the quality of the boat, in speed, or in size.

Mr. PATERSON. Frequency of the trips, I fancy.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister tell us what he proposes to get, or let the item stand.

Mr. PATERSON. The matter is under consideration. It is not an unusual thing to place a sum at the disposal of the minister where a contract has been made. It would be a subject for criticism next year as to whether it was a wise contract.

Mr. FOSTER. How many extra trips does he expect to get ?

Mr. PATERSON. I am told it is what we have at present.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister know any more than he is telling us ?

Mr. PATERSON. No. This is a very reliable company. It will be a question as to whether they will consent to do any more than they are doing for $2,500. The minister would like to get more frequent trips, and he is asking for $2,500 more than the present contract calls for, so that if it is necessary to secure what he wants, if he can get it for $2,500, he wants the sanction of parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the minister can get the vote he must tell the House what his idea is as to improvements, then we will have something to hold the minister to.

Mr. PATERSON. In what particulars does the hon. gentleman mean ?

Mr. FOSTER. In whatever particulars the improvement is to be made, whether in size, or speed, or frequency.

Mr. PATERSON. Then we will have to let the item stand.

Mr. PATERSON.

Steam communication between Prince Edward Island, Cape Breton and Newfoundland, $8,000.

Mr. PATERSON. This contract has expired. The service was performed by the steamer 'Elliott,' which was wrecked. It was a fortnightly service between the points named in the vote. We have not found another boat yet, and we would like the money to find one.

Mr. MARTIN. I may say this was a very useful service to the ports at which the boat stopped. How many trips did she make ?

Mr. PATERSON. It was a fortnightly service between the points named. Fifteen hundred dollars was paid before the contract expired.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Have they advertised for another service ?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Had'nt they better get busy ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, if they want to carry on the work.

Mr. FOSTER. Who administers the Department of Trade and Commerce now, or is it an ornament ?

Mr. PATERSON. No, it is very efficiently managed. I regret the minister is not in the House now.

Mr. FOSTER. If we were to judge from the infantile remarks of the minister who is explaining these votes, it is not well managed.

Mr. PATERSON. That is a fair reflection on the minister who is explaining the votes but it would not apply to the minister at the head of the department. If my explanations are not very lucid, the committee has the satisfaction of knowing that the expenditure of the money is in the hands of a gentleman in whom the committee has full confidence that the public interest will be guarded in every way.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Will the minister call for tenders for another boat to perform this service ?

Mr. PATERSON. I am afraid there will have to be another stand of this vote.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I am sure the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Martin) is not unaware of the fact that for years a steam service has been in operation between Prince Edward Island and the ports of Cape Breton and Newfoundland, during the season of navigation, and I do not see what necessity there is for this subsidy. They are performing the service now, and have been for a number of years, without any subsidy.

Mr. FOSTER. But the vessel has gone to the bottom of the sea.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I am speaking of another, an independent service.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there another service being performed ?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Yes, on the same route, between Charlottetown and the various ports of Cape Breton and Newfoundland. There is a regular line of steamers from Charlottetown, North Sydney and Sydney to St. Johns, Newfoundland. Surely my hon. friend representing the city of Charlottetown is not aware of the fact that for years this service has been in operation.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I am well aware of the object of the service. There must have been some reason for making provision for another service. I think the service the hon. gentleman alludes to is one for his province, but there are other provinces in Canada besides his own. I think he will find that this service to Newfoundland is a very important one, and one for which another boat should be provided. If the service is such as the hon. gentleman describes, there was no necessity for this vote last year. He was in his place, I suppose, and knows what information was given to the committee at that time. I think the service is highly beneficial to the trade between Newfoundland and this country, and anything we can do to increase the trade between Canada and Newfoundland is a move in the right direction. That trade is rapidly passing from Canada to the neighbouring republic, and anything we can do to keep it for Canada should be done.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I am not offering any opposition to the subsidy which is proposed to be voted. I do say, however, that it is unfair that a rival company should be subsidized to do business in opposition to a company which has been doing a fair business for a number of years. I represented to the Department of Trade and Commerce at the time that if this subsidy were to be granted it should be given to the company that had been performing the service for a number of years. I represented that it was unfair that a rival company should be subsidized. I still think so. I will support the proposition that this subsidy be voted, but I say it should go to the pioneer company, to the company that has been doing good work in years past, to the company that proposes to continue that work and to the company that has given very excellent service from the best information that I can obtain.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I am not very particularly concerned as to which company performs the service. I would be perfectly satisfied to give it to the company the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. Johnston) may be interested in.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I am not interested in any company.

Mr. A. MARTIN. You may be interested.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I am not.

Mr. A. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman says that he opposes the payment of this subsidy to any other company, but does not oppose the vote.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. No.

Mr. A. MARTIN. The only object I have in view in calling attention to it is that somebody should be called upon to perform the service. To the company spoken of I have no objection. All I desire is that that service shall be performed in an efficient manner.

Mr. PATERSON. Tenders will be called for, no doubt, and this company will tender.

Mr. FOSTER. This is rather an interesting feature that is brought up. Here is one hon. gentleman who says that for a number of years a capable and full service has been carried out by a line of vessels that is doing the work and doing it well. Suddenly, for some reason or other, against this old and well established line a subsidized line is placed on the route to perform exactly the same service as has been explained by the hon. member for Cape Breton. Is that part of the policy of the Department of Trade and Commerce, or the government ? The hon. member for Cape Breton, says that he is not averse to the subsidy being given if it goes to the old company, but there is just where the crux of the position is. If a company has been for years doing the service and doing it well, making enough out of it to give a good service and to pay its way, why in the world does the government stick its nose in with a new subsidized line ? Are the routes exactly the same ? Do the vessels start from the same ports, touch at the same ports, go to the same ports and return to the same ports, and is the Department of Trade and Commerce doing everywhere what it is doing with these boats ? If that is so it is rather a remarkable thing. I think the hon. minister had better let this stand and I think he had better let it stand a long time.

Mr. PATERSON. If you want it dropped, why, say so.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I have great faith in my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. A. Martin) and he has great faith just at this particular time in the Department of Trade and Commerce, but with all that I think the chamber should have an explantion.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I think I can give the information about this. The boats from Montreal call at Charlottetown and Sydney and their final destination is St. John's, Newfoundland. But, they return without calling at these ports and the government, to develop trade and to get the steamers on their return from Newfoundland and Sydney

to call at Charlottetown, have offered this subsidy. That is the reason.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. minister will have to look into that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Drop it.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I think the explanation given by my hon. friend (Mr. A. A. McLean) will be sufficient to give hon. gentlemen opposite pause before they drop it. The reason for the subsidy is that at present these boats do not return by way of Charlottetown.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, the contract has expired, and no new contract has been made. Of course, if there is a line doing the service and answering the purpose——

Mr. A MARTIN. No, they are only answering it half way. There is no return trade.

Mr. PATERSON. As to the larger question raised by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) as to the wisdom of subsidizing a line of steamers anywhere coming into competition with independent lines, it is a question just how far you ought to go in that direction. It would not be confined to these local routes but it would go beyond. The whole question is raised as to the wisdom of giving any subsidies at all.

Mr. FOSTER. You get into that when you get into the ocean steamship subsidies.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, but apparently there seems to be a misunderstanding in this. The hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island says that the service alluded to by my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. A. Johnston) is not the same service.

Mr. FOSTER. In that case it certainly becomes the duty of the hon. minister to bring down the correct information. He had better let this stand.

Mr. PATERSON. The only question is whether we shall drop this item.

Mr. FOSTER. Why should you drop it on insufficient information ? The hon. minister does not know whether these are or are not identical routes. If they are identical routes there is something to be looked into but my hon. friend (Mr. A. Martin) says the routes are not identical.

Mr. A. MARTIN. No.

Mr. PATERSON. And my hon. friend (Mr. A. Johnston) says they are.

Mr. FOSTER. We do not believe the hon. member for Cape Breton or the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. We must have the hon. minister bring down the information.

Mr. INGRAM. Last year the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce pledged himself to one of his own supporters that he would have these vessels running over the same route both going and returning, and on the strength of that pledge this vote was passed. Do I understand that the Department of Trade and Commerce is not going to carry out the promise made by the right hon. minister in this House last year ?

Mr. PATERSON. In reference to this ?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know what arrangement was made. I did not hear the first part of the hon. gentleman's remarks, but the contract has expired. What was the promise last year ? Does the hon. gentleman have it before him ?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, and perhaps it would be best to put it on 'Hansard :'

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. What will be the starting point in the province of Prince Edward Island for this service and what will be the port or ports of call in that province ? Also, what will be the port or ports of call in Cape Breton and the port of destination in Newfoundland ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Leaving Charlottetown, thence to Bridgetown, Annandale and Souris, P.E.I. ; thence to Glace Bay and Sydney, and thence to St. John's Newfoundland ; returning over the same route.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. In any agreement that may be made with a company for this service, that will be one of the conditions, of course ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is our intention, of course ?

Meaning that that would be the route they would go, that that would be the route they would return, and that any agreement that was entered into would be along that line.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I have to say that I understood that these two lines of steamers went to Charlottetown, touched at Sydney and then proceeded to St. John's, Newfoundland. From the route indicated by my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Ingram) it would seem that the purpose is not only to start from Charlottetown but that the vessels shall touch at various other ports. The steamers doing the work just now, call at Charlottetown, proceeding direct to North Sydney and Sydney and from Sydney going direct to St. John's, Newfoundland. Of course, if it is the purpose to call at other ports I admit at once that it is a different service.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the routes are quite different ?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Well, the routes are not different.

Mr. INGRAM. The right. hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce said, 'leaving Charlottetown' and then he goes on to describe the route.

Steam service between Paspebiac and Gaspé Basin during the months of December, 1905, and January, 1906, $3,000.

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot give much information about this.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As long as we had the 'Admiral' on the coast this vote would be useless, but now with the new steamer the service will be performed as late as January 15 or 20. Last year, or two years ago the service could have been properly performed if we had had a proper steamer.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this an addition to the subsidy given to the same steamer by the other vote ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. This is in another shape. The subsidy is $12,500 for the ordinary service, between the opening and the close of navigation as ordinarily known, but when the boat performs the service during November, December and the early part of January, she takes greater risks, and we have this year the promise by this Interprovincial Company that it will be able to perform the service with this new boat.

Mr. BERGERON. For how many months is the service generally performed ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. From April to December ?

Mr. BERGERON. About nine months, and this will give about a month and a half or two months more.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would like to ask the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) if there is any probability of Paspebiac being an open winter port.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As the Deputy Speaker, owing to his position as chairman of the committee cannot speak, I would not like to say anything on this subject, because I stand for Gaspé Basin and he stands for Paspebiac.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps, as the Deputy Speaker would not like to refer to it, the Solicitor General would read the contents of that wonderful postcard. Perhaps we will find it in that.

Mr. INGRAM. What about this experiment ? How did it succeed ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. There was no experiment last year. The vote was placed there with the expectation that the old company would give us a proper steamer, but the company did not give that steamer, and therefore this vote will be available for the new steamer, the 'Lady Eileen.'

Mr. FOWLER. The subsidy was not paid last year ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It was not earned.

Mr. BERGERON. The boat will now receive $15,500 instead of $12,500, because in future she will be running two months more.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. It seems to me that the Minister of Trade and Commerce should know more about this, and last year he did say it was an experiment.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Last year we had the promise from the company which owned the 'Admiral' that they would get a new boat during the season of navigation. They failed to get that boat and therefore they could not perform the service in December and January. Now we have a new boat and the service will be performed.

Mr. INGRAM. The Minister of Trade and Commerce said that they wanted to make the experiment.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It was not a new steamer last year, it was an old boat which was afterwards burned.

Mr. INGRAM. This is the discussion that took place on it last year :

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is in the nature of an experiment to see if we can prolong that service during the winter months. We are now in negotiation and hope to obtain the service.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We had an item in the estimates for this year ; did the hon. minister utilize that ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, we did not succeed in getting a boat to carry on the service during December and January. They were afraid to face the ice in the Gulf at that time.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The company which owned the 'Admiral' would not risk that steamer in the ice. There is no question that a screw steamer specially fitted for the service, could make the trips in December and January. Some winters the navigation is open during the whole season, but every winter with a good screw steamer such as the new steamer is the company will be able to navigate the waters of the Baie de Chaleurs and the Gaspé Basin during December and January.

Mr. FOSTER. To what point does the railway go down ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. There are two railways ; the Baie de Chaleurs Railway runs as far as Paspebiac.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it an all winter service ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Oh, yes. The new railway will start from Paspebiac to Gaspé Basin.

Mr. FOSTER. That will not be operated this year ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Ten miles will be operated by June next, and 20 miles by next year.

Mr. FOSTER. The new vessel will run from Campbellton to Gaspé Basin during the summer and autumn, and it is now proposed that she will run between Gaspé Basin and Paspebiac for the winter. For running between these places during the

two winter months she gets $3,000 and that makes the whole subsidy to this vessel $15,-500. She is employed in this service practically all the year and the subsidy seems permissible because she makes winter connection between the railway and Gaspé Basin, but when this new railway is built and operated, then of course this service would be no longer necessary.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Probably.

Mr. MONK. When do the trips between Campbellton and Gaspé begin in the summer ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Early in April.

Mr. MONK. Are they weekly trips.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is a semi-weekly service.

Mr. MONK. And they last until what time ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. With the new steamer we will have navigation open until January 15 or 20, so that it will last from April to January.

Mr. MONK. Perhaps my hon. friend can tell me if the steamer 'Admiral' is going to run regularly ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. She was burnt.

Mr. MONK. Is it intended to replace the steamer for the service between River Ouelle and Murray Bay ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Two years ago the 'Admiral' performed that service, but last year, failing to find a new steamer for the Baie de Chaleurs we had to take her again. During the summer she was burned and is now at the bottom of the sea. The work was then performed by the 'Restigouche' and now we have a contract with the company owning the 'Lady Eileen.'

Mr. MONK. Is there to be a service between St. Denis and Murray Bay.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I understand that the Department of Marine had a boat built for that purpose which was running this winter, the 'Champlain.'

Mr. FOSTER. When was this contract made with the new company ?

Mr. PATERSON. On October 6, 1904.

Mr. FOSTER. The contract was made with the company before the boat was built.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The boat was being built. The plans were exhibited in the department.

Mr. FOSTER. And the contract was made on the plans, I suppose, and her capacity as shown by them, and she is bound in the contract to come up to those conditions?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Oh, yes. There is no question but that by the beginning of April we shall have on the Baie des Chaleurs the best steamer on the River St Lawrence.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a comfortable thing for a company which is canvassing for stock to go to the government first through one of its most trusted members and enter into a contract hard and fast, and then go out and sell stock on a sure thing.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And after having invited tenders. I believe a majority of the stockholders belong to the party of my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the minister if that is to be the policy of the government; because, if it is understood to be such, more of us will come in.

Steam service between St. Catherines bay and Tadousac during winter of 1905-6, $2,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is St. Catherines bay?

Mr. PATERSON. It is near the mouth of the Saguenay river.

Mr. BERGERON. I suppose this is a crossing. Is it a steamboat?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Does she carry the mails during the winter months?

Mr. PATERSON. The contract expired on April 30, and none has since been awarded.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it an old service?

Mr. PATERSON. It is a service that was put on last year.

Mr. BERGERON. Who is the owner of the boat?

Mr. PATERSON. There is no boat.

Mr. BERGERON. Who is making the service now?

Mr. PATERSON. No one is. We are asking for $2,000 to enable the minister to make it.

Mr. FOSTER. What will be the length of the course?

Mr. PATERSON. Three miles, I am told. There is no service this winter. The contractors wanted an increased amount, and the minister would not give it.

Mr. FOWLER. It strikes me that this is an ordinary ferry. In every other province services of this kind are subsidized by the provincial governments.

Mr. BERGERON. Our provincial government is on strike now.

Mr. FOWLER. When Mr. Parent recovers his health, you may get a subsidy from him.

Mr. FOSTER. This is an astounding thing. I would suggest to the Minister of Inland Revenue that here may be a way out. If one of the contending parties will undertake to carry out this half-mile ferry service without charging it up to the Dominion, we might all throw our influence in favour of that party. The minister is getting matters down pretty fine when he undertakes to subsidize a ferry of half a mile or three-quarters of a mile in extent.

Mr. PATERSON. Three miles, I am told.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no. Is the government undertaking to subsidize ferry boats?

Mr. GIRARD. I may say that this service was organized last year for the purpose of enabling the people of the whole district of Tadousac to have regular communication with the rest of the Dominion during the winter. Owing to the fact that the Saguenay river at its mouth, which is about two and a half or three miles across, from St. Catherines bay to Tadousac, is sometimes covered with ice, and that the north and east winds at that point are usually very strong, it is impossible for any but a strong boat to make the passage. Last year the government, in response to a petition from the people, organized a service, which gave complete satisfaction to the department and the public. Since then Price Bros., the proprietors of the boat, have organized a new company, and there has been some negotiation between the company and the government. The distance from St. Catherines bay to the wharf at Tadousac is nearly three miles.

Mr. BERGERON. How are the mails carried now?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend understands the situation. He knows that there is no bridge across the Saguenay until you reach Ha-Ha bay, a distance of sixty or seventy miles from the mouth; so that the people along the north shore of the St. Lawrence below Tadousac, if they want to come up to the settled parts of the north shore, when they reach Tadousac, have to travel inland sixty or seventy miles, and then come back and take the shore line up to Murray bay or the other inhabited portions of the country. This is intended to enable them to cross the mouth of the Saguenay river from Tadousac to St. Catherines bay, which is the great milling point of the Price Bros. This service has been performed by a little boat belonging to the Price Bros. They want to put another boat on, and they have formed a company for the purpose, and it is to enable that company to perform this ferry service that this subsidy is asked.

Mr. FOWLER. That does not justify it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think it does. There is no bridge across the Saguenay river and no way of crossing in the winter. There is no means of facilitating communication between those people at the mouth of the Saguenay and the upper part where they have no railway communication.

Mr. FOWLER. This is purely a local affair, and should only be subsidized by the local government. Take the St. John river, which is quite as important as the Saguenay. It has a large population on both banks and yet there is no bridge from below Fredericton to St. John. There are ferries, but if these are subsidized at all they are subsidized by the provincial government.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not two minutes ago we voted a subsidy under identical conditions. We voted $3,000 to subsidize a line to carry passengers from the terminus of the railway at Paspediac down to Gaspé basin.

Mr. GIRARD. That is the only way to give a regular service to the eastern part of the coast. The mail service has to cross the Saguenay during the winter and continue by land, and two years ago the mails were stuck on the west shore of the Saguenay for three weeks because the only means of crossing over was by canoe, and the wind was too strong. But with a small steamer you could have a regular service no matter what way the wind was.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MONK. With reference to this vote from Tadousac into St. Catherines bay. and Tadousac, some facts have come to my knowledge since you left the Chair at six o'clock, Mr. Chairman, which put a rather different complexion on the resolution. This service is performed in summer by the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company. They receive a considerable grant for the service which is more important in summer than in winter. For some years, the winter carrying of the mails to the district below the Saguenay has become of importance because several new industries have started there. Last year there was a great delay in the conveyance of the mails—as much as eighteen days would elapse before the mail could get across from the western shore of the Saguenay and to Tadousac thence fifty miles by vehicle, &c., by dog-train to Matashquan, and further to Belle Isle by any conveyance that offered. The Price Company have built a steamer at a cost of some $20,000 which, during the winter, conveys the mail regularly across the Saguenay to Tadousac and brings the mail back from the east. There are two trips across the opening of the river every day—it is not straight across the river, but

there is a distance of about three miles for a service between St. Catherines bay We pay not for the steam service but for the mails in the winter time, because delay would be detrimental to the industries and to the growing population on the eastern side of the river. There is no road from Tadousac to where a crossing can be effected, and in winter, there is no crossing possible, I am informed, for twelve leagues up the river—you must go that distance before you find a place where the river is frozen across. Under the circumstances, the sum of $2,000 paid to the Price Company seems reasonable enough. Of course, it is local enterprise and falls under the jurisdiction of the provincial parliament. But, as I understand it, this is a subsidy for mail service which interests the whole Dominion.

Mr. FOWLER. The statement made in explanation of the item did not show that this was especially for a mail service. The committee is establishing the principle that these subsidies shall be given for ferries that are certainly within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature. If this government has so much money that it can afford this sort of thing, I can suggest a place where it can spend some of its surplus cash. Along the shore of the Bay of Fundy in a portion of the constituency I represent, there are towns that have no steam communication at all, and a subsidy might be given to a line of steamers to ply between St. John, which is our commercial metropolis in New Brunswick, and the ports along the Bay of Fundy, for instance, St. Martin's quite a flourishing town. Alma, in the county of Albert, Waterside and the town of Albert, and other towns lying along the coast. The steamer could run all the year round. These places are certainly deserving of consideration.

Mr. MONK. I think there is a difference. This subsidy is to enable the mails to be brought across the Saguenay river, which would be impossible otherwise except by going some forty or fifty miles up the river to a point of crossing—and on the eastern side there are no roads at all. In the cases referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) I suppose the mails are brought overland. The mails are brought from Quebec in winter overland to the mouth of the Saguenay, the difficulty is such as I have mentioned.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought it was said that there was a large business done by this ferry across the river, and that the country there was comparatively thickly settled. If that be so, one would expect to find that this boat had considerable earning capacity, enough to ensure a profit without this subsidy. So far, this looks to me like some other cases we have had brought to our notice. A company running a steamboat asks for a subsidy with the idea that not much inquiry will be made and that it will be a good thing to have. If there is a paying business, there is no need of this subsidy. But, if the subsidy is necessary to continue the service, and if there is no other way of carrying the mails, it would be much more likely to be justified.

Mr. PATERSON. The representations that impressed the department were not primarily with regard to the mails. They regarded it as a commercial enterprise. Many of the steamers subsidized promote trade between ports of the Dominion which otherwise would not be readily accessible. The owners in this case were able to convince the minister that it was worth the amount of the vote to encourage the trade of the country, the mails being carried as a part of the contract. But the company now want $3,000 and refuse to take the contract for less. The department would not give the $3,000, and so there is no contract. The minister asking only $2,000, and is not prepared, I understand to give more.

Mr. SPROULE. Was there not a boat running there before the subsidy was given ?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. MONK. There is a great deal in what my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says. But, as a matter of fact, the boat performed this service last year for the first time. It was not generally known throughout the district that the boat would run regularly. There has been a considerable development of that region, and when the existence of this service is better known probably people will avail themselves more of it, and it will not be necessary to pay even $2,000 for the conveyance of the mails. The boat can carry six teams and a large number of passengers. It does a useful work generally in the gulf, I believe that last year it crossed from St. Catherines bay to Rimouski in the beginning of March. The Deputy Minister of Marine was on board on that occasion. But the traffic will probably develop, it is merely beginning.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to argue this matter from a business standpoint as business men around this board. Now, is it a business subsidy or a mail subsidy ? The representation to the minister is that it is a business subsidy for the purpose of promoting trade. If you take it on that ground, all the precedents of this parliament are against giving what you may call a mere ferry subsidy. It is to all intents and circumstances a ferry, which stretches across a river in one of the provinces—a very useful and necessary convenience to have, but it is a thing which, in all the other provinces of the Dominion, has been kept up and subsidized, if at all, by the province. We have them all over New Brunswick. In my time, I re-

member numerous applications were made to have these ferries subsidized. There was one particular ferry in my own county, running from St. John city three miles up to Bayswater, perhaps a little more. I well remember the deputations and pleas that were made to me to get a subsidy for that. The answer of the government always was, It is simply an internal ferry service ; it is entirely within a province, and the province itself must pay the subsidy ; and, as a matter of fact, the province always paid the subsidy, and pays it up to this day.

Mr. PATERSON. Does it carry the mails, too ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes ; and they are paid by the Postmaster General, who pays for the conveyance of the mails of the country, and he pays for the mail bag that is carried on that boat a very small amount, a couple of hundreds dollars probably for the whole season. That is a legitimate payment for the carriage of mails. Then take the river St. John from its mouth up ; here and there you come across a ferry. The St. John river is a wide river, in some parts a mile and three-quarters, sometimes a mile and sometimes three-quarters of a mile, and there are ferries all along the river. Two ferries used always to run opposite Fredericton, the capital of the province, one running up the Nashwassis and the other across to the Nashwak, a distance, in the one case, of about two miles and, in the other, probably of three-quarters of a mile. Never have they asked for a subsidy for these ferries, and if anything was given to them it was given to them by the municipality or by the legislature. You find ferries along the St. John river all the way up. They are all treated in that way. There is a ferry in Nova Scotia, from Dartmouth to Halifax, kept up by the municipalities, and not by the Dominion government. So when you come to the matter of subsidizing ferries for commercial purposes, really it ought not be discussable in this chamber. Where are you going to stop if, under the shadow of a commercial subsidy, you are going to subsidize different ferries ? Now, another point was brought up, and it is one that ought to be looked at fairly. The mails are to be carried to the people on the other side of the river and they are to get their mails delivered on this side of the river. If there is need of a traverse there, and it is difficult in the winter to cross, that is the Postmaster General's business ; he has to see that the public are served with the mails, and if it is necessary to pay $1,000 to get that service, he must pay it. If it is necessary to pay more he must do it, because he is bound to keep up the postal service, and he is bound to dispense so much of the public money as is necessary in order to keep up that service. When this item first came up I took it as a commercial subsidy, and it did not seem to me that it was admissible here at all. As a postal service it is quite admissible, but then it ought to go through the Postmaster General, and he ought to give what is generously sufficient in order to have the mails carried across.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is a great deal to be said in support of the views put forward by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). But the conditions existing at this particular place are entirely different from those that exist in any other part of Canada. Take the whole north shore of the St. Lawrence, from Murray bay down to Labrador, and as soon as navigation is closed the people of that country are absolutely shut out from communication with the outside world, except by means of the road that passes along the shore of the St. Lawrence. Now, from St. Catherine's bay, on the west side of the mouth of the Saguenay, to Quebec, there are facilities for communication, no difficulty about that ; that is to say, you have a road by which you can get out, even though it takes three, or four, or five days, or a week, or a fortnight, in bad weather, to cover the distance. But from Tadousac down the full length of the north shore of the St. Lawrence, they are absolutely without any means of access to the outside world ; there is no boat, no railway, no means of communication whatever, except by this road which runs along the shore of the St. Lawrence river ; and when they reach Tadousac then they are obliged to go, I am sure, it must be sixty or seventy miles inland to get up to a point where they can cross the Saguenay river and get to the other side ; and after they have reached the west side of the Saguenay, they have to go down to S. Catherine's bay along the shore. As a commercial proposition, it does seem to me that it stands in line of all the subsidies that have been given in order to facilitate communication. We are constantly aiding railways, we are constantly aiding steamboat services. Why? In order to give facilities to enable people to communicate with the outside world. Now, the intention here is to enable these people to cross the river at that point and save 140 miles of carriage—that is practically what it amounts to. Now, there is no use in endeavouring to cover this thing up in any way ; it cannot be pretended it is merely a mail subsidy, because, after all, the government can have a mail service if it goes 140 miles as well as if it merely crosses the river. It seems to me it can be defended on the principle that it gives facilities to these people who are to the east of the mouth of the Saguenay river to go up to Quebec and have communication with the outside world. So far as the service itself is concerned, it is performed by a firm down there, as I remember it, who are interested to some extent in the commercial development of that part of the country,

the firm of Price Brothers. My hon. friend, I think, will agree that they are one of the most respectable firms in the province of Quebec.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not enter into the question.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. But it shows this: these people contributed to that service for their own advantage, and I am informed by those who know that after having endeavoured to carry on that service, they find they cannot do it for the subsidy hitherto paid them. Notwithstanding all the business they get, notwithstanding the subsidy they have received, it is not a paying concern, and they cannot go further with it. Now, from the commercial standpoint, this service must drop if we do not help it. I think the fairest way is to state the facts to the House, and let the House decide what is to be done.

Mr. FOSTER. Granting everything my hon. friend has said, which is no doubt the true ground, and that it would be a hardship to go sixty miles on one side to find a place to cross over and then sixty miles down on the other, what does it all amount to? The whole point is the purpose for which the subsidy is paid. For instance, suppose there is a road which makes a long detour of sixty or eighty miles, suppose it is possible to get rid of a portion of this distance, making it probably one-third, one-eighth or one-tenth of the distance, but at the same time at greater cost, they don't come to the Dominion government and ask for that. It seems to me the whole point involved is the making of a traverse way in the province; it is the same as a road, and it is the provincial government that has to see whether the road is the shortest and best to accommodate the people. Now, if that traverse is necessary, it is the duty of the provincial government to provide a roadway, a highway for its people, which is more convenient than the roundabout highway. As it crosses the water, it becomes a ferry, and it is the provincial government, and not the Dominion government, which should supply it. The amount of money, involving only $2,000 or $3,000, is a mere bagatelle. It is not the amount, but it is some principle that I am now arguing for, and whilst I accept the premises of the argument of my hon. friend, at the same time I would say that the government which has the administration of affairs in the province of Quebec is bound to look after that, and to give to the people better and shorter means of traverse than they have at the present time. Then I go farther in reference to the mail carrying business, and if I were the Postmaster General I would give a fair, and even a generous amount for the mail carrying part of it. A commercial subsidy you cannot call it; it is a travel or mail convenience. It is not for the amount of merchandise that is to come and go that it is needed, but it is to put passengers across backwards and forwards and to take the mails backwards and forwards. That is the point of difference.

Mr. MONK. I do not like to subscribe unconditionally to the proposition that if this is to encourage and facilitate trade and commerce it is outside the purview of this parliament. On the contrary the encouragement of trade and commerce, I think, comes distinctly within our jurisdiction. I am not aware that in the province of Quebec or in any other province any description of subsidies which would be an encouragement to trade and commerce would not belong exclusively to our jurisdiction. I think the conditions there render trade and commerce more difficult without the assistance of this steamship and the parties interested properly apply to us for assistance. I see in the subsidies that we grant every year very considerable amounts for a steam service between St. Stephen, N.B., St. Croix river points, Deer Island, Campobello, the inner islands, Passamaquoddy bay and L'Etete or Black bay and also one between Port Mulgrave and Canso and Halifax and Canso. Are these amounts voted purely for mail service?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. MONK. Or are they also for the encouragement of trade?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, trade.

Mr. MONK. I only wish to point that out. I could understand my hon. friend's argument if it were merely a question of establishing ferries. Not only are ferries under the jurisdiction of the provincial authority, but when a bridge is to be built upon a river entirely within the province the authorities interested cannot look to us for assistance. But if you place it on this ground that there are 140 miles of road to be traversed in winter that trade is developing there and when you grant a subsidy to this steamship not only on account of mail service but on account of trade and commerce of that distant locality I think it comes within our jurisdiction and that it does not belong to the provincial authorities.

Mr. SPROULE. In connection with this question it has been a matter of interest to me for a great many years why we do this in the maritime provinces and do not do it in any other portion of the Dominion. If the principle is a proper one we have a right to apply it all over, I could bring to the attention of the hon. minister very many backward places on the Georgian bay where a small subsidy would secure communication by steamer regularly in the summer, whereas, at the present time, steamers only come in casually whenever there are special cargoes for them. In many places on the Georgian bay where they have practically

no roads and where they have to travel a long way from one settled village to another to get their mail it would be a great convenience if they could get a small subsidy—whether you call it a commercial subsidy or for the carriage of the mails it does not matter. I know that years and years ago such a subsidy was applied for but refused. So far as my knowledge goes there never was an instance in which it was given. I remember thirty-four or thirty-five, or thirty-six years ago that strong efforts were made to get some assistance from the Dominion of Canada to carry the mails or assist in establishing a route where the trade that was offered would not pay for a regular boat supply, but they were not successful. I have often wondered why it was that these subsidies were granted for services on the Atlantic coast and refused for service in the heart of Ontario. I never could see why it was justified in one case and not in another. If it is justifiable in one case it should be justifiable in both, but while one is denied it the other gets it.

For services of wrecking plant on the St. Lawrence for the year ending June 3, 1906, $10,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What in the world is this ?

Mr. PATERSON. This is a contract made on the 21st June with Mr. Geo. T. Davie the owner in Quebec of a wrecking steamer called the 'Lord Strathcona' for which the subsidy of $10,000 is granted. That wrecking vessel or apparatus is to be there and at all times ready to render service to vessels that are in distress or wrecked in any way.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is it ?

Mr. PATERSON. It is stationed at Quebec.

Mr. FOSTER. Tell us about it. What is it and what has it done ?

Mr. PATERSON. It is a wrecking appliance.

Mr. FOSTER. How long have you had it there ?

Mr. PATERSON. Several years.

Mr. FOSTER. Tell us what it has done all these several years ?

Mr. PATERSON. It has attended any vessels that have been wrecked near the coast.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. minister knows that is not an answer to say that it has attended any vessels. What vessels ? He should give us the results.

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot give you them, I have not got them. The report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries will show that. But, it has done it in every case. It is kept there for the express purpose of being ready in case of any accident taking place, and I suppose in every case it has repaired to the scene and done the work required. In order to have it constantly where it can be readily available for vessels in distress it has been deemed of a sufficient commercial and general importance to the country to pay a subsidy of $10,000. I understand that the large steamship companies have all petitioned for it and this subsidy is granted in response to that petiion. I cannot say more. It has done what was intended to be done. I think it is perfectly satisfactory. Gentlemen perhaps more conversant with the subject than I will be able to tell the hon. gentleman what it has done.

Mr. FOSTER. What is it that is there ? You talk about 'it' ?

Mr. PATERSON. It is a steamer, a wrecking plant with all the appliances necessary to render assistance to a vessel when she goes on a rock and is in danger of breaking up. It is thoroughly equipped with all the complimentary machinery and is ready to proceed to render aid. They will get paid from the companies to whom they render assistance. No doubt they will charge them, but this $10,000 will only be justified as a public grant.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a sort of a retainer ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is what it really is.

Mr. PATERSON. This amount does not pay the vessel for its services, but as the hon. gentleman says it may be termed a retainer so that the vessel may be at the spot where it is readily available.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the hon. minister if there are any wrecking appliances in that district that are not subsidized coming into competition with this one that is subsidized ?

Mr. PATERSON. Not that I know of. Perhaps the Minister of Justice knows ?

Mr. BLAIN. I think that is rather an important question.

Mr. PATERSON. I believe that this is the only one there.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We have in Quebec a very large graving dock that is the property of the government. Mr. Geo. Davie has been for years past the proprietor of a large wrecking plant. At one time he was the owner of a wrecking steamer called the 'Lord Stanley.' He was in the habit of using this wrecking plant to salve vessels at any point in the St. Lawrence and at times he has gone down as far as the United States with his plant. I might say that it is the only plant in Quebec and that it is considered the best wrecking plant in Canada. In consequence of his using his plant for the purpose of going out of the St. Lawrence at times wrecks have occurred which have resulted disastrously because the means to salve the vessels were not readily

accessible. Some four or five years ago the owners of vessels at Montreal applied to the government to see if arrangements could not be made with Mr. Davie to keep his wrecking plant always available for wrecks in the St. Lawrence. Every one who is familiar with the conditions in the lower St. Lawrence understands the advantage to a wrecked vessel of a wrecking plant being able to go to its assistance at the earliest possible moment. As a result of the negotiations then entered into between the government and the shipping people of Montreal, Mr. Davie sold the 'Lord Stanley' and bought the present 'Lord Strathcona,' which has cost him something in the neighbourhood of $125,000 or $130,000; the understanding being that he would get a boat of that calibre which is greater than he required at the time, to facilitate the work of wrecking in the St. Lawrence. He was to get this retainer, as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has correctly described it, on the understanding that his wrecking plant must always remain at Quebec, so as to be available for any call that may arise in any part of the St. Lawrence, and the wrecking plant cannot leave the St. Lawrence without the consent of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. It is to be always accessible for wrecks in the St. Lawrence.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not rising to object to this, but I would call attention to the unfairness of the treatment of one locality as compared with another. For many years there have been wrecking plants on the Georgian bay and at times there has been serious competition from American wrecking plants coming in there. Efforts have been made from time to time to get the government to put some restriction on these American plants coming in, because the company who have their money invested in the Canadian plants were not earning enough to make them pay and yet what work there was was divided up with the Americans. They received no assistance from the government either by way of subsidy or by coasting trade regulations. They were obliged to stand on their own bottom and continue as long as they could. Why apply one principle to Quebec and another to Georgian bay? If the principle is correct in the one instance it must be equally correct in the other, and in my judgment the argument for assistance is much stronger on behalf of the Georgian bay wrecking plants owing to the very much more scattered nature of the shipping there. I call attention to this because I notice that in many lines there seems to be a distinction drawn beween one part of the country and the other.

Mr. INGRAM. This wrecking plant has been in existence for years. It was not necessary for this government or any other to grant a subsidy to this company to maintain a wrecking plant. It was when Captain Leslie removed from Kingston and took his plant down the St. Lawrence, that it was found necessary to give a subsidy to the Davie Company, and there is where the unfairness of this comes in. Here is a fair wrecking competition as between Leslie and Davie and in order to help Davie out he is given this subsidy of $10,000 a year.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What happened to Leslie when he went to Newfoundland?

Mr. INGRAM. Wrecking is turned over to Davie and there is where the disadvantage to Leslie comes in. What are the government doing in addition to this? By their treatment of Davie they are preventing that competition which vessels would have in the St. Lawrence by granting this $10,000 a year. It is unfair to Leslie who is in competition with Davie for the matter to be put in that position.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In what respect did he enter into competition with Leslie? We all know that there have been wrecks in the St. Lawrence from time immemorial. I venture to say that during the past 20 years Captain Leslie had never gone down beyond Montreal except once, when he went to Newfoundland, and I think he has regretted that trip ever since.

Mr. INGRAM. A vessel man made the statement in this House that Captain Leslie did wrecking in the St. Lawrence, and very successfully, and I prefer taking the word of a vessel man even to that of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If my hon. friend will take the responsibility of making that statement of course I accept it, but I make the statement with some knowledge of Quebec—and I have been connected with the mercantile life of Quebec for many years—I make the statement that Captain Leslie has never gone below Montreal to the assistance of a wreck except in one instance when he went to Newfoundland, and we all know what occurred then.

Mr. INGRAM. I am very glad that the minister made that statement. Possibly in a few days we shall see whether the statement of a vessel owner in this House or that of the Minister of Justice is correct.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The question seems to me to be whether or not it is a fair commercial venture. Was there any difficulty about wrecking in the St. Lawrence before this subsidy was granted? There are wrecking plants in the maritime provinces, possibly none of them quite so extensive as this, although some of them are very efficient as I happen to know by reason of having been professionally engaged in connection with claims where their services were being valued. They have always existed without any subsidy so far as I know, but

I am prepared to concede that conditions may be different in the St. Lawrence. I would like to have information on that point.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think the venture was successful, in fact Mr. Davie is a very rich man, and I think he made all his money out of the wrecking plant except some that he made out of repairs which he made in his dry dock. The question as I understood it was whether or not we could keep that valuable wrecking plant for exclusive use in the St. Lawrence, as I understood it. Of course these negotiations were not carried on through me.

The question was not whether this was a good venture. I am quite satisfied that as far as Mr. Davie himself is concerned, he was prepared to go on doing his business as he did, free to go wherever he liked. But the special purpose of this retainer was to keep his apparatus exclusively for the St. Lawrence. I think the original subsidy or retainer was $5,000. I do not think Mr. Davie has ever approached the department on the subject. It has all been done through the underwriters and shipowners of Montreal. He decided that $5,000 was not sufficient, and it was increased, if I remember rightly, to $10,000. So far as Mr. Davie is concerned, it is simply a business agreement. He has to consider whether it would suit him better to keep his plant for the St. Lawrence for a retainer of $10,000, or to be free to go where he likes either on the St. Lawrence or on the Atlantic. For instance, one of the things that occurred was this, Mr. Davie has the most powerful tug on this side of the Atlantic, the 'Lord Strathcona,' which he was in the habit of using to tow ships from the St. Lawrence around to New York. That has not happened very often, but it has happened; and my hon. friend the leader of the opposition will understand how profitable such work as that is. But Mr. Davie is now barred from doing work of that kind by this retainer. This boats must remain exclusively for use in the St. Lawrence. The only question is whether it is a good business proposition.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has a contract with Mr. Davie?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Does he know what the terms of the contract are?

Mr. PATERSON. I have sent for it.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Department of Trade and Commerce any reports as to the actual work which has been done in the way of wrecking by Mr. Davie? If it has not, does it not think it should have? If you give a retainer to a lawyer, you want to know whether he does any business for you. If you give a retainer to Mr. Davie, it is given in order that he may devote himself to wrecking in a certain area. What track has the Department of Trade and Commerce kept of his operations? It should have a report of every wrecking operation in which he has been engaged, and should be able to make certain that he has fulfilled his contract and has not gone beyond the bounds within which his contract limits him. But the matter has another aspect to me. It is sometimes wise to ask what other countries do in this respect. Does the minister know whether in the United States or in Great Britain the government has ever considered it necessary to give a retainer to one particular wrecking firm in this way in order to get its services, and to bind it to a certain portion of the commercial wrecking area? I doubt very much whether such a policy has been adopted by any other country. If it has not, there must have been some good reason, either that it was not necessary or that some ill-effects come from it. I can see easily what ill-effect will come from this arrangement. It will absolutely paralyze all private wrecking energy and enterprise in the St. Lawrence. The moment it is known that one firm has a retainer for doing wrecking in the St. Lawrence, no private firm will establish a wrecking plant, and every firm that is in the business will go out of it, knowing that the competition is unfair, and in a little while you will come down to a monopoly. What happens then? Just what is happening now. $5,000 was at first considered a sufficient retainer. A year or two afterwards double the amount was considered necessary. Go on for another year or two, and you have a call for $15,000 or $20,000. It works that way, because you put yourself absolutely in the power of one company. The very policy which the government has adopted with regard to dredging is a negative answer to this system. You say you cannot trust your dredging to corporate or individual enterprise, and you have to build your own dredges in order to be independent. You meet with still another difficulty. If the government has to give a retainer for wrecking in a great mart or channel like the St. Lawrence river, with many vessels and with a proportionate number of wrecks, what reason is there why the government should not come to the aid of equally or more dangerous coasts in British Columbia or in the maritime provinces where trade and commerce is imperilled every day in the year? I venture to say that there is not a man in half a million in the Dominion who imagines that the government has gone the length of giving a retainer to one firm for a wrecking apparatus. If they did they would realize the injustice of it. I am not saying a word against the necessity of having a good wrecking apparatus; but the question is whether the government should step in and paralyze the initiative of the individual and the corporation by retaining here and there some large firm to carry on the work of wrecking within a certain area. It strikes me that this matter is more

important than it has probably seemed to some of us before we began to look into it and think about it.

Mr. PATERSON. Of course, it has had the approval of the committee for several sessions. I think the argument of the hon. gentleman would be a very strong one if there were other companies that could be relied upon at all times to render help if help were needed. But I am informed that there is no wrecking company making any complaint with reference to this arrangement. It would be manifestly unfair to subsidize one firm when without a subsidy we could have competition from different firms; but in the position of affairs which is represented to me, in which we have the absolute benefit of having a very strong wrecking plant always available, and we get that by a subsidy without which we could not get a wrecking plant at all, the question for the committee to consider is whether in the public interest the subsidy should be continued. On the great lakes, to which reference has been made, there is competition. We have more that one wrecking plant and the Americans have their wrecking plants, and there is a certain degree of reciprocity. As to the other question of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Foster) as to whether any other government is giving a subsidy under those conditions, I am not aware of it. The question will have to be judged on the points I have mentioned. Could you get what you have now without a subsidy and also what is desirable in the interests of shipping ? If you cannot, is it worth, in the general interests, the amount we pay in order to secure what we have ?

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. minister assumes, as justification for asking for this vote, that there is no competition in wrecking in the St. Lawrence river. He has allowed two or three items to stand, and I hope a few days will be allowed to elapse before they are taken up so that we may obtain information which will prove that there are other wrecking plants and other men willing to go into that line of business in the St. Lawrence. There are other wrecking plants whose owners consider this favouritism to Mr. Davie as unfair to them. Only a year ago very strong complaints were made by these men. The vessel men were asked to sign a petition asking that the Davie plant be subsidized for the purpose of assisting wrecks in the St. Lawrence and they signed it, but they did so very unwillingly and because they were in this unfortunate position that if a wreck took place, the Davies had a monopoly of the business. It is not fair to say there were no complaints, because here are complaints and serious ones. Capt. Leslie has good grounds for complaint and has complained, and the department is aware of the fact.

Mr. MONK. I hope my hon. friend the Minister of Customs will allow this item to stand. The amount is a large one, but it is not to that so much we are objecting as to the principle involved. We have no precise information from the hon. gentleman. What we do know is that this retaining of a wrecking plant is not practised anywhere else and I hardly think that my hon. friend's analogy between retaining a wrecking plant and giving a retainer to a lawyer has any bearing on the subject. We know that Mr. Davie has made a great deal of money in this business, but because he cannot tow boats around from Quebec to New York—and that seems a very extraordinary enterprise for him to embark upon—we are asked to give him a retainer. We have no information as to what has been the effect of this retaining of Mr. Davie. What did he do last year in return for his retainer ? We are given no account of what he did when asked to vote this amount. This item ought to come under the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and we ought to know exactly what Mr. Davie did last year and what prospects there are of his doing sufficient this year to justify this subsidy.

Mr. PATERSON. What my hon. friend asks is not unreasonable. No doubt the Minister of Mairne and Fisheries will have full record of the wrecks that have taken place. I am told that the condition of the contract requiring this plant to be always available has been always complied with. We have certificates to that effect signed by the officers of the Customs Department, but in view of the statement made by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Ingram), who spoke with apparent knowledge, I do not think we would be warranted in pressing this item until he has the opportunity of giving the facts to the committee, so that we may know fully in what position we are. We will, therefore, allow the item to stand.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. With regard to what the hon. minister has said as to reciprocity in the use of wrecking plants, I am not very familiar with the laws of the United States but I am under the impression that our wrecking vessels are not allowed to conduct salvage operations on the American coast.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not know what the laws of the United States are on that point, but I know that the 'Stanley ' went around and towed vessels down to New York.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman is absolutely correct about that. There is no objection to her towing, but I would hardly think that this wrecking plant would be allowed to conduct salvage operations on the coast of the United States. So far as the maritime provinces are concerned, I do not think that it has done much on our coast. I know that it has on the coast of Newfoundland, and I know it has come into competition there with wrecking plants from the province of Nova Scotia. Another considera-

tion we should not lose sight of is that the granting of this subsidy undoubtedly tends to discourage individual enterprise, because those engaged in similar work in the maritime provinces could hardly be expected to compete on equal terms with a wrecking plant which gets an annual subsidy.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the hon. minister also give us the amount of salvage which Mr. Davie has received each year from the wrecking he has done ?

Mr. SPROULE. I know for a fact that the Americans do not allow our Canadian wrecking plants to operate in their waters, because the wrecking plant that was for years in the Georgian bay applied to the Americans for reciprocal rights and were refused, although American wrecking plants can come to Canadian waters to attend to wrecks. Then this company contended that it would be unprofitable for them to keep up their plant unless something was done to assist them or to relieve them of the difficulties which they had to contend with owing to the American wrecking plants there. But nothing was done. It is the grant of assistance in one locality and its refusal in another that I think is wrong.

Mr. BLAIN. If a certain amount of money is necessary to keep a wrecking plant on the St. Lawrence, that money should not be given in the shape of a subsidy to one concern. I am inclined to think it would be better for the government to promote competition between wrecking plants and, at the close of the year, to give the money to the company that has done the best service for the public, instead of establishing a monopoly as the government is now doing. Perhaps the minister would be prepared to express an opinion on that subject when the item is again up for consideration.

Mr. PATERSON. I will mention the matter to the minister.

Mr. MONK. I think it would be well to ask the minister also, why there is no retainer for Mr. Leslie. There was discussion of this subject on the 25th of July last, from which it appears that we only began paying the retainer to the present company after Mr. Leslie went down there. Speaking as a lawyer, I think if we retain Mr. Davie, we ought to retain Mr. Leslie also. He has done quite a lot of work there and stands in the same position as Mr. Davie does.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Has he done a lot of work there ?

Mr. MONK. It appears so from the discussion of last year. Mr. Reid, who is well informed, and who is a shipowner, stated—and he was not contradicted by the Minister of Trade and Commerce—that Mr. Leslie had done a lot of work there.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Below Montreal ?

Mr. MONK. I believe so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Item 187 stands.

Steam service between Petit de Grat and the Intercolonial Railway terminus at Mulgrave, $3,000.

Mr. PATERSON. This is a contract made with Messrs. Hugh Cann & Son, of Yarmouth. The steamer is the 'Percy Cann.' The contract expires this summer. The terminal ports are Petit de Grat and Mulgrave, and the services daily, calling at Arichat and West Arichat when required. The boat carries the mail.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the length of the trip ?

Mr. PATERSON. About 27 miles, I am informed by a member who knows the locality.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the character of the vessel ?

Mr. PATERSON. A vessel of ninety tons. This is a direct service and brings large quantities of freight, largely fish, for shipment on the Intercolonial Railway.

Steam service between St. John, N.B., Westport and other way ports, $1,500.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) knows the geography of this part of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. I know where St. John is, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) knows where Brantford is.

Mr. PATERSON. This is a contract made on the 21st of October last and expires on the 30th of June next. The contractors are the Insular Steamship Company, Limited. The steamship is the 'Westboro III,' and the terminal ports are St. John, N.B. and Westport and Yarmouth, calling at intermediate ports ; to make sixteen trips from November 1 to March 1 and twelve trips from April 1 to June 30. It is not stipulated, that the vessel shall carry the mails, and I do not know whether she does or not.

Steam communication between St. John, Digby and Annapolis and Granville, viz., along the west side of Annapolis Basin, $1,500.

Mr. PATERSON. There is no change. The contractors are the Valley Steamship Company, Limited. The contract expires on the 1st of July next. The steamship is the 'Granville.' The terminal ports are St. John, N.B., Annapolis Royal and Granville Ferry, N.S. During the winter months the trips from St. John are allowed to terminate at Digby. Time and weather permitting calls are to be made at certain intermediate ports. Carrying the mails is not stipulated. There is accommodation for forty passengers and 1,000 barrels of cargo.

Steam service between Annapolis and Hull, England, $5,000.

Mr. PATERSON. I move that that be amended so as to make it read between Annapolis, Hull and London, Eng.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that a fruit service ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How many round trips do we procure ?

Mr. PATERSON. Five trips between October 10, 1904, and January 31. I suppose the trips are all made in the fall. There are four steamers of a capacity of 8,000 or 8,500 barrels. The service is extended so that they touch at London as well as Hull. It is the Acadia Steamship Company, Limited. With reference to the cold storage, the ships guarantee that they are built expressly for carrying fruits, with proper and sufficient ventilation, with sufficient convenience for fruit or other perishable produce shipped on a sea voyage in a satisfactory condition.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be interesting to know how much has been carried.

Mr. PATERSON. No doubt there has been a large trade.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister will bring that down.

Steam service during the year 1905-6 between Quebec and Natashquan, calling at ports and places along the northern shore of River St. Lawrence between such terminals, $3,000.

Mr. PATERSON. This service is performed by the steamship 'St. Lawrence,' with a tonnage of 532, and 300 net, and a speed of 10 knots per hour. It is a tri-monthly service, carrying the mails.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the distance from Quebec to Natashquan ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Five hundred and thirty miles. Natashquan is a little below the eastern limit of Anticosti Island, on the north coast of the St. Lawrence. This boat calls at stated ports. Last year she performed three trips until somewhere at the end of October she got on the rocks, where she is now. She was the old 'Douro' that used to run down there when she was owned by the Frasers. She was sold about two years ago, and was repaired and recast, and called the 'St. Lawrence.' Last October she was wrecked.

Mr. MONK. I heard complaints about that service last year.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes ; they came near having a dreadful catastrophe at the time the vessel was wrecked. It was found she was not properly equipped.

Mr. AMES. Are this boat and the 'King Edward' both subsidized ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. If there is any part of this country that ought to receive some attention it is the north shore of the St. Lawrence. Many industries are being established on that shore all the way from Tadousac down to Blanc Sablon. I think there are at least, to my knowledge, a dozen industries down there now, pulp and timber. There is the Eastern Company, the Dobell, Beckett & Company, and other firms established on that shore, and they have absolutely no means of access except through these steamers. My hon. friend will remember the fishing industries they have down there on the Moisie river and below. If I could have my way I would subsidize two boats, and would endeavour to have a weekly service. You cannot meet the case with only one boat. I would have a weekly service, with two boats, and endeavour to make them comply with the terms of their contract.

Mr. AMES. Is there any clause in their contract which compels these boats to keep up their regular service ? A year or so ago, you will remember, the 'King Edward' several times voluntarily abandoned its regular service in order to engage in profitable wrecking operations. I was on the north coast at the time, and I know it was a great inconvenience to the people of that section to have this steamer, on several occasions, abandon her trips entirely and leave the passengers, who had been planning to take her, for several weeks in out-of-the-way places.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Years ago numbers of people on the lower St. Lawrence used to come up to Quebec to purchase their winter supplies towards the end of the season. On one occasion, because the owners of the 'King Edward' thought the weather was not favourable they said they would not go down, and it was necessary for the government to interfere and get one of the government steamers to take these people back. That happened two years ago last autumn. I think that shore ought to be attended to properly, and my view would be that we should have a proper service, and to have that two boats at least would be required.

Mr. AMES. My first question was whether the government, in return for the subsidies, were requiring the Holliday Brothers, who were the owners of the 'King Edward,' to make three trips regularly according to the schedule.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think it requires they shall make a certain number of trips, but it does not fix the dates of sailing. That is where the inconvenience comes in. As long as they make two trips monthly, it is immaterial what date they select for starting.

Mr. OSLER. I agree that that service should be fully carried out. I understood the minister to say that that boat was badly equipped. Surely, if this government subsidizes boats, they ought to see that they

are properly inspected before the subsidy is paid.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not want to speak in criticism, but it seems to me time to take some steps in this country to prevent such terrible disasters as that which took place on the 'Slocum' in New York. Certainly, from information of some of my friends who were on board the 'St. Lawrence' when she was wrecked, the vessel was not equipped as she ought to have been. I make the statement, not in criticism of my colleagues, as, of course, nothing of the sort is intended, but simply because I think that perhaps the officials ought to be notified of the necessity of looking after these vessels and seeing to it that they have all the requirements that the law makes necessary.

Mr. OSLER. Would it not be an easy matter to make it a rule that no subsidy shall be granted to any vessel until it is thoroughly inspected?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is implied.

Mr. OSLER. It is implied but evidently in this case it has not been carried out.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think it has been definitely stated yet whether that vessel got her full subsidy. It seems to have been fully stated here to-night that she did not do her work, that she actually abandoned her voyage and went in for salvage. Has the money been paid yet?

Mr. PATERSON. Not yet.

Mr. FOSTER. That is still being held back?

Mr. PATERSON. So I am told. You are discussing the St. Lawrence ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That was two years ago.

Mr. FOSTER. Well I want to know whether she got her subsidy or not. It is the 'King Edward' that I am referring to.

Mr. PATERSON. I am told that the claim was that they did their work between trips. The subsidy was earned and it was paid. I understood the hon. minister was talking about the St. Lawrence when I made my previous statement.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it not a fact that the Department of Marine and Fisheries makes a careful inspection of all passenger vessels that ply in our waters?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The law requires them to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. They require to have their certificates and they cannot sail under steam unless the boilers, equipment and hull are inspected. It was a rather startling statement that was made by the hon. Minister of Justice that one of these vessels was found to be totally unequipped, or almost so, and it would be sad if we were to be wakened up some day by a Slocum disaster. That seems to be an imputation on the officers of the department.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I made the complaint directly to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) and in answer to my complaint he produced a certificate which purported to emanate from his office at Quebec. He said: There is the certificate of inspection. On the other hand a gentleman on board the boat in whom I have the greatest possible confidence made a statement to the contrary effect.

Mr. AMES. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether the department has taken into consideration the enlarging of the subsidy in return for extending the trip beyond Natashquan. There are three Reid boats on three sides of Newfoundland. One goes up the west coast, crosses over to the Canadian Labrador, and passes a certain distance down from the straits of Belle Isle, but there is a gap between the ultimate western port of the Newfoundland service and the ultimate eastern port of this line. This gap is between Natashquan and Blanc Sablon. There is a stretch of country which has no service at all. I would ask the hon. minister if he has considered the advisability of extending the service of the 'King Edward.' I was informed by the parties who own the 'King Edward,' when I was taking a trip down there some time ago, that it was only a question of money with them. They informed me that they could continue their trip, make two trips a month and that they were perfectly willing to do so. There is a considerable population between Natashquan and Blanc Sablon.

Mr. FOSTER. We have a subsidy for that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is the 'King Edward' that goes down there.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another one—No. 175.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is the 'King Edward.' In answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) my idea was, having been interested to some extent in this matter through the hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Girard), who wrote to me several times upon the subject that we ought to have two boats, one a larger boat than the 'King Edward,' and that both of them should have regular sailing days from Quebec or Montreal, as the case might be. One would go right down to the straits. One boat could make two trips a month and the other would make an intervening trip, and we might have three or four trips a month. The business down there would certainly support a service such as that. A great many tourists go down there, a great many men go down in the fishing season in addi-

tion to the regular population of the coast and besides that there are large lumbering interests. My idea is that we should increase the subsidy for an improved service but that we ought to put it into the hands of the same men. These Holliday Bros., have large interests on the coast. They are the owners of the Moisie fishing business. We should give a subsidy to the same men if we get proper boats giving them a fair subsidy so that they might properly do the work.

Steam communication between St. John and ports in Minas Basin and Cumberland Basin, $3,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What vessel is doing that service?

Mr. PATERSON. The 'Brunswick.'

Mr. OSLER. This looks to me to be the same subsidy as that voted in item 163.

Mr. FOSTER. It does except that Cumberland Basin is added.

Mr. PATERSON. It is very nearly the same. I think we will let that stand. I see the name of the contractor is the same. It will be worth looking into so as to see whether it is a duplication or not

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Item 194 stands.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. minister probably will find that it is wrongly expressed in the wording. The last vote is probably for a vessel which plies around the different ports of the Basin of Minas and Cumberland basin and makes connection with a steamer sailing to St. John but does not come to St. John itself.

Mr. PATERSON. I have that information here. The terminal ports of item 163 are St. John and Minas basin ports, Spencer's Island, Canning, Wolfville, Parrsboro', Kingsport, Maitland and Ross river, while the ports of item 194 are St. John, Spencer Island, Canning, Wolfville, Parrsboro', Kingsport and Maitland. It is very nearly the same service.

Direct monthly steam communication between Canada and South Africa, $146,000.

Mr. PATERSON. This is a service the contract for which was entered into with Messrs. Furness-Withy & Co. and Messrs. Elder-Dempster & Co. They joined forces for this service and the contract was made with them to last five years from October 1, 1902 to October 1, 1907. The steamers of course, were not specified by name but they were to be of 5,000 tons net register and their speed was to be not less than 10 knots. The terminal points are Montreal and Quebec in summer and St. John and Halifax in winter. It is stipulated that they shall call at three ports in South Africa, Cape Town, Port Elizabeth and Durban. They are to make monthly trips and the subsidy is £30,000. The carrying of the mails is stipulated for and cold storage is provided. With reference to freight, Canadians are to have a preference on ten days' notice. The vessels are allowed to fill up with foreign, American trade, if there is not enough Canadian freight offering.

Perhaps it would give the committee a little idea of the extent to which the service is benefiting the Dominion if I were to read a letter which we have received from Mr. D. W. Campbell, agent of the Elder-Dempster Line which puts the matter as clearly as could be. The letter is as follows :

SOUTH AFRICAN CARGOES.

Elder-Dempster & Co.
Montreal, Feb. 4, 1905.

F. C. T. O'Hara, Esq.,
Acting Deputy Minister,
Department of Trade and Commerce,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Mr. O'Hara,—I am to-day in receipt of yours of the 3rd instant re cargoes carried by the South African steamers, for six months ending, we will say, with the February steamer, which is to sail on or about the 18th instant. We are including this steamer as we have her now practically fully booked.

The six months commencing with September, 1903, and ending with February, 1904. The steamers of the joint service, during this period carried practically full cargoes. A large proportion of the cargoes were composed of Canadian wheat and flour. We also had large shipments of Canadian lumber, more particularly red pine, and a fair quantity of manufactured Canadian goods, such as furniture, carriages, agricultural implements, ploughs, &c. We also had considerable shipments of Quaker oats, manufactured at Peterborough, Ont., also considerable metallic roofing. In the refrigerators of our steamers we had very heavy shipments of mild cured bacon, shipped by the Laing Packing and Provision Company, Montreal, about 300 tons for each departure. We also had during October and November several thousand barrels of apples.

From September, 1904, to February, 1905. The steamer that sailed in September carried about three-quarters of a cargo, about sixty per cent being Canadian and forty per cent American. Owing to the contract by the Laing Packing Company with the Imperial Cold Storage Company, of Cape Town, having expired, the refrigerators carried a much smaller quantity of Canadian products than went in the same month in 1903. The steamer that sailed in October was a full ship, she had in her refrigerator equal to about 3,000 barrels of Canadian apples. Her cargo was composed principally of Canadian flour, considerably planed pine lumber, and manufactured lumber, such as doors, sashes, &c. The steamer that sailed in November, which was the steamship 'Melville' was about three-quarters full. Her cargo was composed of about fifty per cent of manufactured goods of Canadian origin and fifty per cent of American. The next steamer was the 'Etolia' which sailed in December. This steamer carried practically a full cargo. Since her departure a decided improvement has taken place in the South African business, the financial position appears to have considerably changed, and in consequence the 'Wyandotte,' which sailed the end of January, had a very large cargo, and

sailed a full ship. She only took sufficient coal for the voyage to South Africa. Besides a large quantity of miscellaneous cargo, she had about 55,000 sacks of Canadian flour, but we are sorry to say she had very little refrigerator goods. The next departure will be the steamship 'Melville' in February. This steamer is fully booked. Her cargo will be largely composed of flour, practically eighty per cent Canadian. At the present time we have secured about 55,000 sacks of flour, and about 200,000 feet of planed white pine, and about 20 cars of Quaker oats made at Peterborough, Ont.

Owing to better trade conditions in South Africa a decided improvement has taken place in the demand, and our South African agent advises us that the corner has now been turned and that a continuance is expected. We are also advised that the preference is materially helping the importation of Canadian goods.

I am,

Yours very truly,

D. W. CAMPBELL,

I concur in his conculding remark; I think that there will be a great advantage. We have now a preference in South Africa, our freight rates will be as low as those from the United States and with the preference, if we maintain the quality of our goods, the trade should greatly increase. Repeat orders are evidently being received now according to this statement as to flour and other items. In my own business my anxiety is not to make first sales, but to secure repeat orders. If you receive the repeat orders you know you have your customer, and as there are repeat orders coming in here I am led to believe that our people are sending goods there that will command the market if they once get a foothold and the preference I consider will be of so much advantage to us that it will turn the trade in our favour as against our American friends. I fully look for that and it will be very gratifying.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister tell us what information he has in regard to return cargoes? That is an important point to know as well.

Mr. PATERSON. The trade is largely in our favour. We sent them $2,380,000, and they only sent us $69,000.

Mr. FOSTER. We did not send that by our vessels. What we are trying to find out is whether there can be a mutual trade. The statement the minister read with reference to the outgo, I consider satisfactory, but we cannot keep the trade up for ever or very long unless we get return cargoes. It would be interesting to the committee to know just what came back in each of these vessels.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman means that we cannot keep up the transportation long unless there are return cargoes. The companies have taken that risk for the number of years that I mentioned.

Mr. FOSTER. But unless they can get a trade that will work both ways, they cannot carry it on unless we pay for it.

Mr. BERGERON. How many vessels are engaged in that traffic?

Mr. PATERSON. There is one a month. I have not a list of them.

Mr. BERGERON. A monthly trip between Canada and South Africa would require a fleet of more than twelve vessels.

Mr. PATERSON. No it takes about 30 days to go there.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I think a ship can go to South Africa easily in thirty days. At the time of the war some ships carried hay in about that time. Do these ships call at ports of the United States as well as Canada?

Mr. PATERSON. No. American goods are shipped from Canadian ports.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. We have been discussing these subsidies all afternoon, and for the first time we have a succinct statement with regard to the trade pertaining to a single subsidy. Why is there not a similar report furnished by the Department of Trade and Commerce with reference to each vote? The agent of a steamship company can in half an hour dictate an intelligent letter showing the whole condition of the trade, and giving us the satisfactory information that it is growing. Why should not the same kind of information be given to the House and the country in regard to every one of these subsidies. I do not believe in spending large sums of money in maintaining great departments which do nothing for the country, and I hope that before another session we shall have an intelligent report like this one in regard to every one of these votes.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister get some information from the agent in regard to the return cargoes?

Mr. PATERSON. I dare say Mr. Campbell can furnish that.

Mr. BERGERON. What ports in Canada do the boats call at?

Mr. PATERSON. Montreal and Quebec in summer and Halifax and St. John in winter.

Mr. OSLER. At what ports in the United States do they call?

Mr. PATERSON. They do not call at United States ports. United States goods are shipped from Canadian ports, but Canadian goods get the preference by receiving ten days' notice ahead.

Mr. HENDERSON. Are the rates charged on American goods the same as those charged on Canadian?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. I scarcely think that is fair, when we have to pay the subsidy, and the United States pay nothing. That

is giving the Americans a preference over the Canadians. I think they should pay something additional in order to make up for our subsidy. It is quite proper that Canadians should get the preference; but if Americans want to ship goods in our subsidized vessels, surely they should pay some premium for the privilege. We assume that we get lower rates because of the subsidy we pay.

Mr. PATERSON. When this contract was being made, if we had insisted that the vessels should be restricted to take Canadian goods alone, the probability is that no contract of this nature would have been made. The Canadian trade had to be almost created, but Canadian goods get the preference.

Mr. HENDERSON. When this subsidy was first granted, I understood that our vessels did call at American ports and take on American products of a similar character to our own, and carried them to South Africa in the vesesls that we subsidized, and placed them on the same market on which we put our goods. I scarcely think it is fair to our Canadian producers that we should subsidize vessels to carry American products to the very markets we want to get. I would rather give a larger subsidy and leave the American goods at home, and let our own goods get all the market. I do not think for a moment that we should carry American goods to be sold in competition with our own, and certainly not to enhance the price that we get for our goods, but rather to depreciate the price. It seems to me the Minister of Trade and Commerce should give this matter a little more consideration to make it fair to Canadians.

Mr. PATERSON. Should not the hon. gentleman give it a little more consideration? Suppose a steamer were sailing with half a cargo of Canadian goods, and were consequently forced to charge a certain rate. If it could get another half cargo, which would enable it to reduce the rate correspondingly, would that not be an advantage to the Canadian shipper? The hon. gentleman must remember that the American is not the only competitor the Canadian shipper has in the market. He has to meet English and German competitors as well. What we should have is a preference for Canadian goods and that is secured to us. The contract is a very good one for Canadian producers and I anticipate that we are going to do a large trade with South Africa.

Mr. HENDERSON. I was under the impression, when the subsidy was first granted, that our vessels called at American ports, but I may possibly have been mistaken. I think the principle all wrong of subsidizing vessels to carry American goods to a market we want to supply. It would be better for our producers to pay a little more freight and not have this competition. It may be that the United States goods which are shipped alongside of ours in the same vessel will be goods that will come into competition with ours, and a small fraction of difference in freight would not compare with the loss that may be sustained through this competition. For instance, apples may be sent from the United States as well as from Canada, we may also have American cheese sent in these same vessels which carry Canadian cheese, and these may depreciate the Canadian goods. It may be that in this way we will be depressing the market to the injury of my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Maclaren), who, I understand, ships cheese to a large extent from Canada to South Africa and even to Mexico. We heard the Postmaster General describing the large amount of cheese he saw in that latter country. I trust that the subsidy to be paid vessels running to Mexico will not be paid to vessels which call at American ports and which will carry American cheese and thus lower the price in that market of the cheese which the hon. member for North Perth is sending there. I would like him to get the very best prices possible, and a slight reduction in freight, consequent upon the vessel carrying American cheese, would not compensate him for the loss that would result from this competition.

Mr. PATERSON. My hon. friend must remember that American goods shipped in American bottoms might be of the same class as the Canadian goods shipped in these subsidized vessels, and we would not really have the market exclusively to ourselves in any case. The Americans are not limited to shipping by this line, but I think that we will be found in this position, that the cheese shipped by the hon. member for North Perth will be found superior to anything the Americans can send, and I have no doubt that we will be in a similar position as regards other lines.

Mr. HENDERSON. I quite agree with the hon. minister that our Canadian cheese is superior to the American. That is the reputation it has in the old country, and no doubt it will have the same reputation in the South African market, but there is this danger that the inferior cheese will be quoted against our better cheese, and the South Africans may not at first be able to discriminate between the two. But if the cheese and other products of the United States can be sent in American vessels, why do they send them to Canada to be shipped by our vessels? We are subsidizing vessels to carry American products. The Americans do not seem to have a line of steamers from New York to South Africa which will carry freight as cheaply as ours, and I am still of the opinion we should not

encourage that American trade in our bottoms. Even suppose there should be ten per cent of the space not filled up, this company which is getting the subsidy ought to be still prepared to give us a fair rate.

Mr. PATERSON. Canadian freight has the preference over American freight, but the question is whether it would not be in the interest of Canada to allow these vessels to complete their cargo with American goods rather than to go with only a part cargo. There is this other point, that the preference which has been granted to us in South Africa will be very advantageous, not only in the way of preference, but also in the way of determining what are Canadian goods. I look to great benefit from the preferential arrangements we have made with South Africa. I think it was generous on their part to enter into such an arrangement, for it looks as if, in the course of trade, we may hope to do a larger trade with them than they can hope to do with us.

Mr. HENDERSON. I fail to see where the existence of a preference alters the other case at all.

Mr. A. MARTIN. What restrictions are there on those vessels with regard to freight rates? Will Canadian goods have a preference or can the company give a preference to American goods by charging them a lower rate? At any rate, American goods should not be carried at lower rates than Canadian goods. If there is to be discrimination it should be in favour of Canadian goods. If the contract does not prevent the granting of lower rates to Americans it ought to do so.

Mr. PATERSON. The rates are not specified in the contract. The deputy minister says there is no discrimination against Canadian goods.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Is there anything to prevent a preference being given to American goods?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know that there is.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I submit that there should be. Suppose a vessel is at Montreal with a two-thirds cargo. To get the other third, the owners might offer to carry American can goods at cheaper rates. This would place Canadian shippers at a disadvantage, and there should be something to prevent it.

Mr. PATERSON. I have not the contract before me, but the deputy tells me that it expressly provides that there shall not be discrimination against Canadian trade.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I think it is important that we should have the contract before us.

Mr. FOWLER. This is a very important point that the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. A. Martin) has raised. When we give this large subsidy there certainly should be no discrimination against Canadian trade. I do not say that there is anything improper in vessels subsidized by Canada carrying American freight. We want to carry the trade of the world, if we can, but we must not pay a subsidy and allow those who enjoy it to discriminate against our own people.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this subject have only raised the fringe of a very important question, which applies not only to steamships, but to the railways that we have so heavily subsidized. Of the thousand millions invested in Canadian railways, over one-quarter came from the people of Canada. And to-day the Department of Railways, this government, and the Railway Commission, allow these great roads to carry traffic of the United States that competes with our products in the old country through Canada at about one-half what the Canadian farmer has to pay. The wheat of the western states, the corn of Illinois, go through Canada to the sea-board for one-half what is charged for carrying Canadian grain. I have no doubt steamship companies fill this up with American cargo at lower rates than they give Canadian goods—that is a practice of all transportation companies whether by sea or land. There is only one cure and that is that Canadian and steamship services should be used altogether for the interest of the Canadian public.

Mr. WILLIAM WRIGHT. Does the American government subsidize steamships to carry goods from the United States to South Africa?

Mr. PATERSON. They have steamships running to South Africa, but whether they subsidize them or not I cannot say.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it the intention of the minister to bring down the contract?

Mr. PATERSON. It is not the custom to lay these original documents on the table, and perhaps it would not be necessary to copy it all. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could indictate what portion he would like to see——

Mr. FOWLER. Just that section.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is provision made for increase in the number of ships, if the trade grows as it seems to be growing?

Mr. PATERSON. Not in this country. But that would naturally go on if it pays.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister write to the Elder-Dempster Company for information with reference to the return cargoes?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister any report previous to the last six months?

Mr. PATERSON. The information with reference to the cargoes is in the department but it would need to be tabulated with reference to each steamship.

Mr. FOSTER. Another year we must have all that for each steamer.

Mr. TAYLOR. To see what these boats have down for their money.

Mr. MONK. It would be simpler if we had a law obliging the companies receiving subsidies to make a sworn return. In the United States, wherever there is a grant, a sworn return must be made.

Mr. PATERSON. Theirs are mail subsidies.

Mr. MONK. Yes, they have mail subsidies, but no subsidies for the encouragement of trade.

Mr. U. WILSON. When will the minister lay the contract on the table?

Mr. PATERSON. I understand the hon. gentleman wants only a copy of one part, that dealing with freight and discrimination.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister had better bring down the contract and lay it on the table. None of us will run away with it.

Mr. PATERSON. It is not usual to bring down the original of these documents.

Mr. FOSTER. There are probably three or four copies in the department.

Mr. PATERSON. Not of this I believe.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. There is another obvious point, and that is that we should have a proper consular trade service in connection with these subventions. Not only should we have reports from steamship companies, but we should have reports from the men who represent the Dominion of Canada in promoting and extending trade. If we are to become an exporting country we should not have such haphazard business as we have had this afternoon, but a report of the steamship companies, a report of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and a report of our consular agent.

Mr. PATERSON. We have that.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But these reports should be brought forward and presented to the country in easily and intelligible form. If Canada's trade is to be extended we must organize our system as they have done in the United States. We must have fresh intelligence and bulletins, so that our people may know where opportunities for trade present themselves. I do trust that what has been said by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and others will be respected and that next year when these votes come up, there will be an intelligent presentation of this effort made by the Department of Trade and Commerce to extend Canadian trade.

Mr. PATERSON. I would point out to the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) that, so far as the Department of Trade and Commerce is concerned, they already issue a large and voluminous report giving the information that the hon. gentleman asks for. If the hon. gentleman will study that, he will find what he wants to know.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. No; the hon. gentleman is paid for presenting these things intelligently to the committee.

Mr. PATERSON. They cannot be presented more intelligently than by giving the written report of these commercial agents. They cannot be presented in any better shape.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. We have only one.

Mr. PATERSON. If the hon. gentleman will take up the Trade and Commerce reports, and the bulletins that are issued respecting the commercial agencies, he will find the information he is asking for.

Mr. MONK. But we would not get it all. Take the item of $146,000 for steamship service to South Africa; it would not give us the return cargoes or any of the details which we ought to have.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The minister should come to parliament and present a statement, giving the total grant, in what direction trade is improving, or otherwise, what our agents abroad have to report, and so on. He could present it in a brief form that would go to the public and be of public use. I shall look for better things next year.

Mr. PATERSON. Do I understand from the hon. gentleman that he considers this valuable report not worth studying, and that he cannot find what he is seeking?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The Minister of Finance, in his budget speech of an hour, gives the country an intelligent view of its financial affairs, and that is something that ought to be done by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in bringing down his estimates.

Mr. PATERSON. I could not undertake to give a list of all the different cargoes that came from South Africa here and that went there from Canada—of course, I can give you the round numbers, but I cannot be expected to give more. We ought to be able to give you the amount of the return cargoes in bulk, and perhaps in a general way what they consist of. But to go into all the details on the estimates could not be expected, especially when you have reports prepared already giving them. Might I ask the hon. gentleman to read the Trade and Commerce report, and if there is anything that he does not find in it and that he wants to know, I will try and supply the lack.

Mr. BARKER. Will the hon. gentleman refer us to the page of that valuable work where we will find about the return cargoes?

Mr. PATERSON. In the return of the commercial agencies. The conditions of trade between the two countries are such that we may hope to benefit more by this reciprocal arrangement and by these steamship subsidies than our fellow-colonists will. They are not in a position to send us as much as we are able to send them, but they are going to be a profitable market for us. We are doing what we can to encourage trade.

Administration of the Chinese Immigration Act, including remuneration to Trade and Commerce and Customs officers, $4,000.

Mr. PATERSON. It is the same vote as last year. The effect of the Chinese capitation tax is that there was collected during the calendar year of 1904 $3,200. This includes an amount of $1,700, being a $100 tax collected on seventeen Chinamen who had entered previous to January 1st, 1904. But the tax was not collected at all after that date. The remaining $1,500 is made up of a tax of $500 paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway on each of three Chinamen who had deserted. That is, as I understand, seventeen Chinamen had entered under the previous rate. No Chinese have paid the $500 tax under the new Act.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Have none come in ?

Mr. PATERSON. There were these three deserters. But outside of them, no Chinamen landed except fifty-six exempted ones. Under the law merchants, professional men, students and men of science are exempted.

Mr. FOSTER. How is that $4,000 you are asking for to be spent ?

Mr. PATERSON. In paying the salaries of the collectors of customs, inspectors and interpreters.

Mr. FOSTER. How much was spent last year ?

Mr. PATERSON. Salaries, $3,953.31 ; contingencies, $239.95.

Mr. U. WILSON. How many officials are there ?

Mr. PATERSON. The number of officers is not here. The deputy says there are six.

Mr. FOWLER. Are these special officers ?

Mr. PATERSON. No, they are officers of customs. Though the Chinese portion of the administration is directed by the Department of Trade and Commerce, they make use of the Canadian customs. We do not pay the inspectors.

Mr. AMES. May I ask the hon. minister if these officers are preventive officers for the purpose of seeing that the law of exclusion is rigidly enforced ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, though they are customs officers they act under the Department of Trade and Commerce in reference to the Chinese.

Mr. AMES. I understand that the flow of Chinese into this country has absolutely ceased.

Mr. PATERSON. It looks like it.

Mr. AMES. Not a single one came in last year since the tax of $500 was imposed ?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. AMES. Then is it necessary to pay $400 for these officers when Chinese immigration has absolutely ceased ?

Mr. PATERSON. The influx might be renewed.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Do the hon. minister and the government ask us to accept the idea that the Chinese are being excluded ? I can only speak from what I observe in Toronto and I think I can say without fear of contradiction that the Chinese portion of that city has increased by 1,000 or 2,000 within the last year or so, and that we have probably 5,000 of them there. I do not know what the Chinese population is in Montreal but they are coming into eastern Canada at a surprising rate. They are enterprising people to a large extent. They are going into business more and more in Toronto with the result that in some streets every third or fourth shop is a chinese store. They all say that they come from British Columbia and that they have been in the country for some time, but I think these officers who have charge of this department are not keeping their eyes open. They cannot come from the United States because they have to pay more to get into that country, but the number of Chinamen who are coming into the eastern portion of Canada is something surprising, and it will be interesting if anybody cares to investigate to try and find out where they are coming from.

Mr. PATERSON. They are coming from British Columbia. Having come in once they are at liberty to come east.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I know that.

Mr. PATERSON. I understand my hon. friend to say that they are going into business. They must know the English language to do that and therefore they must have been in the country for some time.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Some of them know very little of it.

Mr. FOSTER. How many came in last year ?

Mr. PATERSON. None.

Mr. FOSTER. 4,719.

Mr. PATERSON. Chinese ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON. Came in ?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly. I advise the hon. minister to read the Trade and Commerce Report.

Mr. PATERSON. I am afraid it does not give that.

Mr. FOSTER. Look at page 750. The total collections were $474,420. The revenue that the provinces got is a very large revenue. It amounts to $231,000.

Mr. PATERSON. The explanation of that must be that knowing that the tax was to be increased there was an extra rush into the country at that time.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is a most versatile man.

Mr. PATERSON. That is the fact because none have come in since.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. minister gave all these reasons why none came in and now he gives another reason why 4,719 came in.

Mr. PATERSON. It was owing to the fact that they knew that there was to be a raise from $100 to $500 and the Chinamen were sharp enough to get in before the tax of $500 came into effect, while those who did not get in are evidently staying away from us.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask the hon. gentleman to take a little of the advice he gave to my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) and just take a square hour and read over his own report.

Mr. PATERSON. That is not my report. I have hardly as much spare time as my hon. friend, but he has given me convincing proof of what I have said that all the information he seeks for he can get if he only looks for it. He has set me right in reference to that matter and I have no doubt that if he pursues his investigations further he would be able to answer my hon. friend from South York.

Mr. INGRAM. I think the British Columbia newspapers will support the statement made by my hon. friend from South York. They charge that Chinese are entering Canada in the eastern portion of Canada. We have also the statement made by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) who quoted the 'Nanaimo Free Press' to the effect that Chinamen were entering Canada and that some of them were even accompanied by a special officer of the department. The impression seems to be that the Chinamen are coming into Canada in the eastern portion of Canada.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I can hardly let the statement the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has made that 4,719 Chinamen came into the country last year pass without saying a word or two in regard to it. If the Trade and Commerce report shows that for the whole of the year 1904 a certain number of Chinamen came in that statement must apply to the year ending the first of January, 1904.

Mr. FOSTER. I can only take the report and I must take it as being authentic. The report tells me that up to the 30th June, 1904, for the year 1904 there were 128 exempted, 4,719 paid fees and there were these collections, refunds and the like of that. There is no doubt about that information. How many have come in since 30th of June, 1904, up to last of the calendar year I do not know.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I would point out to my hon. friend from North Toronto that since the imposition of the tax there have been no Chinamen coming into this country with the exception of the few who are specially exempted.

Mr. FOWLER. When did the tax become operative ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. On the first of January.

Mr. FOWLER. 1905 ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. 1904. The tax has been in vogue for the past year. Chinamen have not been coming in. I would tell my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) that if Chinamen are coming into eastern Canada we are very pleased to know it, as they must be coming from British Columbia. We had the scourge long enough with us. They are not now coming into British Columbia. We suffered very severely from the great horde of Chinamen coming into the country and the tax has been a splendid thing as far as British Columbia is concerned. You are now getting them and you will find very shortly that you will have the people rising up and demanding that they shall be shut out.

Mr. MACLEAN. But the dumping clause cannot apply to Ontario.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Well I suppose that you have lots of Chinamen in Ontario who do not wear long queues.

Mr. U. WILSON. I do not see how it is that these books do not agree. The Department of the Interior has charge of immigration. It gives a list of the immigrants that come in, but I do not find any Chinamen in the list while in the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce my hon. friend from North Toronto has found the record of a very large number of Chinamen.

In addition to that I asked the minister some time ago for the number of preventive officers he had employed, and he did not

give us that information. I think before the item is passed he should give the number of preventive officers and try to make some explanation. The reports with reference to immigration ought all to agree. I do not see why the Department of the Interior should get one report and the Department of Trade and Commerce another. I have asked the minister to give the number of officers who are employed to prevent Chinamen coming into this country and he does not see fit to answer.

Mr. PATTERSON. I am sorry the hon. gentleman understood that I would not answer. I was trying to get the information that would enable me to answer him satisfactorily. I am told that there are six special officers who are under the Department of Trade and Commerce, but all the customs officers have the circulars and know the regulations with reference to Chinese and it is part of their duty to see that no Chinaman shall enter without paying the capitation tax. But they are officers of customs. The deputy tells me that there are six interpreters and officers especially charged with this duty who are under the pay of the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. U. WILSON. Will the minister tell us the pay that each of these officers receives ?

Mr. PATERSON. I have not it here, but if we had the Auditor General's Report we would find it.

Mr. INGRAM. Supposing that a Chinaman comes from China, lands at Vancouver, and is passing through Canada to Newfoundland accompanied by a special officer. Would he give bonds ?

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, yes, he would be under bonds.

Mr. INGRAM. Supposing that he passed through Newfoundland and in the course of a year or so entered Canada could he not get over the tax in that way.

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Paterson, House adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 14, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 56) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway.—Mr. Bole.

Bill (No. 57) to incorporate La Compagnie Electrique de Trois Rivières, St. Maurice, Maskinongé et Champlain.—Mr. Bureau—by Mr. Talbot.

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Canadian Northern Railway.—Mr. Lamont—by Mr. Parmalee.

EXCHEQUER COURT—RAILWAY DEBTS.

Mr. VICTOR GEOFFRION moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 59) respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to railway debts. He said : This Bill is for the purpose of correcting an apparent oversight in the Act which it proposes to amend. In the province of Quebec all sales made by judicial authority, under the Winding Up Act, in insolvency proceedings, have the effect of clearing the movable property sold of all incumbrances, privileges, hypotheques and mortgages, so as to give to the purchaser a clear title to the property. It is obvious that a sale under this Act ordered by the Exchequer Court should have the same effect as when ordered by the judge of a superior court, it should have the same effect as in a sale made by a sheriff. Of course, we should give the same authority to the Exchequer Court, because otherwise the law would be unworkable. A difficulty of this kind arose in the case of the South Shore Railway, which was offered for sale under this Act by the Exchequer Court, but nobody would buy it because the Exchequer Court could not give a clear title. It is clear that a hypothecary creditor would not suffer any more prejudice in a sale made by order of the Exchequer Court than in an ordinary sale by a sheriff, because we can rely upon the judge to see that the sale is properly advertised ; and, of course, the creditor could protect himself in bidding at the sale to see that the property was sold at its full value. If it is sold at its full value, no one can suffer any prejudice. This, briefly, is the purpose of the Bill.

Mr. MONK. I would ask my hon. friend if the Bill provides for notices to be given, as in the case of a judicial sale ?

Mr. GEOFFRION. Yes ; it is left to the judge of the Exchequer Court to give a proper notice of the sale. I have no objection to introducing a clause providing that a certain delay should be given, but it was thought that a judge of the Exchequer Court would see that the proper notice was given by advertisement of the sale.

Mr. MACDONELL. I would ask the hon. gentleman if provision is made in his Bill for pending litigation ? There is now pending before the Privy Council litigation regarding this very matter, from the province of Ontario, in the case of the Central Ontario Railway Company. Is there provision made for pending litigation ?

Mr. GEOFFRION. No such provision is made in this Bill. It is simply an amending Bill, and will have the effect, in the province of Quebec, when a sale is ordered by the Exchequer Court, of giving a clear title to the purchaser of the property, the same as in the case of a sale made by a sheriff. Otherwise, under the Act as it stands, a sale ordered by the Exchequer Court could not be attended with a clear title to the property. It is almost certain that under the sale ordered by the Exchequer Court a clear title could not be given. That is the opinion of the court, as I understand it; and, as the Act is unworkable, we want to remedy it as far as the province of Quebec is concerned, so that the sale ordered by the court may have the same effect as if it were a sheriff's sale.

Mr. MACDONELL. Did I understand that the operation of this Bill is confined to the province of Quebec?

Mr. GEOFFRION. The Act to be amended applies to the whole Dominion, but we want to have, in the province of Quebec, as far as this sale is concerned, a clear title. I have no objection to extending it to other provinces if it is the will of the House.

Mr. BERGERON. May I ask the hon. Minister of Justice if he knows anything about the provisions of this measure which has been brought down by the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion)—and whether it is an encroachment upon provincial rights. This is a single case which might be remedied by reverting to a sheriff's sale in the province of Quebec. The railway for which my hon. friend seems to be asking for the passage of this measure can be sold under the authority of the sheriff without this measure at all.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. All I know of this Bill is what I have learned from what has fallen from the lips of the hon. gentleman who has introduced it.

YUKON—DELAY IN OPENING BALLOT BOXES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to ask the government whether they have any information as to the cause of the somewhat extraordinary conduct of the returning officer in the Yukon. If I understand it he delayed the date at which he should open the ballot boxes and sum up the result of the elections until the 7th February with the result that the member for that constituency will not be gazetted until, I suppose, near the end of March. I do not know what period of time at this season of the year is required for the transmission of the mails. I have been led to look into the condition of the law a little, and while it seems to me perfectly evident that a clear and satisfactory explanation is required from the returning officer of his conduct in this regard, it also seems desirable that the condition of the law should be looked into. I think that the returning officer under the law has the right to fix the date. I have examined the provisions of the Yukon Representation Act and of the Dominion Elections Act, and they seem to be identical in that regard. Unless I have overlooked some provision of the law the result seems to be that any returning officer can postpone as long as he sees fit the date at which he shall open the ballot boxes and sum up the results. The result in regard to the Yukon seems to indicate that this condition of the law should be amended in some way. Some period should be fixed within which the returning officer shall open the ballot boxes and sum up the results, and some provision should be made giving him the power to adjourn whenever an adjournment might be necessary by reason of his not having received all the ballot boxes. I may have overlooked some provision of the statute which can be brought to my attention by the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) or the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), but from a very hasty perusal of the statutes I have arrived at the conclusion which I have just mentioned. However, I rose for the purpose of asking whether any explanation has been obtained from the returning officer because I think the hon. Minister of Justice, somewhat earlier in the session, stated that an inquiry had been made of him by telegram asking him to give the reason. The results are somewhat serious. The gentleman who was elected in that constituency on the 16th December last will not be able to take his seat in this House until the middle or the end of March. As a result of this the Yukon is disfranchised during a period of about two months when matters will come before the House in which the interests of the Yukon are very much concerned. I would therefore be glad to know from the right hon. Prime Minister whether or not any answer whatever has been made by the returning officer in regard to this subject.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If there has been any correspondence on this subject it has been carried on no doubt by the Secretary of State. I cannot give any information at this moment to my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden), but if he will renew his question to-morrow probably I will be in a position to give him the information.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to know whether the hon. Minister of Justice agrees with my view of the law in regard to the powers of returning officers, and if so whether or not he thinks it desirable that there should be some amendment to the law.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). Mr. Speaker, when this question first came under the consideration of the De-

partment of Justice we looked into the law and the conclusion we came to was absolutely the same as that to which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) has come. This is the first time that a difficulty of this sort has occurred since the law has been in force, and it has now been in force for over twenty-five years, but this one case will probably show the necessity of an amendment in the direction my hon. friend has indicated. I have spoken to my hon. colleague the Secretary of State on the subject and we are endeavouring to determine what the policy of the government should be in regard to it. When this question was brought to my notice by the hon. member from Toronto earlier in the session I communicated with the Secretary of State. He has been in communication with the returning officer and perhaps it would be proper to bring down the telegrams exchanged. I would suggest to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to ask the Secretary of State for these telegrams.

PAYMENT FOR BALLOT BOXES.

Mr. J. B. MORIN (Dorchester). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to draw the attention of the government to the complaint of a gentleman about some ballot boxes that he has in the county of Dorchester. He writes as follows :

(Translation.)

Sainte-Claire, February 9, 1905.

J. B. Morin, M.P.,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Will you kindly interest yourself for me in the proper quarters to obtain an allowance for me for 21 ballot boxes which have been placed in the post office since 1891 by the late Dr. C. A. Lesage, who was the returning officer for Dorchester ? These boxes were new when I received them, and I have taken good care of them. I have never used them, and I would be glad to have them taken away and to be compensated. Will you please look into that matter for me, and tell me what I ought to do ?

Yours devotedly,
J. E. CAYOUETTE,
Postmaster.

Now you have a right to say what you please about boxes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that some one in the county of Dorchester has had a claim against the government since 1891. I have never heard that we had a creditor in the county of Dorchester, but I have no doubt the government can pay anything that is owing to him so that if my hon. friend (Mr. Morin) will send me the letter I will see what can be done with it.

CENSUS AND STATISTICS.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may from time to time pay out of the moneys to be provided by parliament for such purposes, such sums as are required for the taking of the census, and for the collection, tabulation and publication of agricultural, commercial, criminal, educational, manufacturing, vital and other statistics ; the remuneration of the necessary officers and clerks and the payment of all expenses incurred in carrying into effect an Act for such purpose.—Mr. Fisher.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before this resolution passes, might I ask the Minister of Agriculture how the money, some $18,200, which we voted last year for agricultural statistics was expended ? The Auditor General's Report dealing with this expenditure is not yet down and we do not know what was done with that money.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I could not give my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) a detailed account of it of course. The sum which he refers to was in the estimates for the current fiscal year. A portion of it has been expended that was voted for general statistics. I speak from memory—I would have to look up the vote of last year to be accurate—but I think the sum mentioned was a part of a vote for general statistics, and the vote for the year-book would be included to make up the sum the hon. gentleman mentions. That which was voted for the year-book was spent in paying for the printing and binding of the year-book. The vote for general statistics was expended in the payment of the clerks who are engaged in statistical work in the Department of Agriculture. I do not remember any other expenditure that has been made under that vote during the current fiscal year ; I do not think there is any other expenditure. I do not remember at the moment the figures the hon. gentleman used but I rather take it that it covers the votes I have mentioned. I am just reminded of another vote for what is called criminal statistics, which appears in the estimates for my department, and which is also, I think, included in that sum of $18,200. I have here a list of the employees and the salaries they have been paid, and I am not aware that there has been any other expenditure.

Mr. TAYLOR. There was a special vote for the Statistical Year-book at $6,000 ; that had nothing to do with the amount I referred to, which is for general statistics, $18,200. That is apart from the year-book. Was that money spent in gathering statistics ? If so, of what nature were these statistics and was this expenditure outside of the census or was the money used as part of the expenditure in connection with the census ?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know the figures to which my hon. friend alludes, but the figures I have are $3,200 for general statis-

tics and a supplementary vote of $10,000 for general statistics.

Mr. TAYLOR. If my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) will refer to the estimates now before us, on page 32 he will find the figures I refer to.

Mr. FISHER. Perhaps the second vote I referred to may have been $15,000 instead of $10,000 as I suggested ; that would make the $18,200.

Mr. TAYLOR. And you are asking the same amount this year. I want to know how that money is expended.

Mr. FISHER. I shall be glad to give the information up to the present time. That vote has been expended on statistical work, part of it, the usual statistical work always carried on in the department every year and part of it special statistical work, that is work drawn from the compilation of the census, and it has been found that a portion of that latter work has been of sufficient value to be included probably in the final reports or volumes of the census. The consequence is that I might almost say that a portion of it has been devoted to such work as is contemplated in this Bill, that I have now before the House, between the decennial census. It is largely the kind of work, although not all of the kind of work that the Bill contemplates and which I would like to see taken up and continued by the officers of the department between the decennial census years and the work which was necessary after our decennial census year on the compilations of the census of that year. I can give my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) the expenditure which has been made with regard to the individuals employed &c., if he desires it.

Mr. MONK. As this is a somewhat important measure, I would like the minister to give us an outline of what the expenditure contemplates in connection with this new office in the immediate future and what work would be performed by the officers of this new department for the first few years ?

Mr. FISHER. I would say to my hon. friend when discussing this Bill a few days ago in committee, before the financial resolution was before the House, the question was asked of me as to the probable expenditure involved in the proposed legislation. I then said that I thought it would be about $20,000 more per annum, practically immediately, than we are now spending on statistical work in the department. I have since been going carefully over what I would like to do under this Bill, and I think that the amount which I then indicated is quite sufficient to accomplish all that I contemplate or expect to do for several years to come with the possible exception of some expenditure in connection with printing which I did not take fully into account when I made that estimate. I do not know yet that the printing would require more money than the amount I stated, but I want to be entirely frank with the House and do not wish in any way to say anything which I am not quite sure is within the mark. I therefore thought that I ought now to say that if we are to undertake to publish monthly bulletins or to publish every year a very large amount of statistical information that we gather, in extended form, it might be that the printing bill would be larger than I at first thought.

An extra thousand or two of dollars might therefore be required from year to year for printing. I wanted to give this explanation of the financial side of the case so that there would not be any suspicion that I was minimizing or misrepresenting it.

My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier has asked me to give an outline of what is proposed. We have had under the law a general census every ten years, and a census of Manitoba taken in the mid-year between the regular decennial censuses. In 1885 or 1886 we had a census of the Northwest Territories taken on the same basis as the census of Manitoba; but since that time there has been no special census taken of the Northwest Territories. Under this Act I propose to continue to take every ten years a census of the whole Dominion of Canada, and to take in the mid-year between the regular census years, a census of Manitoba, and, if this parliament at the present session should create two new provinces in the Northwest Territories, or any provinces, to take a census of them in the same way that the census of Manitoba is taken. The Manitoba census is taken by virtue of a provision in the Subsidy Act. Nobody can say to-day what may be decided in regard to a new province or new provinces in the Northwest Territories. But whatever is decided in regard to subsidies for those new provinces, I think it is well that this Act should provide for the censuses to be taken in the province of Manitoba and in the new provinces to be formed in the Territories. The figures which I have given do not include any expenditure which may be necessary in connection with those censuses. Those figures indicate what I expect the annual expenditure to be, in addition to which special provision will have to be made for the taking of the decennial census and for the taking of the census of Manitoba and the other northwest provinces. As I have said, I believe the value of this work will be very great; and, as the work will grow, it may be that a few years from now the minister will have to come down and ask for a larger vote on this account; but, so far as our expectations or intentions go at the present time, the money I have spoken of will, I think, cover the necessary expenditure for several years to come.

Mr. SPROULE. I inferred from what the hon. minister said at first that there would be a considerable saving in the cost of taking the decennial census. Where will that come in?

Mr. FISHER. That will come in whenever the vote is taken for the decennial census. I hope and believe that the organization of this work regularly and permanently will facilitate and cheapen the taking of the decennial census. The saving will be in the appropriation made by parliament for the decennial census.

Mr. SPROULE. I wanted to know by what means you were to make a saving, and how much the saving would be.

Mr. FISHER. It would be difficult to say how much the saving would be. The officers appointed permanently would be able to devote a good deal of time and attention, for a year or two before the taking of the decennial census, to preparation for that work, so that it would not have to be all done within a few months, as has hitherto been the case. It would not reduce the expense of the work of the enumerators or the local commissioners throughout the country, but I think it would reduce the expenditure at the head office. It is proposed by this Act to consolidate the three present laws relating to the statistics—the General Statistics Act, the Criminal Statistics Act and the Census Act. The work will be an expansion and enlargement of work which was contemplated when the General Statistics Act was passed. That is proved by the fact that in this consolidated Act I ask for very little increase of powers. Practically I have to-day the necessary powers for nearly all the work for which I am asking powers to-day. That work is the collection of statistics.

The kind of work to be done I outlined the other day. I would like to do for the Dominion a good deal of what is being done in Ontario through the Bureau of Industries. I would like to give statistics every year of the crops, the live stock, the areas of land under different crops and so on, and establish a system by which bulletins would be issued giving correct information with regard to agriculture, and also probably every year a larger bulletin or pamphlet giving a compilation of the results. In some years we might take up one group of subjects, the next year another and so on, and thus, the course of the whole ten years between the two censuses, publish probably four or five times certain classes of information. At present we have no such information for the Dominion which we have for Ontario and one or two other provinces, and what is obtained in Ontario is not available to the people in other parts of the country. I think that that work ought to be done for the Dominion and published as often as can reasonably be expected. I would not undertake at the outset to issue the whole of the information every year, but I do think it would be advisable immediately to issue some of it every year. Some classes of information we might issue two, three, or four times, between the two decennial censuses, That is as regards agricultural information, but it is equally important to get industrial information. Let me add that in the agricultural information would be included everything that grows upon the soil. Forest areas and the production of wood would be included, but the manufacture of those products into other articles would come under industrial information. As far as the latter information is concerned, we have to-day practically none of an official or authentic character except that contained in each decennial census. It is important, in the development of our industries and national progress, that we should have that kind of information more frequently and thus follow the example set by other countries. I would consider it advisable, at least once and more probably twice or three times between the census years, to take a pretty complete industrial census. I would not have it taken by enumerators or by sending agents to individual factories, but would get the information by correspondence and by sending out schedules to be filled up. This work could be done by the central office at Ottawa without any need for the great staff which we have to employ throughout the country at each decennial census. Nearly all the agricultural information we can get in the same way. To a large extent it is got in this way in the province of Ontario for the bureau of statistics. I might say that in the year 1902 the United States passed an Act for the establishment of a permanent census office, and the arguments they gave in favour of the scheme are very largely those which apply to this one. The condition of affairs there used to be pretty much what it is to-day here. They had no general census statistics. Some of the states had partial statistics, but there was nothing in the shape of national statistics taken between the censuses. They have, however, established a permanent census office for the purposes I have outlined, and they do the work in the same manner and on the same lines I have indicated. They are this year taking an industrial census of all their manufacturing establishments, without any army of enumerators or agents throughout the country. They are doing it by correspondence, by sending out schedules to be filled up from the central office at Washington, and they are satisfied with the results so far as the work has gone. I would like to see such information got here between the two censuses—probably twice or three times. We shall not take all the industries in any one year, but might so arrange that a very small staff working every year would be able to get in the ten years an immense mass of new information which would be of

the greatest value to every one engaged in industrial enterprises.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think the hon. minister should allow this resolution to stand until we get the information I am asking for now. A few days ago I asked this question :

Has the work in connection with the taking of the census for 1901 been completed ?

To that the minister replied :

The work in connection with the taking of the census for 1901 has been completed.

I then asked if the services of the staff engaged on this work had been dispensed with, and got this reply :

Yes, in so far as the taking of the census and the compilation are concerned ; but there are a certain number of the staff still in the service of the government working on tabular statements drawn from the compilation of the census. These are paid out of the general statistics vote.

Then I put a third question : How many are still retained in the service of the government ? And was told that only six persons were so engaged. I asked again :

What has been the total expenditure in connection with the taking of the census of 1901 up to 1st January, 1905 ?

To this the minister replied $1,192.296.19. What I want to know is what is the total cost in connection with the census from start to finish. Last year we raised the vote from $12,000 to $20,000 for the archives. Then we voted for the collection and compilation of criminal statistics, $2,000 ; for the statistical year book, $6,000 ; and for general statistics, $18,200. That vote is asked for again. I want to know what was done with that $18,200. Did a large portion go to pay this census staff that are still retained in completing the census ? If so, how are we to know, ten years hence, what the census of 1901 actually cost us ? I gather from the answers of the minister the other day and to-day that persons are still employed working up the figures from the census, which figures will be published in the last volume. If that is work in connection with the census, surely it should be paid out of the census vote. The census of 1881 cost less than half a million, and the census of 1891 just about half a million. And, so far, we have paid for the census of 1901 almost a million and a quarter, and still, judging by the minister's answers, money is being paid on account of the census to-day. It is only by questioning the minister in the course of such debates as this that we can gain information. I put a question on the notice paper the other day asking for information which, it seems to me, the minister might easily have given. He has three or four staffs gathering statistics, yet he could not answer these simple questions :

1. How many inspectors or other persons have been appointed or employed to attend to the enforcement of the Fruit Marks Act of 1901 ?
2. What amount has been paid for the services of said inspectors or other persons up to the 1st of January, 1905 ?
3. What amount has been paid for travelling and other expenses for said inspectors or other persons up to 1st of January, 1905 ?

These were simple questions and called for only such information as we require for the intelligent consideration of measures that the minister brings before us. He might have asked one of his clerks to turn over the book and, in five minutes, get the information to enable him to answer these questions. But, instead of answering he told me that the information is so voluminous that I must move for a return. I think this is unfair. And now he wants us to pass this resolution. But before it is passed we want certain information. The Auditor General's Report is not down showing what was done with the vote of $18,200, nor does the minister undertake to give that information to the committee. Before we can vote the people's money we ought to know what has been done with other votes.

Mr. FISHER. I am willing to give the information the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) asks for. He speaks of the Auditor General's Report not being down ; but he knows that the expenditure since 1st July last, to which he refers would not be included in that report.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to find out what was done with the general statistics vote.

Mr. FISHER. I am quite willing to give that information. I have already said that the general statistics vote was applied to the payment of a staff engaged in that work. Of that staff there are a number who have been there for years, who are practically permanent. The names of some of these are Messrs. Munroe, Watts and Pelletier and Miss Ross. These have been paid out of this vote the same as in former years. I think that Mr. Pelletier was appointed three or four years ago, but the others were all members of the staff when I came into office. There is almost infinite work to be done in preparing tables giving in form to be used by the public, information from the census schedules. Much work of that kind has been done by this staff within the last few months, and this may appear in the last volume of the census. It is not really census work. The census volumes could have been published on the 1st of July last. But the volumes were not all printed. All but two were not as complete as they are now, but they were as complete as census volumes need to be. This preparation of tables of which I have spoken is statistical work pure and simple. It is a kind of work which, I hope, if this Act is passed, to have carried on all the time from one census to another. It is for

work of that kind that I retained a portion of the staff who had been employed on the census, knowing them to be experienced in that kind of work and being aware of what they could do. I had no intention of hiding what was done, and thought I had given the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) the information he asked for in as complete form as he could expect. I have nothing to hide in the matter. If this Act is passed, I will have officers working for the next five years in the compilation, or rather tabulation—for I prefer to reserve the word compilation for the census work for publication in the census volume—in the tabulation of information drawn from the census. That is, to a large extent—but not altogether—the work which these clerks have been doing for the last six months who are paid out of the vote for general statistics. I say frankly that, in doing that work they did finish a small part of the compilation of the census volumes which was not quite complete on the 1st of July last. But it is statistical work within the proper meaning of that term.

Mr. BLAIN. As I understand the minister, he says that some part of the statistics contained in the Year-book are taken from the last census and some other part collected in some other way. Do I understand the minister to make that statement?

Mr. FISHER. I do not remember making that statement, but the Year-book, as a rule, is compiled from the departmental reports of the year. There are certain tables in it taken from the census. For instance, I think the population tables are taken from the census and then computed on a certain basis of the actual increase for every year. I think there is a statement of the population of the country every year in the Statistical Year-book which is computed from the last census on a fixed proportion of the natural increase, and in that way it is taken from the census. I think there are some other tables computed in the same way from the census. But the Year-book for this year would not have any statistics taken from the census of four years ago. It would have to be computed to bring it up to what the officer in charge of the Year-book would calculate to be the statistics for this year. But the great bulk of the statistics in the Year-book are taken from the departmental reports for the year, and one reason why the Year-book has been late in coming out is that the officers working on it can only begin their work when the other reports are finished and supplied to them.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we then to understand that the information contained in the Statistical Year-book is all taken from the last census returns and the departmental books that are published? Or, in other words, does the Statistical Year-book contain any further information than that which is procured from these two sources?

Mr. FISHER. The officer in charge of the Year-book gathers no outside information each year for the Year-book; it is only from the publications of the government that he compiles or tabulates it. He does not collect statistics in the way that this Act contemplates they shall be collected in the future, and which I hope to do with the power proposed to be given.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood the minister to say that some proportion of the $18,000 expended last year was for the purpose of collecting special statistics.

Mr. FISHER. No, what I said was that of this $18,000 $15,000 is a new vote. The $3,200 which has been voted for general statistics for many years back has always been expended in the payment of certain salaried officers who are doing work on the Year-book. The work I have spoken of was other work, but none of this money was spent in the way of gathering information from outside sources, it was only spent on work connected with the compilation of the census and the preparation of tables from information in the census.

Mr. BLAIN. Then the Statistical Year-book gives no new information whatever, it is simply a compilation of the returns of the different departments?

Mr. FISHER. I think that is the case.

Mr. BLAIN. Then the minister proposes to expend a certain amount of money for the collection of information between the censuses that are now being taken? Would the minister state how he proposes to collect that information in the province of Ontario, both in respect to agriculture, commerce and manufactures?

Mr. FISHER. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Bill he will see that I take power to get such information as I can from any provincial or local sources; when I consider it accurate and complete I would not undertake to do the work over again.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister stated the other day that in the province of Ontario there was very full information taken every year by the assessors? Does he propose to take any further information in the province of Ontario in respect to these statistics?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot say just now what the assessors do collect. I think myself we would not make any commencement of getting more information than is now published by the Bureau of Statistics in Ontario on agricultural subjects. Perhaps afterwards we might arrange to get more.

Mr. BLAIN. What about other subjects?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, industrial subjects, because in the province of Ontario, so far as I know, there is no information of an industrial character such as I have outlined and that I think we ought to collect. But

we would not need to collect whatever is already collected by some local or provincial organization. If there was a local or a provincial organization which already collected such information, I would make use of it, and supplement it where necessary.

Mr. BLAIN. We are to understand then that in Ontario, at least, the agricultural statistics that will be procured under the new expenditure will be no different from what they are at the present moment, but the minister proposes to expend money for the purpose of procuring commercial and manufacturing statistics which will be valuable to the people. I suppose, before bringing down his Bill, he has outlined some plan that he proposes to adopt before asking for this increased expenditure. He knows that at the present time there is a large number of manufacturing concerns in Ontario and he knows that information respecting them and respecting commercial affairs, would be valuable to the people. Surely the hon. gentleman must have some fixed policy in his mind of the way he proposes to collect that information ?

Mr. FISHER. I thought I had already answered that question. My plan would be to take industrial statistics, as well as agricultural and manufacturing statistics. For that purpose I would have the officer here prepare a schedule of questions, and I would send these questions out to the industrial establishments whose record we have in the department. I would have the office here secure information by the best means in their power as to new industrial establishments wherever any sprung up. I would ask the managers or members of these establishments to fill up the schedules which were sent to them, and return them to the office here. That information would be very considerable in its character, it would enable the office here to compile those answers and tabulate them in a proper form to be published. I think that ought to be done as far as manufacturing industries of all kinds are concerned, once, twice or three times between every decennial census. That ought to be done, not only for the province of Ontario, but for the whole Dominion. I may say that the work of this office would be done for the whole Dominion, the same kind of information would be obtained for the whole Dominion, the information will be compiled for the whole Dominion in all its subdivisions and would be issued as information concerning the Dominion of Canada. I do not know whether that covers the ground referred to in my hon. friend's question.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose they refuse or neglect to give answers to the question ?

Mr. FISHER. We have power to require them to give the information under this Act. We have power under the Census Act to require the information when taking the census. If anybody refuses to give us information he can be summoned before the court and ordered to give it, and if he then refuses he is subject to a penalty. I forget the exact penalty but it is a serious one. There is a fine and imprisonment in the final resort for a refusal to give information. In this Act I ask for power to get that information in the same way in any investigation undertaken by the office. This same power I now have in connection with information in census work.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the hon. minister if this work will be done without the appointment of a number of officials in different parts of the provinces ?

Mr. FISHER. The outline I have given does not contemplate the appointment of officials. At the same time, I do take power under certain circumstances and for certain special investigations, if by Order in Council these investigations are decided upon, to appoint a special official for such special investigations. That is now given me under the General Statistics Act. I can to-day appoint an official under the General Statistics Act to go and make an investigation of any special industry in Canada and get statistics and information in regard to it, but I could not force people to give information. By this Act, if passed, I will have that power, but otherwise I have the power now except with that limitation of which I have spoken.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister has already stated that the department have a correct list of the industrial establishments in Canada. If a new establishment is put in operation or an old one ceases, what facilities has the hon. gentleman for keeping the list in the office up to date ?

Mr. FISHER. One of the first duties, I think, of a department of this kind would be to make what I might almost call a catalogue or index of the industries of the country. I think that can be done in the first place by taking the names of the industries already entered in the last census. We have all the details of them. Of course, a few of them may have disappeared and a number of others may have been created. We have easy facilities for getting them. The Boards of Trade in the different cities and towns and the commercial directories which are available to anybody would assist us in that respect. We would have all these available to our hand and we would, as one of the very first works of an office of this kind, prepare a list of industrial establishments. I think that should be one of the first works in connection with any industrial investigation. As a matter of fact, in the census of the industries of the United States which is going on to-day under the permanent census office that is just the way that they are proceeding. That is the way I have proceeded in connection with the agricultural industry in this country. I

have to-day in my own department elaborate and very carefully prepared lists of those engaged in what I may call the agricultural industries which have been prepared in the way that I indicated, and by a careful consultation with those who know about these things all over the country. To illustrate the matter I may say that we consulted the dairy association in regard to the butter and cheese factories. We have inspectors all over the country who know all about these. We have an almost absolutely complete list of all the butter and cheese factories in Canada, and we also have a very correct list of the bacon establishments, the fruit evaporating works and various industries of that kind that are connected more or less with agricultural work. The same kind of thing could be easily done ; it will take a little time and money, but there is no insurmountable difficulty and I am satisfied that under the operation of this Act as complete records of the other industries of the country can be obtained.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, we are undertaking a work which will in all probability cost a very large sum of money and it may be proper at this stage to consider what we are going to get in return. We do know that in Ontario and Manitoba, at least, they have already facilities for gathering all the statistics and information that are likely to be received through this new office. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has told us that he proposes to have this census taken every two or three years. It will be important for us to know how many months or years will be permitted to elapse between the collection of this information and the time at which it is given to the public. We do know that a most important part of the census which was taken three years ago, a part that we desire to have as dealing with a question of the greatest importance to the members of this House, is not yet out, and we have no guarantee that it will be out within the next year or two. It seems to me that unless some better proof can be shown of the necessity for the information proposed to be gathered it is not desirable that such a large sum of money should be expended. We should have some guarantee from the hon. minister as to the time at which the census will be taken and we should also have some guarantee as to whether we are going to have this information within a few months after it is collected instead of being furnished with some old, out of date material, because, if this information is to be of any value to this House and to the country we must have it within a few months of the time at which it is gathered. If it is the intention of the hon. minister to collect that information and to give it to us within a reasonable time there may be some excuse for the inauguration of this new department, but when we find that the publication of the results of the last decennial census has not been characterized by such expedition as is necessary if the information is to be of value to the country we are not encouraged to hope for better results in this case. If the hon. minister can assure us that the information will be collected and issued within a reasonable time and in a form in which it will be readily available, especially to manufacturers, then I say there may be some excuse for it, but I do hope that we may get this information more promptly than we have been able to obtain that which has been collected in the past.

Mr. FISHER. I would say to my hon. friend (Mr. Barr) who has just taken his seat that certain parts of the information, such as I have been talking about now, can be got and after it is got it can be compiled in about a month and issued. When we have the whole census to deal with that is another matter. I am only speaking about certain interim or partial information obtained from time to time. That information can be issued very rapidly by bulletin. A complete consus of industries for the whole country might take longer, but to obtain what I might call this industrial intercensus information for interim reports, I believe would take a very short time : I believe that we could get the information and compile it within a couple of months of the date on which the heads of the firms furnished their information. Supposing that next week I was to send out schedules to firms all over the country and to ask them to return them to us on the 1st of April, filled up with information to that date, I venture to say that all the compilations in regard to that information would be ready and issued to the public before the first of June.

Mr. GANONG. Will the schedules under this Act be the same as those in the regular census?

Mr. FISHER. Oh, no, the schedules will be specially prepared for this purpose.

Mr. GANONG. I think if there are special schedules we should know what they will be because I do not think the manufacturers should be subjected to the whim of any minister, no matter how honest he may be, as to the information they are forced to give.

Mr. FISHER. In regard to that the census requires manufacturers to give us this information, but the individual manufacturer's information is never divulged to the public; it is only compiled and the compilation is given to the public, but the individual manufacturer's information is given to our officials under the seal of secrecy and that information is not accessible to anybody. We cannot get general information for the whole country unless the details of that information are supplied to some officer who will compile them. That is an essential principle of the Census Act and

it must be an essential principle of any arrangement for collecting statistics. I may say to my hon. friend that in the last census there were only a few individual and scattered instances where any manufacturers objected to giving the information. When such a case arose, instead of taking the manufacturer by the throat and forcing him by law I sent a special officer to meet the manufacturer and to explain the situation to him, and in almost every case the manufacturer recognized the true situation and saw that the information in regard to their own particular business was not going to be divulged to the public but would simply be a portion of a statement in regard to the general business of the country. I think that in two or three cases I actually had to threaten them with proceedings to get the information, but in the whole Dominion of Canada there were only one or two such cases.

Mr. GANONG. I am not objecting to a general census schedule, but I think it is putting a good deal of power into the hands of the minister. If the minister went far enough he would find a good many kickers in this country.

Mr. MONK. I think in a matter of this kind the schedules must necessarily vary. in the United States the information is not divulged except with consent of the parties interested.

Mr. FISHER. It is not divulged at all.

Mr. MONK. They must necessarily vary ; it is not like the case of a general census. I listened to the information given by my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) and of course he has convinced me that it was necessary that a permanent census office should be established. In the United States it is true that the permanent census office was only created in 1902 and it is still in the probationary stage. That appears by the annual report published by the new census commissioner of the United States, the chief of the permanent census bureau, and it is a question that has been discussed in the United States ever since 1879. I believe also that if we had a permanent bureau organized with as little expenditure as that intimated by the minister, and if the work was properly carried on, it would tend to diminish the expenditure of the decennial census because there are two parts in the measure of my hon. friend, one in regard to the decennial census and the other in regard to the creation of this permanent office. I have nothing to say as far as the decennial census passages are concerned ; they are very much the same as those already in the law. The Bill of my hon. friend, however, abolishes the Act respecting statistics and the Act respecting criminal statistics. We are entering upon an entirely new order of things and crea ing a machinery which I submit to my hon. friend must necessarily tend to increase in expense from year to year if it is to be really effective. Although my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) has given a general explanation I do not find that he has gone into enough detail as regards the method of carrying out the work of the permanent office and the details of expenditure. I think that if we are going to limit it to some $20,000 per annum for four or five years it would be a certain consequence that there would only be work performed here at the permanent office; no field work could be done but my hon. friend has not given us that assurance. Indeed from some of his later remarks I would rather gather that outside work would have to be done on a rather extensive scale and I really cannot think it is possible to confine the expense of that new machinery within the figure mentioned by my hon. friend. We are furthermore to create a permanent office, and I question if it would not be worthy the consideration of the hon. gentleman and the government whether it would not be better to place the permanent census office as soon as we create one under the control of the Department of Trade and Commerce. Of course if the census had been confined to a decennial event it is not so important and we can ignore the question of why it was placed in the Department of Agriculture. I do not say this because I have any want of confidence in my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) but because I think the work of the Department of Agriculture must necessarily tend to increase greatly, and that this work of the collection of statistics in regard to industry, agriculture, and the trade of the country would be much better placed in the Department of Trade and Commerce just as I think that the Department of Labour would be better if entrusted to the Department of Trade and Commerce because these subjects are corollary ones and are better treated in the same department. That is the way the United States have constituted that work, and I see from the reports that the placing of these three branches of work under the same department has been productive of very good results. My hon. friend has spoken of a sum of $20,000. I would like to call my hon. friend's attention to the figures of the cost of the permanent census office in the United States since this department was established two years ago. Of course, I am prepared to admit there is a great difference in the work to be done, but having due regard to the work to be done I find that our census work and work connected with statistics in Canada calls for a much larger expenditure proportionately than the same work in the United States.

The census of the Philippine Islands, taken quite recently, and the tabulating and compiling of that census, with a population considerably greater than we have in Canada, namely, 8,000,000 souls, has cost the United States $214,117.58. The twelfth cen-

sus of the United States itself cost only about $11,000,000 ; and when one considers the population of that country, what that census has produced, the large number of volumes and what a marvel of research and information it is, one cannot help coming to the conclusion that the one and a quarter million dollars which we spent for our census is proportionately a very much larger sum. The cost of the census bureau of the United States, similar to the one which my hon. friend seeks to create here by the present measure, was, in 1903, $1,350,271.08, and in 1904, $1,102,693.64 ; and it will appear to members of the committee who will take the trouble to peruse the first report of the Director of the Census Bureau to the Secretary of Commerce and Labour concerning its operations for the year 1903-4, that a much more clearly defined scheme, carefully prepared and studied, was submitted to Congress, before Congress, by a law passed in March, 1902, decided at last to establish that bureau. There is another point to which I desire to call the attention of my hon. friend and the committee. We have not a very large amount of money at our disposal for the mere taking of statistics. I mean that we have much more immediate and practical uses for our available money, although I do not for an instant deny the usefulness of a permanent census bureau, if the expenses of it can be kept within proper limits ; and I do not think that can be unless a more detailed and carefully thought-out scheme is first submitted to the House by the department interested. We are exposed, I think, to the danger of a double taking of the census, unless, before seeking the authority of parliament for the establishment of this bureau, my hon. friend finds out what can be done with the provinces in regard to the statistics which they take at present. I see by section 16 of my hon. friend's Bill that he takes authority to arrange with the authorities of the provinces or territories for the supply of their statistics. That is what has been done in the United States with a large number of the states. Arrangements have been made by which the federal office gets the benefit of the statistics gathered in the different states, and even, as in the case of Michigan, contributes equitably to the cost of obtaining those statistics. I have heard it mentioned here that industrial statistics are gathered in the province of Ontario. I do not believe that we have in the province of Quebec machinery for getting industrial statistics. My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) reminds me that we have agricultural statistics, and a very complete system established under our municipal law, by which we obtain a very valuable amount of information which is absolutely necessary for a census office such as the one in contemplation, and which is obtained without any expense to the province. Of course, the information gathered from time to time would be absolutely useless unless it were furnished to the public, as it is under every proper system of this kind. My hon. friend will find that for educational, municipal and agricultural statistics he can obtain in the province of Quebec almost all the information which he requires for his office, and which I am afraid will be duplicated if we rush hastily into this proposed scheme of a permanent bureau without beforehand making arrangements with the provincial authorities. I may say, with regard to municipal statistics, that under our provincial code the secretary-treasurer of every municipality governed by the code is bound to furnish to the Lieutenant Governor the name of the corporation, the estimated value of the taxable real estate, the estimated value of the real estate not subject to taxation, the estimated value of the property declared liable to taxation by article 710, the number of persons paying taxes, the number of arpents of valued land, the rate of assessment in the dollar imposed for all purposes, the value of the property of the corporation, the debentures of the corporation, the amount of taxes collected within the year, all other sums collected, the amount of arrears of taxes, the capital amount due to the municipal loan fund, the amount of interest due upon such loans, all other debts, the amount raised by loan within the year, the amount received from the government under the Seigneurial Act, the interest paid on debentures, the expenditure for salaries and other expenditure for municipal government, all other expenditure, the number of persons resident in the municipality, any other statement which the Lieutenant Governor in Council may require. That is what the secretary-treasurer of each municipality is bound to furnish to the Lieutenant Governor in Council. In other words, he must give every possible municipal statistic of interest, and whatever other information may be required from him by the municipal authority. Town councils, under our General Town Clauses Act, are obliged to furnish by their secretary-treasurer similar information. The secretary-treasurers of county councils are also obliged to furnish special information. We have, of course, a complete set of educational statistics. It is only the province that can at present obtain that information. I am sure that a system could be easily devised under which, at very small expense, we could obtain agricultural statistics. With regard to industrial information, it would perhaps be better to wait until we see what is the result of the first industrial census which is being taken by the permanent census bureau in the United States, where there is under contemplation at present a general law called the License Law, which will apply to all corporations under the jurisdiction of Congress, requiring them to furnish automatically, so to speak, to the government all statistics

and information of a general nature, saving always to the officers of the general census bureau the right to obtain special information for special and specific purposes.

Does my hon. friend intend doing any outside or field work? As far as I can see, he has not tried to make any arrangement with any of the provincial authorities in order to prevent the duplicating of the same work and thus causing confusion and useless expense. I should think that the provincial authorities, who are best qualified to collect the information referred to by my hon. friend, would do that work for very much less than it would cost to have it done from Ottawa. My hon. friend does not seem to have attempted to follow the system adopted in the United States. There a very considerable proportion of the states act in concert with the federal census bureau for the purpose of securing and compiling statistics on many subjects. I believe that the scheme outlined by the minister will lead to the appointment of officials to do outside work and entail considerable expenditure. It seems to me that before deciding to establish this bureau, we should find out what arrangements can be made with the provinces so that we might work harmoniously with the provincial authorities. For these reasons I think that my hon. friend should wait until he has gone further into the subject and made sure of what co-operation he can obtain from the provinces.

Mr. FISHER. I am pleased to note that my hon. friend endorses at any rate my idea of having a census office established for the Dominion. If I am not mistaken, the leader of the opposition last year gave utterance to somewhat similar views as to the desirability of having a permanent census office established at Ottawa. Anybody who has interested himself in statistical work will appreciate the advantage of such an office. I quite agree with my hon. friend regarding the advisability of our utilizing where possible, provincial and municipal labours. We certainly would not for a moment think of collecting ourselves statistics which can be procured from provincial or municipal bodies. In the province of Ontario certain statistics are compiled by the Bureau of Statistics and published, but there is not much of that work done anywhere else. In the General Statistics Act, I am given the power, which is repeated in this Act, of making arrangements with local authorities to supply me with the information they gather. But if certain statistical information can be obtained from the provincial or municipal authorities, that would still have to be compiled for Dominion purposes and also separated into groups, and that work could only be done at the central office in Ottawa.

Mr. MONK. How will the hon. gentleman collect industrial information in the province of Quebec where there is no agency for the collection of those statistics?

Mr. FISHER. The same difficulty exists in Ontario. Even in Ontario there are no industrial statistics collected to-day.

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, there are.

Mr. FISHER. To a very limited extent.

Mr. INGRAM. In the matter of labour employed in manufacturing institutions, I have here certain letters which the department of the province of Ontario sends out to the manufacturing establishments asking for certain information. Look at page 104 of the Bureau of Statistics Report for 1903.

Mr. FISHER. Is there any tabulation of the returns there?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. I have not examined that particular volume, but I have always understood that there was very little of what I have called industrial information collected by the Ontario Bureau of statistics. There may be a little about the number of hands employed, and, in Ontario and Quebec—and the other provinces, I suppose—information is collected by the factory inspectors as to the hygienic condition of factories. But I do not think there are statistics as to the manufacturing productions of the province, the capital employed and so on.

Mr. INGRAM. Here are a few words from the letter:

> The bureau in seeking your co-operation in this matter gives you the fullest assurance that any information you may give will be received in the strictest confidence, and will only be used in tabulated form, and in such manner as will not disclose the identity of the person supplying such information.

Mr. FISHER. Will the hon. gentleman furnish me with the list of questions asked?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes; there are twenty-one questions in the list.

Mr. FISHER. Even supposing that this work is done for the province of Ontario, it is not done, as the hon. member for Jacques-Cartier (Mr. Monk) says for the province of Quebec. I propose to ask that information from the manufacturers all over the Dominion. I have already told the committee that I had no intention of sending out enumerators between censuses to collect industrial information. I would do the work by correspondence, by sending schedules to be filled up by the heads of the industrial establishments. I want it throughly understood that, if such machinery as my hon. friend seems to think necessary—a corps of enumerators all over the country to collect this information—were adopted, the amount I have estimated would

not be nearly enough to meet the expenditure. The estimate I have made is based upon the plan outlined. First, we will take all the information that is now collected by local, provincial or any other machinery, and, secondly we will collect industrial information by sending out schedules asking for reports to the office. I have no intention of going into the more expensive method referred to by my hon. friend from Jacques-Cartier. This is a scheme which has been adopted, as my hon. friend says in the United States. Their expenditure is very much larger than ours. For instance their census cost about $11,000,000 against about $1,000,000 for ours. My hon. friend says that they have a very much greater number of people to enumerate. But the area over which the enumeration takes place in the United States is not larger than in Canada. The expenditure in proportion to the number of people might reasonably be expected to be greater in Canada. Also, speaking from memory and subject to correction, I think there is a considerable amount of information in connection with mineral production given in our census which does not appear in the census of the United States, but which it is the intention of the permanent bureau of census of the United States to collect.

Mr. MONK. I do not see how my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) can even avail himself of the statistics gathered by the provinces without either outside work or making an arrangement with the provinces and contributing at least a small sum in order to secure the benefit of the statistics collected by the provinces. As he has said, the statistics of the provinces are not compiled as he would want them compiled, and there must be expenditure in getting them in the shape in which he wants them. He must make an arrangement with the provinces, an arrangement which, I think, we ought to control to a certain extent; or else he must employ outside help. And once he enters upon that he will find the expense considerable. Moreover I fear, as an hon. member on this side has suggested, that once we enter upon this work, the provinces will abandon the statistical work in which they are engaged, in order to save expense and on the plea that we are doing the work. That is one reason why I would urge that an arrangement be made with the provinces beforehand. I do not wish to prolong the discussion. If this were merely a question of the expenditure of $20,000, it would not be of so much importance. But I again call the attention of the committee to the fact that three departments which naturally are closely connected are now separated. We have the Department of Labour, under the Postmaster General—for what reason, I cannot imagine, except expediency at the time of its establishment—possibly political expediency. We have the Department of the Census under the Department of Agriculture, though there is no natural relation between the two. We have the Department of Trade and Commerce. I really think that more effective work would be done and some money saved if these three departments were under one head.

Mr. INGRAM. We have now six millions of people in the Dominion of Canada. And, since 1896 this government have increased the public expenditure enormously. In 1896, under the former government, we had a statistical department. When the year for taking the census came round, the work was done under that department for about $500,000 on each of two occasions. The last census, under the present government, cost more than double that amount. Now, after the census has been nearly completed the Minister of Agriculture proposes that we establish a census bureau. The people of the United States, up to 1902, got along very nicely with only a statistical department. They did not think it necessary, until they had a population of about eightly millions to have a census bureau. But we, with a population of only six millions think we must have a census bureau. We have had a statistical department for years. We have had a Department of Labour which has agents all over the country furnishing it with statistics.

Now how does the hon. gentleman propose to obtain his statistics? He says the reason he is asking for so little money is the excellency of the method he proposes to adopt, namely: to issue a circular letter to the various individuals in order to get the information. In the province of Ontario where they have agricultural, industrial and mining statistics, they have found that the circular letter method for collecting statistics does not work well, it is largely a failure, and it will be still greater in the hon. gentleman's case. Indeed the failure will be still greater, because he is proposing to perform an entirely new work in a new field, while the Ontario system has been going on for years. Now what do we find in this circular letter? We find that they ask for:

Name of firm; post office address; character of business; capital employed, including plant; number of days in operation during the year; gross value of product manufactured during the year; has the production increased or decreased during year; if either, what per cent; value of materials used in production during year, including fuel, gas, &c.; total taxes paid during year; total insurance paid during year; amount invested, if any, in permanent repairs or plant enlargement during year; total number of employees during year (wage-earners only) male and female; total wages paid during year to wage-earners only, male and female; highest weekly wages paid, male and female; lowest weekly wages paid, male and female; total

number of salaried clerks and officials, male and female; total salaries paid to clerks, officials, &c., during year; have wages been increased or decreased during the year; if either, what per cent; what class of employees has increase or decrease affected; if both, what per cent in either case?

Now, I doubt very much whether the hon. gentleman, under his method, can draw up a better set of questions than those twenty-one questions I have read. Of the method of collecting statistics, the Ontario officials say:

> Notwithstanding that every assurance of confidence was vouchsafed by the department, but 307 answers were received to 3,000 circulars issued, demonstrating the prediction previously expressed that the mail method of seeking such information is altogether ineffective.

Now here is a province that for years has been collecting statistics, having educated people to the necessity and importance of replying to these circular letters, yet we have the admission in that old province of the total failure of that method. I pointed out the other evening that for the amount of money the hon. gentleman was asking his method would never work. Instead of asking for $35,000 he is now asking for, the expenditure will be largely increased by the establishment of this branch of the census bureau. The creation of this department of the census bureau will mean a head, a deputy head, possibly, and many assistants, it will mean the incurring of a large amount of expense. Now instead of doing that, why not adopt the machinery you have at hand? You have a statistical department, give it more clerks, and obtain by its means the information that you are proposing to obtain by this new method. It would mean less expenditure, and to my mind, it would accomplish all the hon. gentleman is endeavouring to accomplish by this legislation. The people of the country are complaining of too much government, of over legislation. They say that we have too many members in this House, too many ministers in this government, too much government machinery, and they are complaining of the burdens imposed upon them. We are to have this session the creation of one, or perhaps two, more provincial governments in the Northwest Territories, no doubt a very proper thing; but they will certainly increase the expenditure of government in this country to that extent. Instead of going on with this Bill, let the hon. gentleman adopt the suggestion of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and see what the United States are going to accomplish by their new census bureau. The time for taking the new census will soon be on us, and I hope we will then be in a position to take a better census than has been taken this last time. This last time there were many statistics collected that were really unnecessary, because the several departments already had the figures recently collected which would have served the purpose, instead of issuing so many schedules to collect the same information. For instance, we have an Indian Department, a Department of the Interior, who know perfectly well the number of Indians we have on the reserves, and know all about them. What more could we gain by employing census enumerators to go round and take these Indians all over again? That is only one instance of the prodigal manner in which the public money has been expended, and that is one reason why the cost of taking the last census has already reached $1,250,000.

Mr. FISHER. The questions asked in the province of Ontario for collecting industrial statistics are more numerous than I would propose to ask. But there is this essential difference in the operation of the method, that whereas the provincial government has no authority to compel people to answer questions, and as a matter of fact they do not answer them, I have power at the present time, under the General Statistics Act, to require answers to such questions. I desire to obtain the same power under the Bill I now propose. I have that power at present, but only in so far as the census year is concerned; I want the same power to obtain answers to these questions. I think the reason why the information with regard to industries in Ontario is not complete is that the local authorities have not got power, and cannot collect the information. Practically the Bill now before the House is a consolidation of the General Statistics Act with the Census Act.

Mr. BLAIN. May I be permitted to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that in the province of Ontario no new manufacturing establishment can commence operations until it has first been inspected by the factory inspector, and a certificate given that everything is all right. Yet the hon. gentleman says that the reason he wants this large amount of money is to get industrial information in the province of Ontario, as well as elsewhere. I do not think the hon. gentleman has given sufficient information to the committee, and I do not think he has sufficiently posted himself on this question before he has ventured to introduce this measure and ask for this large amount of money to be expended. Speaking for the province of Ontario, I object very strongly to this expenditure of money. If the Ontario government is to expend a large amount of money for taking care of this work of enumerating the industrial institutions and collecting agricultural statistics, paying for it out of the treasury of that province, why should not other provinces do the same thing? Are we going to govern in Ontario and regovern in the Dominion, or govern in Manitoba and regovern in the Dominion? As my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) has pointed out, the people are opposed to this

expenditure. We are paying enormous amounts of money for provincial information and it is now proposed to duplicate this expenditure in the Dominion. I am sure that the hon. minister, when he looks into these matters more fully, will either abandon the proposition or come forward and give more detailed information as to what is done in the different provinces.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and agreed to.

Mr. FISHER moved that the House go into committee on Bill (No. 5) respecting the census and statistics.

Mr. BERGERON. No.

Mr. FISHER. Well, if my hon. friend objects to going into committee on the Bill I will not press it, but I would be glad to go on with the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a case of exhaustion, that is all.

Mr. FISHER. If my hon. friends object we will have to go into Committee of Supply. Do my hon. friends prefer going into Committee of Supply ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We might as well make some progress on this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. We are ready for anything.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think that as some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House would like to consider a little the suggestions which have been made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture it would be better to allow the matter to stand until to-morrow.

Mr. FISHER. I do not wish to press it.

Motion withdrawn.

SUPPLY—ICE JAM ON THAMES RIVER.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS (West Kent). Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the government to a very important question appertaining to the district in which I reside. There are a large number of people living between the city of Chatham and Lake St. Clair on the banks of the River Thames, covering a distance of seven or eight miles on each side of the river, who have a very great grievance because of the ice jamming in the River Thames and causing a large amount of damage to property in that district. I may say that the jam there last year caused damage to the farmers in that vicinity to the extent of from $175,000 to $200,000. The cause of this jam is the breaking up of the ice between London and Chatham previous to its breaking up between Chatham and Lake St. Clair and the reason of that is that the banks are higher from Chatham to London than from Chatham to Lake St. Clair, the result being that the water rises more rapidly above than at the lower end. The ice breaks up above several days previous to its breaking up below. The ice remains firm and solid at the lower end and the ice from above comes down and jams there causing the ice and water from the London district to overflow the banks of the river and flood the property of adjacent residents. I may say for the information of the government that the jam that was caused there last year resulted in the flooding of the magnificent farms on both sides of the river to the depth of eight or nine feet. I may also state that the Grand Trunk tracks were swept away causing damage to that company to the extent of from $40,000 to $50,000 besides impeding traffic for several days. I am not speaking in the interest of the Grand Trunk Railway because I think they are able to take care of themselves, but I am speaking particularly in the interests of the farmers of that district who lost, practically, in many cases, everything that they had. Some farmers, who have good farms, were last year obliged to go out and work by the month or the day to get a living. The hon. acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) who lives in the district knows the situation possibly as well as I do. Although not living in the exact vicinity in which these jams occur the hon. acting minister knows possibly the results of these jams and of the floods caused by them. I trust that the government will see fit to give us a remedy at once. I think there is a remedy. What we desire, and what I have agitated and what a number of prominent men in my district have agitated, is that we should have the services of an ice crusher that would come from Lake St. Clair and crush the ice between Lake St. Clair and Chatham two or three days previously to its breaking up in the London district. There are men living in the district who will be able to notify the hon. acting minister when the crusher should go up the river and break the ice. There are ice crushers at Detroit and at Port Huron, so that they are available in that district, and I trust that the government will see fit to provide a remedy at once. The reason that I call the attention of the government to it now is that the river may break up within the next six or seven weeks and we may have the same results this spring as last spring. I trust that in the interests of the residents of that district the government will see fit to go into the matter at once and give these people the relief which I think they are properly entitled to.

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, I may say in answer to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clements) that this is not the first time that the attention of the government has been called to the matter. The former member for Kent also brought the matter to the attention of the government. I am aware of the difficulties to which the hon. member

has referred. The constituency which I have the honour to represent in the House is also on the River Thames, but of course, very far up from the hon. gentleman's constituency where the conditions are not exactly the same. The difficulty seems to be that it would be almost impossible to get a boat from Detroit through the Detroit river and Lake St. Clair in time to do the work that would be necessary on the River Thames. If the hon. gentleman thinks it would be any advantage I should be very glad, as acting Minister of Public Works, to communicate with some of the boat owners at Detroit and see if it is possible for one of these boats to go from Detroit and accomplish the work that the hon. gentleman brings to the attention of the government. We have a resident engineer in the neighbourhood and I shall be very glad to call his attention to the matter, have him visit the locality and get a report thereafter to see if it is possible for the department to carry out the wishes of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I may say, as far as being able to get the crusher from Detroit or Port Huron is concerned, that I think the hon. minister would have no difficulty whatever because the ice is not, as a rule, over a foot or one foot and a half thick. The minister will understand that these crushers are able to crush ice three feet thick, so that it is not necessary to have a boat lie at the mouth of the river for this special purpose. But it would be a great advantage if we were able to get a boat when we required it. We quite understand that it is just at a certain period that the boat is required; it must be at the time when the ice is breaking up, which may be three weeks from now or may be in six weeks.

Mr. HYMAN. I shall have the engineer report and see what can be done in the matter.

Mr. BERGERON. Before you leave the chair I wish to inquire of the Minister of Public Works about an order of the House given January 23, for

A statement showing the amount of money spent by the government, or any department thereof, in the parish of Chateau-Richer, county of Montmorency, for building wharfs, piers, docks, breakwaters, &c., or for removing boulders or rocks from the beach in front of the said parish, or for any other public works, from the 1st of September, 1904, to the 15th November of the same year.

We would like to have that as soon as possible.

Motion agreed to, House went into Committee of Supply.

Public Works—Antigonish public building, $15,000.

Mr. GANONG. We had some discussion in regard to this matter the other day. I do not think that any member objects to Antigonish having a proper building. As far as I am concerned it is wholly as a matter of principle that I am objecting to this vote. I think, as the member representing that constituency said that this town should have a fair share of public money but I do not think it should have more than a fair share, that it should have the share of two or three towns of similar size. Perhaps the hon. gentleman representing the constituency will advise us as to when this town was incorporated?

Mr. McISAAC. About twelve or fifteen years ago; I do not remember the exact date.

Mr. GANONG. Now this is a growing time in Canada. In 1881 the population of the County of Antigonish was 18,060. In 1891 it had dropped to 16,114, a loss of 1,946. In 1901, during the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite, it dropped again to 13,617; it had lost 2,497 of its population. That is, the total population of the county at the present time is 13,617 according to the census. This population is divided in this manner: Rural population, 12,091 and urban population 1,526, which includes the town I presume incorporated fifteen years since. Well, let us look at the records of the town itself. In 1891, the population was 2,758; in 1901 its population was 1,838, a loss of population in ten years of 920, and still they propose to erect a public building there in a town containing 1,838 people that has lost 920 of its population in the last ten years, a town having really no manufacturing business to amount to anything or any present prospect of any such business, a town that is simply an outport, not a port of entry, where not a large amount of shipping is done. I think it is inexcusable to spend $25,000 of public money on such a building as they propose to erect in this town, which has no possibility of growth as far as one can judge. They had to bring forward some kind of excuse and the only excuse they could advance is that they must house the engineer and his assistant. But these officials have evidently been housed before in some form. I do not think that when a building worth $10,000 or $12,000 is sufficient for the population of this town and is all the government is justified in erecting that we should add another $15,000 to the cost in order to house the engineer and his assistant. Not only does it entail an additional expenditure in the first place, but a janitor must be kept and the heating and lighting of such a building must be almost double that of a building suitable for the requirements of that town.

Mr. McISAAC. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ganong) is entirely mistaken in the figures he has given.

Mr. GANONG. I should like to pass the census report over to the hon. gentleman; the figures are in it.

Mr. McISAAC. The hon. gentleman asked me how many years it is since the town was incorporated. I do not remember the exact year, I said twelve or fifteen years ago but I am satisfied that it was incorporated since the census of 1891 and that the figures for Antigonish in that census include the population of Antigonish polling district outside of the town limits as the town is now constituted. The only census of the town taken since it was incorporated was that of 1901 which gives a population of 1,838. But it must be remembered that this too is misleading. The town of Antigonish covers a small area, probably a mile long and half a mile wide, but the district outside the incorporated town must be included in the population which will receive benefits from this building. If the committee will look up the census figures they will find that the incorporated town itself is put down at 1,838, but the population of North Grant is 403. That is a poling subdivision of the polling district of Antigonish. There is also Antigonish South, which is put down at 590, making in all a population of 2,831, which is really the population of the town and the adjoining districts which will utilize this public building.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is there no post office in these outlying districts ?

Mr. McISAAC. No, there will be no other post office within a radius of three or four miles. This is the only town and the people outside use this building. When you consider that there are about 2,800 people benefited, it will be seen that the situation is very different from that indicated in the statement made by the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Ganong). As I stated, the other day the importance of the town of Antigonish has been recognized long ago. It was recognized by the late government as far back as 1882, when they purchased a building which had been used as a college building. It was a wooden building thirty years old when they purchased it, and instead of putting up a new building at that time the government undertook to repair that old building which was very poor economy indeed, because they had, year after year, to make appropriations to keep it in repair. The money was being wasted and the building was not being much improved by the money that was expended on it. It was getting worse year after year until two years ago, when a vote of $1,500 was put in the estimates for repairs. The Board of Trade of the town protested against the expenditure of any more money on the building, a wooden building fifty years old and in such a condition that the expenditure of any more money upon it would be a waste, and they pressed for an examination of it. The Public Works Department sent a man down to examine the building, and he reported that it was entirely unfit for further use, and that it would be a waste of money to attempt any further repairs upon it. Therefore a vote was put in the estimates last year for a new building, and the vote of this year is for the completion of that building.

Mr. GANONG. I anticipated just about what our friend has given us, and, to show you that the town is going back, I want to quote these figures. The population of the town proper shrunk from 2,758 in 1891 to 1,838 in 1901, a reduction of 920. The country district, where something is produced for market, I suppose, increased in the same time from 482 to 590. But taking the town and the village together, their population dropped from 3,340 in 1891 to 2,428 in 1901, a drop of 912, and that drop was almost wholly within the town, showing that there has been an absolute loss of nearly a thousand people in a population of less than 3,000 in the last ten years ; and yet we are asked to build a $25,000 building as a monument to the hon. gentleman who represents that district.

Mr. McISAAC. The hon. gentleman does not properly represent the facts. He should add the population of North Grant, 403, as well as that of Antigonish South, 590, which brings the population up to 2,831. So that, so far as the town of Antigonish is concerned, there is no reduction in the population at all. The hon. gentleman is not familiar with the locality, and does not give the figures of the surrounding district.

Mr. BLAIN. I see that $1,500 was voted two years ago for putting new letter boxes into this post office. I judge, from what the hon. gentleman representing the county says, that that money was not expended.

Mr. McISAAC. No, that is what I refer to.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman also stated that a report was presented to the government on the condition of the building. Perhaps the hon. minister would give us some statement as to that before the item goes through.

Mr. HYMAN. The chief architect in his report states :

> The Antigonish public building is a wooden frame building, fifty feet by thirty-two feet, two and a half stories high, and in a bad state of repair. The main beams and sills are rotten and in such a state that portions of the timber can be pulled away by the hand, and the boards are so decayed that where repaired they will not hold the nails. The building has settled four inches in the centre, and the plaster is cracked beyond repair. It is reported to be fifty years since the building was erected.

Mr. BLAIN. On whose recommendation was the contract for letter boxes let to a Montreal firm ?

Mr. McISAAC. That vote of $1,500 was not expended at all, for the reason I gave.

Mr. GANONG. On whose recommendation is it that the department undertakes to spend $25,000 for the erection of a public building at this place, in view of the actual facts of the case, showing a reduction in the population and revenue ?

Mr. HYMAN. I may say, in the first place, that the hon. gentleman representing the constituency made, as I think he had a right to make, very strong representations to the department. I may say also that under date of April 8, 1904, the secretary of the Council of Board of Trade of Antigonish transmitted the following resolution to me :

The Board of Trade of Antigonish are aware that the government of Canada appropriated at the last session of parliament the sum of $1,500 for improvements and repairs to the public building in the town of Antigonish, in which are the post office, custom house and engineer's office. The said building is a wooden one, fifty-seven years old, and in a very dilapidated condition ; the council of said board of trade are of the opinion that any considerable expenditure made in repairing it would virtually be a waste of money ; and, for reasons stated, the said council beg strongly to recommend that before making any expenditure on repairs to said building a competent person be sent by your department to examine the building and report on its condition ; whereupon we believe it will be manifest to you and your department that the best interests of the county and the country will be promoted by constructing a new public building for the town of Antigonish, such being absolutely needed.

The report of the engineer of the department, which followed that, I have already read.

Mr. GANONG. Then it is simply on the recommendation of the hon. gentleman who represents that constituency that the department undertake to spend $25,000 ?

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman asks me a question, and then he says it is on the recommendation of the member alone. I have just read the recommendation of the Board of Trade, asking for the expenditure.

Mr. GANONG. There is no such amount mentioned in the resolution of the Board of Trade. They do not suggest for a moment that a $5,000 building would not answer all the purposes. I was perfectly justified in making the statement I did.

Mr. HYMAN. The Board of Trade certainly made no suggestion as to the amount. The amount expended and the character of the building are of course left very largely to the department.

Mr. WILLIAM WRIGHT. I would like to suggest that, as there are a great many important growing towns in the Dominion of Canada of larger population than this one which do not participate in these expenditures for public buildings would it not be well for the government to require any municipality wishing a public building to contribute say half the cost ? If this sort of thing goes on, any little town which has a political pull will be able to get a building, while many large and growing towns all over the country will not participate in these expenditures.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no doubt that the old building was pretty old. Fifty-seven years is a considerable age for a wooden building. Something had to be done. The whole question at issue is not that something should not be done at Antigonish, but as to the wisdom of putting $25,000 of the people's money into a building to accommodate such public business as there is there in the way of customs and post office. If it be necessary to provide room for some engineers who have a district under their supervision, they could be accommodated without the country putting up an expensive public building. Suitable rooms could be hired in any town at a very moderate figure. If we were on the other side of the House and the time was about 12 or 15 years, ago, we would have such questions as these put to us. The Minister of Public Works would be asked whether or not there had been any report from the Postmaster General as to the absolute necessity for a building to accommodate the post office in Antigonish and what kind of building was required. He would then be asked, whether the Minister of Customs had urged the necessity for better accommodation for his collector. And if such reports were not supplied, there would be a pretty good sized row kicked up and a charge made that this building was simply being put up in order that the member for the county might be able to show that a certain amount of money had been spent in his constituency. But if you have to put up a building, does not the minister think that in a place of that kind a serviceable and commodious building, which would give all the accommodation required, could be put up for, at the outside, $10,000 or $12,000. Why should the department put up a $25,000 building, when a $10,000 one would give all the accommodation required ? What does this $25,000 expenditure involve ? It involves the annual payment of $1,000 for interest and $500 at least for the cost of caretaking and repairs. You cannot get a caretaker to take hold of that building and pay for the heating and the little repairs every year for less than that figure. That makes $1,500 which you take from your revenue ; and as the whole postal revenue of that office is only about $3,000, one half of it will disappear entirely. Nobody objects to Antigonish getting a serviceable building for its public business, but $25,000 is altogether too much to pay, considering its revenue, population and prospects.

Mr. HYMAN. In this particular instance the officers of the Post Office Department

were asked with regard to their requirements and so also were the officers of the Customs Department. It does not seem to me that it would be good policy to put up a building in this town which would not give all the accommodation required. The difficulty is this, that although the estimate of building is only $16,000, it will cost almost as much for fitting up and electric light, and I do not think it is in the public interest that we should skimp and put up a poor looking building which would not do credit to the country. As regards the cost of running it, there is a caretaker there at present, and when the hon. gentleman says the cost will take one half the revenue, he leaves out of consideration the customs duties which are collected there to the extent of $7,700.

Mr. FOWLER. I have not the slightest objection to Antigonish getting a public building, but since the county of Albert has no public building and contains the town of Hillsborough, which has a considerably larger population than Antigonish, and the population of which is increasing, instead of decreasing, as is the case in the latter, I would suggest that the hon. minister would reduce the cost of this building to $15,000 and spend the other $10,000 on the erection of a building of like character in the town of Hillsborough. That is a fair proposition and in this way he would meet the views of the hon. member for Algoma, who wants to have the money to be voted for these public works more evenly distributed over the whole country. We have a large customs and post office business in Hillsborough. It is the centre of a splendid farming population and does a very large trade, and I trust the hon. minister will take note of my remarks and see whether he cannot agree to the suggestions I am making.

Mr. HYMAN. I am sorry I cannot accede to my hon. friend's suggestion. We do not think that a fit and proper building could be put up in Antigonish for less than $25,000. But of course if the hon. gentleman has any presentation to make in favour of a public building in the town of Hillsborough, I shall be happy to give it every consideration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How many towns are there in Canada with a population of from 1,500 to 2,500 which are not yet provided with a public building ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have no statement of the kind with me, but I could have one prepared.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would not delay this item for that. Perhaps we can find it in some return already brought down. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hyman) could indicate any official source of this information I would not give him the trouble of having the statement made up by the department. Otherwise, I would like to have it.

Mr. HYMAN. Of course, it would be easy to make up a statement in the department giving the places that have public buildings, and a list from the census returns of others of similar population.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not speak of this matter because this building is to be in Antigonish. I shall be glad to see a public building there. There are public buildings in towns of a similar size in different parts of the country. But, when we propose to spend $25,000 or $30,000 in a town having a population of between 1,500 and 2,500, I think it would be a desirable thing for this committee to know exactly what that is going to amount to in the long run. If Antigonish is to have a building costing $25,000, we may anticipate, I suppose, that practically every other town of approximately the same size, will demand a similar building, and, according to what I have heard during the last two or three sessions of parliament, we have every reason to expect that their requests will, some time in the early future be acceded to. What is that going to cost us ? To be able to judge of that I want a list of towns from 1,500 to 2,500 population which are not supplied with public buildings sufficient for the ordinary public service of those localities. With this information we shall have an idea of what this policy means to the country. I am assuming, of course, that the department has some policy with regard to it, and that in selecting Antigonish or any other town as a place in which a building is to be constructed costing $25,000, it is proceeding upon some definite policy with regard to the erection of these buildings throughout the country and is not doing it at hap-hazard and simply because one locality or another happens to have political influence with the government.

Mr. BLAIN. A vote was given in 1903 to equip the old building in Antigonish. That seems to have satisfied them for that year; but, in 1904, they seem to have realized the need of a new building costing a large amount of money. I think the minister ought to give us a statement of the cost, showing the cost of the land and how it was purchased, the cost of the building and of its equipment. He should also tell us whether the contract is to be let by tender. And when the building will be completed and ready for occupancy and will a caretaker be appointed ? I ask all these questions at once in order that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hyman) may not be called to his feet too often.

Mr. HYMAN. I desire to give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) every information. I think this is the third or fourth time I have answered these questions in detail. There will be no cost for the land, as it is the intention of the department to build on the old site. It is estimated that the building itself will cost $16,000; heating, $2,000;

wiring, $600; fittings and the furnishings, $3,000; fencing and sidewalks, $500, and a clerk of works and contingencies to make up a total of $25,000. No contract has been entered into by the department yet, nor have tenders been called for. Plans and specifications will be prepared and tenders will be called for in the legal way by public advertisement.

Mr. BLAIN. When will the building be completed ?

Mr. HYMAN. That is a matter to which the department has not given attention as yet. When a contract is to be let, no doubt the time allowed for construction will be fixed.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it the custom of the department to build sidewalks in front of all these buildings ?

Mr. HYMAN. Where improvements of this nature are made it is the custom of the department to pay its share of the cost, and, where the department destroys a sidewalk in the course of constructing a building, it has been the custom of the department to replace the sidewalk so destroyed.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Canso public building, $15,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the site been obtained?

Mr. HYMAN. No. The cost of the site will depend altogether on the part of the town in which it is purchased. There have been no negotiations yet for purchasing a site. The populaion is 2,367. The postal revenue is $1,487, and the customs revenue, $1,787.

Mr. FOSTER. What is it proposed to spend there ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is proposed to spend about $9,500 for the building. Then the heating may cost $1,100, the fittings about $1,500, boxes about $1,700; altogether probably not less than $14,500.

Mr. FOSTER. What arrangements are now made for the post office and custom house ?

Mr. HYMAN. They are in a rented building. We pay $60 a year for the post office and $50 for the custom house. It is proposed to put up a brick building on a stone foundation.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, the minister sees that whilst, with reference to Antigonish, there was a postal revenue amounting to $3,700 and a customs revenue of $7,700, Canso is a town with only $1,487 postal revenue and $1,787 customs revenue, and the minister now proposes to spend, we will say, about $20,000, on a public building in that town. The rentals for the two buildings now amount to $110 a year. The other will be running up to $1,200 or $1,300 a year. It does seem as if the minister was running the thing pretty well into the ground. You are undertaking to put these expensive public buildings in every part. What do they do in the United States ? That is quite a forward country, with 80,000,000 people, fairly prosperous. What is the principle adopted there with reference to small post offices ?

Mr. HYMAN. I must acknowledge that I have not looked closely into the methods pursued in the United States with regard to these matters, and I do not know as we are accustomed to go there for precedents, at least hon. gentlemen opposite tell us we should not. In Canada, when we put up public buildings, we think it is a good principle to make them a credit to the locality and a credit to the country. No doubt by scrimping on these buildings we might cut down the expense a little, but I question if, in the long run, that would be in the interests of the country. In making up these estimates I have endeavoured to make the class of buildings fit the localities in which they are erected. In making up these estimates—I desire to be perfectly frank with the committee—I put the sum high enough to cover all probable expenditure, and I expect that we shall be able to keep within the estimate.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the trouble with the present arrangements for post office and customs house in Canso ? What is the trouble with the business being carried on under rental as it has been, I suppose, for a number of years ? Did the minister ever think of the system which is in vogue in the United States and other countries, the rental system, not entailing large capital expenditures, where you get a fairly reasonable service for the people ? The minister says it is not always well to look for examples on the other side of the line. Just at this time, when we are building $25,000 post offices in little towns, giving from $1,000 to $3,000 of a revenue, the minister does not want us to go to the United States for an example. I notice the Postmaster General seemed to echo the sentiment of the Minister of Public Works. If the echo were only long enough and persistent enough to reach back eight or ten years, we would hear the hon. gentleman's voice——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. You can hear it whenever you wish.

Mr. FOSTER—in this chamber very strongly, very vehemently, denouncing the expenditure of large sums of money in small towns for public buildings. I think if the Minister of Public Works would look into the matter as it is carried on in the United States he would find that they have an excellent postal system in small towns and villages, where they use rented buildings. They

give a certain amount as a salary to the postmaster, he finds his place, and finds accommodation, and the people never think of asking the government to erect public buildings in little towns and villages. The Minister of Public Works says he don't want to scrimp. No one asks him to scrimp, but there is such a thing as looking to the source from which the money comes. That source is the hard working men all over this country, many of whom have all they can do to make both ends meet. They have to pay their taxes, and their taxes form a fund into which the hon. gentleman and his colleagues dip. This kind of expenditure is the least valuable that we can make. If you build a railway with public money there is a growing value that returns to the people. They get their goods carried and themselves carried, business is developed, and if you help trade and commerce by subventions, it all tends to growth and development. But a public building in a little town, though it may be nice as a monument, does not bring a revenue, it does not cause any development. It is a nice thing to look upon sometimes, if it is well built, but it does not fructify anything, it does not add anything to the development of the country. You can easily spend a million dollars in that kind of fixed expenditure, but you would much better take the million dollars and put it into what you might call development expenditure. Are we to look upon this as a party measure or as one in the country's interests? If we look upon it in the country's interest, neither of these votes would be in the estimates to-night. But the party is bound to stand by the minister, and to say that the expenditure is good. But the time is coming, our expenditures are increasing so much, that we ought to call a halt upon this method of expenditure. I do not think it is economical; I do not think it is in the interest of the country. What is the rule that the hon. gentleman takes ? If he gives to his friend who represents Guysborough an expensive public building for a small and somewhat thriving fishing town how can he avoid in any fair way of administration giving it to every other town unless he gives simply on the line of distributing it as a part of the party spoils ? My hon. friend may hark back to previous years. Let previous years take care of themselves as far as I am concerned. He can get up and in answer to me he can call up the shades of the past if he pleases, but it is for the present and for the future that we are here and now in the future I am opposed to that kind of expenditure.

Mr. HYMAN. If my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) and the House would say that for the future there shall be no expenditure on public buildings, but that in all cases buildings for public purposes shall be rented I have not the least doubt of the possibility of a certain amount of money being saved to the country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) takes exception to the erection of these buildings and he says that the time has come to stop expenditures of this kind. The hon. gentleman was in power here for a number of years. He had the honour of being a minister of the Crown and of holding one of the most important positions as Minister of Finance, and I have just as much right to ask him why the time did not come then when expenditures of this class should be stopped. There is no doubt that this class of expenditure was not inaugurated by this government; it was inaugurated by the previous government, it was carried out by the previous government and if we have erred in this respect it is because we are following in the footsteps of our predecessors in office.

Mr. COCHRANE. You said it was wrong.

Mr. HYMAN. If we said it was wrong you say it is wrong now so that we are on an equal footing.

Mr. COCHRANE. You promised that if you got in you would remedy it.

Mr. HYMAN. If we are to look at this matter simply and solely from the sordid dollars and cents point of view I do not think that expenditures of this character can be completely justified. I am not prepared to say that the time has come when we should simply call a halt and stop entirely the erection of these public buildings. There are a great many counties in which there are no public expenditures of any kind. There are shire towns in which it is only fair and right that we should have a public building without looking at it entirely from the sordid standpoint of dollars and cents. Without any desire to bring up any particular cases in which the old government may have erred in regard to these expenditures, I can only say that in this we are following the precedent which was set up by our predecessors. The hon. gentleman says that these expenditures are entirely political. Let us assume for the moment that the expenditures of the old government were entirely political—and I presume the argument would apply in that case as well as in this —what would be the effect? The effect would be that that party having been in power for a number of years they would have public buildings erected in constituencies represented by the party. Is it fair to say that if another party comes into power it shall not erect buildings in the counties which have been overlooked by the previous government? I remember very well that in 1891 a discussion, possibly like the present discussion, took place in which the hon. gentleman who is now the Minister of Public Works very strongly pleaded on behalf of the town of Woodstock. He pointed out that expenditures were being made in very much smaller places, but that no expenditure had ever been made in Wood-

stock although it was a town of 10,000 inhabitants. I think that neglect was afterwards corrected and that an expenditure was made by the hon. gentleman's government. If you look upon these matters purely and simply from the dollars and cents standpoint I do not think that there can be any doubt that the public business can be carried on in a rented building as well as in an office which is built for the purpose. But, that is not entirely the policy of the government. The policy of the government is, when they have public money, when they feel that they can afford to make an expenditure on a public building to erect a public building, to endeavour to keep the amount of the expenditure as low as possible, but to erect a building in accordance with what the Department of Public Works should erect.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I am not going to indulge in anything like the pot calling the kettle black, and I am not going to say the province of Nova Scotia is not entitled to her share of the expenditure, but I would like to see that expenditure devoted to some valuable purpose on the lines set out by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). Take this Canso vote; $800, is four per cent on the money, $800 additional is the cost of caretaking and maintenance, and $500 is the sinking fund, making $2,100 a year put on the country where $110 now meets everything. I quite agree with what my hon. friend said that this money should be spent efficiently no matter what we have done in the past. Look at the good that would be accomplished by the establishment of a technical school in a little town like Canso. If we gave $2,000 to every county in Nova Scotia to improve the fisheries, to extend railways, or to be expended in some other progressive way the people would get a return for the money. But all they get from this expenditure are brick walls to look at. In the erection of a public building there is no advancement in the commercial or educational life of the people. There is a blank brick wall which is practically of no use except that it is an ornament. We are not here to build ornaments, we are here to advance the interests of the people and we are here as the trustees of the people to administer their estate. The money is theirs, it is not ours. The hon. Postmaster General is one whom everybody respects as an administrator of trust funds and I have heard him speak at times very learnedly on that subject. We are here as the administrators of trust funds which are to be administered in the interest of the people who own the money which is not to be squandered. If it has been the practice in the past to justify expenditures of this kind it is high time that practice ceased no matter which party is to blame. Let us administer this money in a way in which it will be profitable and in which it will convey some benefit to the public. I would far sooner see this money put into railways, public schools, the promotion of the fisheries or the encouragement of agriculture and things of that kind than see it expended in this way. It would end in the development and progress of the country and the people would learn to appreciate the act of any government that would spend money in that way. I am not taking objection to Nova Scotia getting her share of the money but I do take objection to the doctrine being set up that when good things are going this or that town is to have her share of the good things because some other town had it in the past and that because one party is in power, now is the time to reward the constituencies friendly to the government. I do not subscribe to those doctrines at all. I repudiate them and I am sorry to hear them enunciated in this House. If the hon. Acting Minister of Public Works would pay a visit to the United States or some other countries and see if there is not some rule that governs in cases of this kind I think the result would prove advantageous to himself and to the country. I have a pretty fair idea of what obtains in the United States. There is a rule—it is not a very strong rule—but there is a general rule that a certain amount will be spent in towns of a certain population and with a certain revenue and in that way those who have these matters in charge can keep a check on the expenditures. But now, we have sent the idea abroad that an expenditure will be made in any town that is friendly to the government——

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. That is pretty near what we have heard here to-night; that is that any town of 1,500 inhabitants that is friendly to the government can have $25,000 spent on a public building. That is not good policy. There might be a reason for a public building of this kind if we had public ownership of telephones and telegraphs and if the express business were conducted in connection with the post office. But, we have not got that at the present time and that being the case I say that this expenditure cannot be justified. I oppose it, not because Nova Scotia is not entitled to an expenditure of public money, but because it is not being expended efficiently and it is not our duty as trustees to squander the public money as it has been squandered in these votes.

Mr. SPROULE. I entertain the same opinion to-day in regard to expenditures on buildings of this character as that which I have entertained for many years, and I hold that no government has any business to expend money on that principle. We have post offices all over the country and have a somewhat extensive experience as to the cost. Take towns and villages with the

same population and the same amount of business, and you will find that in every instance where we rent the building it costs the country very much less, in most cases not one-fourth of the money that it costs to erect our own buildings. Then we put up buildings in some small places while in large towns never a dollar has been spent for public buildings, and to-day we have only rented buildings in them. Take, if you like, the county of Grey, which I represent. It is one of the largest counties in Ontario, with a population of about 75,000. If you take Meaford in that county with a revenue of $3,807, which shows that it is a live, prosperous town, you will find that not a dollar has been spent for a post office, but people there have not clamoured for the expenditure because there is a good post-office building built by a private individual and all we pay for that is $160 a year as an allowance for rent, fuel and light. $160 a year covers all the expense of a building for a place which is as large or larger than Antigonish or the place where we now propose to put up a post office. What justification can there be for incurring an annual outlay of over $1,200 a year to give the same accommodation to the public which they can receive for $160. It is a very bad business principle. Then take Owen Sound, one of the best towns in Ontario, a town of 10,000 population, but up to the present there has not been a dollar spent for a post office. They have a building rented there at a very much less cost than the interest in the investment and the cost of caring for a government building. Not many years ago when the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) was running up there the Postmaster General visited that town and picked out a very nice site——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I never did anything of the kind.

Mr. SPROULE—and gave the people to understand——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I never did anything of the kind.

Mr. SPROULE—all I can say is this that I will give my authority for the statement, Mr. Hopkins, with whom I have been very well acquainted for many years. Mr. Hopkins with the Postmaster General walked into the Patterson house in Owen Sound. The Postmaster General walked upstairs. I asked Mr. Hopkins what he was doing, and he said picking out a site for a post-office and he picked out a very good one.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is quite untrue.

Mr. SPROULE. And he gave the people to understand——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I never did.

Mr. SPROULE—that if they supported the government in this election what a fine thing it would be for them——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I never did. If the hon. gentleman says that I gave the people to understand that, I give the most emphatic possible contradiction to his statement. I can quite recall being pestered by people wanting to sell lots for post office purposes and to all of them I declined to say anything except this : Owen Sound needs other things more than a post office; it requires the developing of its harbour. That is what I have told the people in many instances.

Mr. FOSTER. What does Canso require ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am speaking of Owen Sound.

Mr. COCHRANE. What did you go upstairs for ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. What I have said in Owen Sound is : Owen Sound has magnificent harbour facilities and I think that Owen Sound requires the improvement of its harbour to enable it to make money. That would be better for Owen Sound than to spend money on public buildings that otherwise might very properly be erected. I took this argument and I leave it to my hon. friend if that is not correct. No matter what must be the claims, no matter how justifiable it would be to expend for post office building and harbour works, after all there is a limit to what the country will pay to any particular place, and I have pointed out to the people, not of Owen Sound alone, but of other places, when they have discussed with me from time to time proposed expenditures to public buildings, I have asked them : is there not some other way, is there not something more urgent that would be a more useful expenditure than would the erection of public buildings? My recommendation to them is to see that the application is first made in regard to public works that are of greater urgency and likely to be more advantageous. I have given that advice constantly to people from places like Owen Sound. I did so in Meaford ; my hon. friend refers to Meaford. It is not many weeks since some gentlemen from Meaford proposed to me, thinking I had something to do with the recommendations for the building of post offices, that I should, in the interest of Meaford, recommend the appropriation of some money for a public building. I said : I think that whatever money the country can afford to give for Meaford would be more wisely expended to-day in developing your harbour. We have commenced to develop Meaford harbour and my hon. friend will justify, I am sure, all we have done there.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. And will justify more. It has a bright future if we enable it to trade outside. That is the kind of argument I have advanced at Meaford and at other places. There are some places

not so situated geographically where wharfs, &c., can be of service, inland towns or places that are not in need of harbour facilities; these places may press for expenditure on public buildings, but we have had to contend with the effect of a bad example. The public have been falsely educated. For example, I have before me a paper and I will show you—but I did not intend to cut in on the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and I must apologize. I will later on show where we have been left by the bad example I spoke of.

Mr. COCHRANE. What did you go upstairs for ?

Mr. SPROULE. I only hope the Postmaster General will be fortified with sufficient strength to withstand this bad example and adopt better principles. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) to what a splendid rebuke this is to his policy in regard to post offices, and the principle is a good one, if they only lived up to it. I will say with regard to the Postmaster General that he must have been very unfortunate in the choice of his language in explaining the situation in Owen Sound, for my information was that he went down and showed what a splendid place they had for a dry dock, how much they required for harbours, how badly they needed a post office, and what a fine thing it would be to have all their workmen employed. I had been speaking there and I said that no matter what candidate was returned the government would have to do justice, and then along came Mr. Hardy and said : Oh yes, you will get justice, but there is a difference between cold justice and hot justice. Hot justice was an active commerce, employment for the labourers, expenditure of money in the town, fine buildings going up, improvements to the harbour, and expansion of commerce. This was the warm justice they were going to get in contradistinction to the cold justice which would be meted out if they sent an opponent of the government. The Postmaster General being there two different parties were vying with each other in the effort to sell a site and one of them, who had always been a Conservative, told me in the hotel that but for the fact that he had reasonable hopes of being able to sell a site to the Postmaster General he would support our candidate, but he said : You know I am hard up and anxious to sell my lot, therefore I cannot afford to oppose them. He was unfortunate in his language, because that is the impression he left.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman has no information except hearsay. Mr. Hopkins he says, told him. I never knew a member of this House more given to founding statements on hearsay than the hon. member. He begins a statement by saying 'I have heard,' 'rumour says,' 'a man told me,' &c. He is a regular Sarey Gamp with a ridiculous Mrs. Harris. He is eternally producing some imaginary witness to bolster up some absurd argument. I never suggested to any one that we would buy or build a post office in Owen Sound ; I never gave a promise during or before or after an election or said that I was favourable or that the government was favourable to the building of a post office. I ask the hon. gentleman to desist from charging me with doing a thing when I did not do it.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is quite gratuitous to intimate that I am in the habit of basing statements on hearsay. I say that the evidence that I submit is as good, as reliable and as honest as the evidence that he submits. I have given the name of a respectable gentleman in Owen Sound who has been there for 30 years or more.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is about the only time you ever gave the name.

Mr. SPROULE. He walked in in my presence along with the Postmaster General. I happened to be in the hotel because I was staying there. Is that not good evidence ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I submit it is. Let the Postmaster General go into Owen Sound and say that the evidence of Hopkins is not reliable. I can tell him one thing, that he would not get a very courteous reply. If the Owen Sound 'Advertiser,' which supports the hon. gentleman, does not bear out in the main what I say with regard to the impressions left on the people's mind, I will admit that I was entirely wrong in my impression. But I believe I was justified in every particular. With regard to Meaford, I said nothing. About the wisdom of spending money on harbours instead of post offices, I agree with the hon. Postmaster General. The expenditure on Meaford harbour was an admirable expenditure and served a good purpose. If the hon. gentleman proposed to-morrow to spend money for a post office in Meaford, I do not know that I would justify it. Meaford has now a good post office which costs the country only $160 a year, whereas, it would be impossible to have a good building put up there at a less cost than double or treble that amount. Take the village of Markdale, where I live. It has as large a revenue or larger than this place, but there is no post office there, and there has never been any application for one. Take Chesley, Durham, Shelbourne, Dundalk, any one of them as large as this place ; but no person pretends to say that the government would be justified in incurring an expenditure of $15,000 or $20,000 to put up a public building in each of these

places, because the public are now provided with accommodation for less cost than they would be if the buildings were put up. What I complain of is the want of business principles in the spending of the public money, the wastefulness of paying $1,000 or $1,200 a year for a service that could be got quite as well for $150 or $200. When the Postmaster General and his friends were on this side of the House, I took the same ground. I said, as a supporter of the government at that time, that whenever the government could not get a suitable building for a moderate figure, they might be justified in erecting a building, but otherwise they would not.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But you always supported their votes.

Mr. SPROULE. Not always.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, always.

Mr. SPROULE. I ought to know what I did quite as well as the Postmaster General.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Did the hon. gentleman ever vote against a grant of the late government for a post office building ?

Mr. SPROULE. I am not in the witness box now.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. His principles are his own and his vote belongs to his party.

Mr. SPROULE. I said, and I repeat, that when I was on that side of the House supporting the government, I gave voice to the same sentiments that I do to-day. I say now, as I said then, that that is a sound principle, and the government that departs from that principle is not a good business government, and is not using wisely and economically the trust funds of the people.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The main argument used by some of the hon. gentlemen who have addressed the committee is that we should rent buildings for custom houses or post offices. I wish to point out that in Canso we are absolutely without decent facilities at the present time. The occasion of applying for this building was a fire, in which the existing custom house was burned. The business is now carried on in a dwelling house, a very inconvenient place. There is no building in the town at all suitable that could be secured by the government. The post office is in a small wooden building, something like 8 by 10 feet. It is so small that the people have to stand outside in the snow on stormy nights while the mail is being sorted, and there is no place to shelter them while the mail is being delivered. This small building was erected by the postmaster because there was no other suitable building. I may also point out that while the revenue from the custom house is small, a large business is carried on in connection with it. Canso is the principal fishing station on the eastern coast of Nova Scotia. It is now the headquarters of the banking fleet, and a large number of vessels call there year after year. I find on looking at the trade and navigation returns that the number of vessels engaged in the coasting trade which called at Canso last year was 802, with a tonnage of 41,349 tons, and having crews numbering 4,988 ; the number of steamers was 607, with a tonnage of 63,317 tons, and crews numbering 6,249 ; the number of vessels outward bound for sea was 466, with a tonnage of 41,066 and crews numbering 6,909 ; making altogether 1,875 vessels calling at that port during the last year, with a tonnage of 145,732 tons, and crews numbering 18,227 men ; showing the committee that there is a large business done in the custom house there, although the revenue is small.

Mr. FOSTER. How does the hon. gentleman account for that ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. It is the duty of the customs officer to enter these ships and report them.

Mr. FOSTER. These are fishing vessels.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Fishing vessels, from which there is no revenue at all. Canso is not an importing point. A large quantity of goods are used there, but they are imported chiefly from Halifax. Consequently, the amount of duties paid there is small, but the officer has a great deal of work, which he is required to do under the Merchants Shipping Act. Canso is a growing town. Some complaint was made in connection with the last item that we were voting money for a town that was decreasing in population. By the census, I find that the popluation of Canso in 1871 was 1,090, in 1881 1,411, in 1891, 1,824, and in 1901, 2,367, an increase of 35 per cent during the last ten years. The number of money orders issued there last year was 2,583, and the amount of money transmitted $29,750.98. Besides being the headquarters of the fishing industry in Nova Scotia, Canso is a cable station. Eight or ten cables are landed there. It has two large stations, one under the management of the Western Union, the other under the management of the Commercial Cable Company. The committee will therefore see that it is absolutely necessary to provide this accommodation at Canso, owing to the fact that there is no building that could be rented at the preseit time.

Glace Bay public bullding, $15,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population of Glace Bay ?

Mr. HYMAN. Over 11,000. The town is growing very fast.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the revenues ?

Mr. HYMAN. The postal revenue is $5,443.88 and the customs revenue $46,650.72.

Mr. FOSTER. What is it proposed to spend there ?

Mr. HYMAN. $39,900. The building is to cost about $30,000, heating $2,300, fittings $3,700, and contingencies. The site has not yet been purchased, but negotiations have been started with regard to some sites.

Mr. FOSTER. Started before the election ?

Mr. HYMAN. No, I think within the last month.

Mr. FOSTER. Have not the officers been there ?

Mr. HYMAN. I understand that an officer was sent there during the last week. There is no report from him yet.

Mr. BARKER. What has the $3,000 already spent been spent for ?

Mr. HYMAN. There has been no expenditure of any kind. We have to June 30 to spend the money voted last year.

Mr. BARKER. What do you contemplate spending $3,000 for—buying the land?

Mr. HYMAN. It must be remembered that these estimates are made very early in the year, and it is always a question just what amount we are able to spend within the fiscal year to carry out the orders of the House. The officer of the department has only been there within the last ten days, and he could not tell within a dollar how much we shall spend of the vote of last year.

Mr. BARKER. The minister tells us that he does not know how the $3,000 is to be spent before the 1st July ?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not.

Mr. BARKER. Surely, the hon. gentleman must have had some idea before he asked for a revote of $7,000 on $10,000 ?

Mr. HYMAN. As I tried to explain, these estimates are made up early in the year. They were started last December, and so the officers of the department had to look ahead six months. They put down the sum of $3,000 as being the amount of the probable expenditure up to the 30th June next.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister received any report from the officer sent down to look after the site ?

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Mr. FOSTER. How much is it supposed that the site will cost ?

Mr. HYMAN. It depends upon the location. I have no report before me. I have some knowledge of the town, and I am afraid the site will be somewhat expensive.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not see quite how the hon. gentleman can make his estimate unless he has some idea of what he will require for the site.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will see that we are asking only $15,000. I have given the amount it is expected to spend for the building. Without question we shall have to ask for a further vote, as the whole amount will not be expended in the fiscal year for which this is being asked. When I ask for a further vote, I shall have more particulars as to the site.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this a general public building ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. For customs and post office ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. This is an expenditure which, I think, the minister himself will feel, he has no difficulty in defending. Here is a town of 10,000 or 11,000 people, a growing town; and the hon. gentleman asks for $39,000 for a public building. I should think that there could be no very great objection to that. But how to justify $25,000 in the case of one of the towns we have been considering as against $39,000 in this case I cannot see. I want to impress upon the minister, if I can, the general policy, already largely carried out in this country, of renting buildings for the public service in the smaller towns and so keeping the expenditure within reasonable bounds.

Mr. HYMAN. I have already explained that, as between the buildings proper in these two places there is a difference of 100 per cent. But, when you come to the heating, lighting and fittings, there is not the same percentage in difference in cost. I have gone somewhat carefully into the character of the buildings we are providing for the different places, and I find that there is not so much difference in these accessories between a building costing $16,000 and a building costing $30,000.

Public buildings—Nova Scotia—Halifax Dominion building—improvements, repairs, &c., $2,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be done there ?

Mr. HYMAN. General repairs. The department is at present erecting a new building at Halifax, but it is necessary to make some expenditure on the old one. It is intended to use the new building for customs house purposes, and to use this building for a post office alone. I think the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. R. L. Borden) is aware of the circumstances. The post office part of the old building has outlived its usefulness, and it is proposed to renew the whole building and use it for post office purposes only.

Halifax immigrant building—additional story over the one story portion, &c., $11,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be done with that ?

Mr. HYMAN. That is explained by the vote itself—it is an addition story over part of the building. There is a contract for the work amounting to $15,000. The estimate for heating is $2,000 ; lighting, $1,500 ; furniture, $1,500 and fittings, $2,000—total $22,000. The amount we have at our disposal now is $11,000 and this is to complete the building.

Halifax immigrant building—detention building, $24,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Where is that being constructed ?

Mr. HYMAN. We are now looking for a site.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It was voted last year, but, apparently, no part of the money was spent.

Mr. HYMAN. The whole question in regard to this has been a question of site.

Halifax new public building, $112,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is to carry on the work on the new public building in Halifax which has been under construction since 1902.

Mr. BARKER. What is the object of this building, and what is the ultimate cost to be ? So far the figures seem to be $187,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The object of this building is for customs purposes, and to furnish offices for the engineers of the Public Works Department. The contract for the building was $250,000 It is proposed to spend on fittings and furniture. $12,000 ; engine and boilers, $3,000 ; heating boilers, $8,000 ; electric wiring, &c., $4,000 ; elevator, $7,000 ; incidentals, &c., $6,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How many stories will this building have ?

Mr. HYMAN. Four stories besides the basement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is to be the size of the building ?

Mr. HYMAN. The lot is 106 feet by 86 feet, and the building covers the whole lot.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Within what time was it to be completed, under the contract?

Mr. HYMAN. It should have been completed last fall. I understand that the main reason given by the contractor—I have had some communications with the contractor, trying to hurry him up—was the difficulty in procuring stone from the quarry; that, and the difficulty of getting enough stonecutters at Halifax, are the reasons given by the contractor for the non completion of the building at the time specified.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understood there was some difficulty raised about procuring skilled workmen, and the workingmen of Halifax were not very much astonished to find that that excuse had been given. Some action was taken on the subject. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would have no objection to bringing down the correspondence with the contractor. I would not consider the building more than half finished. I think there are two stories and part of the third story up.

Mr. HYMAN. I have seen a photograph of the building, I think the third story is up and part of the fourth.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the hon. gentleman any idea when the building will be completed? It has been going on for a year and a half now, and at the same rate it will take a year and a half longer.

Mr. HYMAN. I think it would take at least a year from the present time to complete it. There is another half story and the roof to be put on. I understand the work will go forward much faster in future.

Mr. BARKER. I understand this building was to have been completed according to contract five months ago. Will the minister tell us whether anything has occurred since the contract was entered into to postpone the completion of the building? It ought to have been finished in September last. What peculiar circumstances are there that make it improbable that the building will not be completed for more than a year to come?

Mr. HYMAN. There has been nothing between the contractor and the Public Works Department since the contract was made, which can be urged as an excuse for the non-completion of the building. I gave the reasons which the contractor has offered, namely, the difficulty with regard to procuring stone. I may say that the contractor, before the building was commenced or a short time after, made application to the department for the substitution of one stone for another, and the department did not accede to his request. The contractor has always said that the main difficulty was to procure the stone fast enough.

Mr. BARKER. Has that question of the kind of stone been definitely settled, and is the government to stand by the original contract?

Mr. HYMAN. Absolutely.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to have a copy of the contract and of the correspondence with the contractor, if the hon. gentleman has no objection.

Mr. HYMAN. Not the slightest. Some of the statements I have made with regard to the stone may not appear in the correspondence. I was in Halifax myself last year, and strongly urged upon the contractor the necessity of pushing forward

the building, and he made the statement to me personally about the stone.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like an opportunity of discussing this after the documents are brought down, at the same time I do not want to hold up the item.

Mr. HYMAN. Certainly, I shall be glad at any time to discuss this item when the other estimates are going through.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think this is a case in which the department should urge expedition upon the contractor and enforce it by every possible means. The Postmaster General himself spoke the other day in strong terms of the miserable, wretched accommodation in the city of Halifax for the postmaster and his staff. He did not use language any too strong. There was a good deal of delay in letting the contract. It dragged on for about two years after the item first appeared, and now we have a building only three-quarters finished, that should have been completed five or six months ago. The circumstances of the case rendered it absolutely necessary that that building should be completed within the time fixed, and it does not seem to me that what has been stated by the minister affords any good excuse. The contractor knew the kind of stone that was required for the building, and he should have made provision for it. He simply offered as an excuse, so far as I can gather, that he had some difficulty in getting the stone. Is there no penalty in the contract to compel the contractor to be a little more expeditious? It is for that purpose I would like to see a copy of the contract. The minister may be able to tell me now whether there were the usual provisions in the contract for some penalty, or some recourse against the contractor in case he does not complete the building within the time specified.

Mr. HYMAN. The contract is the usual contract made by the department with contractors. There is a deposit of ten per cent, or thereabouts of the amount which is in the hands of the government, and it is in the power of the government to enforce the contract by making any such deduction from the deposit that the government might feel proper to make. But it is rather a harsh measure to take with a contractor. The government have not always carried that out. I do not know myself of any place where that forfeiture has been carried out by the government against a private individual. The contractor has given as his reason that he is unable to get the stone.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The forfeiture is sometimes enforced. I know a case in which the imperial government employed a builder at Halifax to perform a certain work. They asked him if he could do it by a certain date, and he said he could do it before that date. He said: Name your own date, and they did so. He was about two months over the time specified, and they charged him £6 or £10 a day for every day that he exceeded. The government were put to expense and inconvenience by the delay. I am not suggesting that the government should act in such a way with this contractor. There may have been difficulties which would make it inadequate for the government to do so, although they may have the legal right to exact from him the penalty. I would like to see him treated with absolute fairness; at the same time I think the powers which the government have in that regard might be so placed before the contractor as to compel him to get along with his work more rapidly. Is any work being done at present?

Mr. HYMAN. I understand from the officers of the department that the material is being collected, and that certain stone cutting is going on. I do not think there is any actual laying of stone being done at the present time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am bound to say that I did not see any great evidence of haste on the part of the contractor when I observed the work. However, I would like to see the correspondence before being able to judge definitely, but I would be surprised if any satisfactory reason has been made out by the contractor for the great delay.

Mr. HYMAN. The documents will be produced.

Inverness public building, $15,000.

Mr. GANONG. Is this an incorporated town?

Mr. McLENNAN. It was incorporated last year.

Mr. GANONG. It is not so stated in the census.

Mr. McLENNAN. A municipal census taken last year shows a population of some 3,000. The town is growing very rapidly, it has in fact much exceeded the population of the shire town of the county of Inverness, or any other of the growing towns in that county. So rapidly indeed has been its growth that in the year 1901 when the last census was taken, the population did not exceed 100, whereas, owing to the development of the coal mines by the Inverness Coal and Railway Company, the population of that locality has increased to 3,000 last year, when a census was taken for the purpose of incorporation. The Postmaster General's return for 1900 or 1901 will show that the revenue from the post office for either of those years would be something like $80 or $85, whereas the postal revenue is now $1,255. The amount of money orders issued was $11,000 and odd during the past year. This abundantly shows the rapid growth of the town even

without reference to census. As an illustration of the rapid development that is going on in mining in that county, I may state that there are two other towns in it which are rapidly developing on similar lines but not to the same extent as in this instance. There were coal sales from this mine during the past year amounting to 200,000 tons, securing to the government of Nova Scotia $20,000 of revenue and no doubt a proportionate amount to this government The customs revenue at that port will not show much of the amount collected because the goods consumed there by the miners, who are almost absolutely a consuming population, are entered at Halifax and at Montreal. At the same time the customs receipts there would exceed those taken at Canso, and other points where similar buildings are sought. I may say also that although the county of Inverness in population and resources in every particular is one of the most important counties in Nova Scotia, strange to say, it is the only county in that province to-day without a public building within its confines—not one. Its population, according to the last census, is 25,000 in round numbers and from the description I gave of the progress of these mining towns it would not at all be exaggerating to estimate the population of the county to-day at 30,000 ; yet, as I have indicated there is not a public building within its confines.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the customs revenue there ?

Mr. McLENNAN. $1,950. It is an outport of Port Hood.

Mr. GANONG. What is the total cost of this building, land and everything complete?

Mr. HYMAN. There has been no site obtained for this building as yet nor have there been any negotiations in regard to the matter of a site. I am in hopes of putting up a building of the class 'C,' the estimated cost of which is $9,500 ; heating, $1,128 ; fittings, $1,485 ; boxes, $288, making, with contingencies, $14,500.

Mr. GANONG. It is quite evident that this building is not to be built on the basis of revenue, for I question if you can find another town with the population claimed by he hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan) with a postal revenue as small as that which he gave.

Mr. FOSTER. That $15,000 does not include the site ?

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Mr. McLENNAN. In regard to the postal revenue I might further explain that the postal accommodation in that town is so very poor that the company and the bank agent there do their postal business in a great measure with the postal car, sending their mail by train direct without any reference to the post office at all, because, there is only a wretched building. There was great difficulty in securing a building at all for the post office for the simple reason that rents are so high in the town that no person would rent the government a building for so low a rent as would be paid for postal accommodation.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if these gentlemen buy their stamps from the postal car too ?

Mr. HYMAN. I am not able to give the hon. gentleman that information.

Mr. McLENNAN. There is nothing to prevent these gentlemen from buying postage stamps where they please.

Mr. FOSTER. They do not come up to Ottawa to get them do they ?

Mr. McLENNAN. No, but they go to other offices.

Mr. FOWLER. How far would they go to some other office to get them ?

Mr. McLENNAN. I know that the bank particularly buys its stamps at other post offices.

Mr. FOWLER. Would the hon. gentleman say that this is because of the poor accommodation at this post office ? Surely they have room enough in the post office to keep the stamps. Surely there is enough room for a person patronizing the office to stand in out of the wet while he is buying postage stamps.

Mr. McLENNAN. The accommodation is so very poor indeed that these parties scarcely care to do business with the office.

Mr. FOWLER. I would suggest that in fine weather they might be able to buy stamps there.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I would like to know whether the population which the hon. gentleman refers to of 2,800 is the population of the whole country, and if there are any other post offices in the county besides this ?

Mr. HYMAN. I cannot give the hon. gentleman any information in regard to other post offices, but there is no post office building owned by the government in the county.

Mr. A. MARTIN. What is the population of the village where this post office is located ?

Mr. HYMAN. The population is given at 3,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would it not be worth while for the hon. minister to consider whether a $14,000 post office would meet the wants of this growing town ? If the town keeps on growing as the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan) says,

in two or three years it will perhaps need a $30,000 building.

Mr. McLENNAN. There is no doubt of it. I will come up here again for more.

Shelburne public building, $15,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This vote is asked for the purpose of providing a public building at Shelburne. There has been no site purchased up to this moment. The postal revenue is $1,552 and the customs revenue, which I note has doubled in the last year, is $1,227.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population of Shelburne ?

Mr. HYMAN. In the last census it is given as 1,445.

Mr. FOSTER. What is it supposed this building is going to cost ?

Mr. BARR. It is very hard to understand the principle which hon. gentlemen opposite pursue. We find that in Shelburne, N.S., where the population is 1,445, the government will probably spend $15,000 while in Shelburne, Ont., which is about the same size there is no building at all.

Mr. BERGERON. And the postmaster dismissed.

Mr. BARR. And the postmaster dismissed. It must be because of the large support that hon. gentlemen have from Nova Scotia and which they do not seem to have in Ontario. I ask on what principle of justice are we spending these large sums of money in one province and in one part of one province when we have a village equally as large, a country surrounding very much superior and a larger post office revenue, and yet we hear no word of any expenditure in connection with a building in that place. There should be some principle of justice and fairness laid down in connection with the expenditure of public money in the different provinces. In Ontario to-day it is very true that there is a large majority against hon. gentlemen opposite, and yet we find from the returns that the money spent in Ontario according to population is much smaller in amount than in other provinces that give a large support to hon. gentlemen opposite. It does seem to me that the principle upon which they act is that to the victors belong the spoils. It does seem to me that this is a pernicious principle. It is one which I admit hon. gentlemen contended against very strongly, one on which they grew eloquent on every occasion when questions of this kind came up. It seems to me that they have forgotten, in these short years that they have been in power, all the principles they professed and the course which they pointed out should be followed, and would be followed as they promised, if they attained the reins of power. Now we find that they have outheroded Herod, that they have gone far beyond any previous government along these lines. We must draw some line or this system will become a game of grab and the county that gets the greatest pull upon the government will receive the greatest amount of money.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think my hon. friend will find that he is in error in thinking that Ontario has been slighted, in fact or for any such reason as he has assigned. It is a mere accident that money may be distributed among the provinces so that one receives more than another, but it certainly is not based on political grounds. If the hon. gentleman will turn to page 47 he will find that the items to be voted for Ontario for this year amount to $1,094,200—

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. For post offices ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Under the head of public buildings—whilst the appropriation for Nova Scotia is $240,500. Of course Nova Scotia in population and area is much less than Ontario, but the vote to be given to Nova Scotia is not 25 per cent of the amount being voted to Ontario.

Mr. BARKER. The population is very much smaller.

Mr. GANONG. What is the total cost of this building ? You say the ground has not been acquired ?

Mr. HYMAN. The land has not been acquired. Both the customs house and post office will be placed in this building. It is estimated that the cost of the building will be in the neighbourhood of $8,500. Then it is estimated that there will be $500 for heating, $1,500 for fittings, $500 for any requisites in regard to sidewalks, fencing, &c., and then of course there is an estimate for contingencies, $1,500 making a total of $13,000 for the building.

Mr. GANONG. I notice that the population of this town is 1,445 and it has made wonderful growth. In the last ten years it has grown 145 people. In the last census the population was 1,300. It seems as if the same principle that applies to outside counties applies also to the counties represented by the ministers.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is the business done now and for the last twenty years.

Mr. HYMAN. In a rented building.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the rent ?

Mr. HYMAN. $60, for the post office and $40 for the customs.

Mr. FOSTER. $100, and you say the customs revenue is $1,227. You are building a customs house to collect that much money.

Sydney public buildings—addition to, $2,500.

Mr. HYMAN. This is a small amount of money to make provision for completing an

addition to the public building at Sydney. The original building was built some years ago

Mr. BARKER. We might take the two items for public buildings at Sydney and North Sydney Mines together.

Mr. HYMAN. They are not placed together.

Mr. BARKER. They are not very far apart. We have had about $200,000 granted last year and this, about Sydney. Nobody I think, objects to every assistance being given to Sydney, but we ought to have particulars about this expenditure.

Mr. HYMAN. Sydney of course is on one side of the harbour and Sydney Mines is entirely on the other side of the harbour. I do not know the exact number of miles but it is quite distant.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. They are about 22 miles apart and this amount is simply to complete the Sydney building.

Sydney Mines public building, $14,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this a new building ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is a new building, the contract is given, the amount of the contract being $16,750.

Mr. FOSTER. For fittings and all ?

Mr. HYMAN. That is for the contract; the estimate for heating the building is $2,000. Fittings are placed at $3,000, and incidentals, $2,500, amounting in all to about $24,000. The department are not sure whether the building will be wired or not; if it is wired we will have to add $1,000 to that.

Mr. BLAIN. How much did the site cost?

Mr. HYMAN. The site was bought some time since and cost $4,500.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population ?

Mr. HYMAN. 3,191.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the size of the site ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is a corner lot on the corner of Main Street and Fraser Ave. There is 96 feet frontage; the lot is 45 feet wide, and 136 feet deep at one point; it is a triangular site.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the minister taken the precaution that was suggested here of having all these public buildings a certain distance from any other building ? I called attention to the fact that in the United States, government buildings are by law not to be within a certain number of feet—I think a hundred—of any other building, public or private.

Mr. HYMAN. I do not think that could be carried out in the case of small post offices. Here the site cost $4,500 and it is doubtful if the expenditure required to keep it entirely isolated would be justified. The policy of the department is wherever possible to have a corner site. In this case the custom of the department is to have a lane on either side so as to make the building as far as possible a detached building.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. I do not know the value of land there and whether $4,500 was a high expenditure or not, but I will say there have been instances, both under the present and past administrations, when land was paid for at too high a price, and if it cost three times that amount, I am satisfied that the government would be justified in having fine public buildings kept up, and would be even justified in taking them off the main street of a town and putting them in the nearest square with a park where they would be safe from fire from adjoining buildings, and would be more attractive. I hope the minister will give this serious consideration. The public will stand $2,000 more for this building if we must have these buildings in order to have proper surroundings for the public building.

Mr. HYMAN. Of course while the department has the right to choose a site, in most instances they have to consult the convenience of the city or town in which the buildings are being erected. I can quite conceive myself that if we were to look at it solely from a public works standpoint, what he hon. gentleman suggestsi might be carried out, but it has always been the desire and the usage of the department to endeavour to meet the wishes of the city or town in which public buildings may be erected.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I suppose that was the case in reference to the Sherbrooke drill hall ?

Mr. FOSTER. What is the revenue there?

Mr. HYMAN. The post office revenue is $2,450, and the customs last year was only $85.

Mr. D. D McKENZIE. There is no customs house at Sydney Mines; it is an outport of North Sydney. The post office is a rented building.

Mr. FOSTER. How much is the rent ?

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. I see by the estimates that the postmaster is allowed $65 for rent and fuel, but of course it is notorious that the accommodation is not satisfactory and that there has been an urgent cry for increased accommodation for some time. The hon. minister gave the population of the town of Sydney Mines as 3,000, but I may say that it is one of the boom towns of he province of Nova Scotia and that its population to-day is easily over 5,000. The amount of money orders handled there last year was $64,000, which shows that there was considerable business done.

It is the home of the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Co. The coal shipments from that port have trebled within the last few years. Taking it all in all, it is a very important town, and not to be measured by the amount of customs revenue collected, because there is no customs house there at all.

Souris public building, $10,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Has anything been spent on that ?

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population ?

Mr. HYMAN. In round numbers 2,000. The postal revenue is $1,537 and the customs revenue $3,358. The estimated cost of the building is $9,500, heating, $1,128; fittings, $1,763, and contingencies, amounting in all to $14,500. If we have to wire the building that will cost $500 extra. No site has yet been selected.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the business being done in now ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have not got that information.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister have any report from his officers as to existing accommodation before he commences putting up a new building ?

Mr. HYMAN. Only in cases where buildings are rented by the Public Works Department. In this case the rental would be paid by the Customs Department and the Post Office Department, and, therefore, we would have no report as to that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. With regard to sites, would it not be advisable for the government to secure options on sites before it is generally known that a public building is going to be erected? It is customary for the owners of possible sites to raise the prices as soon as it is known that a public building is to be put up. Why might not an officer of the department secure a proper site beforehand? He need not even communicate with the leading Liberal of the place. He might get an option on a site large enough to provide a nice public ground around the building. The minister would immortalize himself if he would start that rule.

Mr. HYMAN. It has been the custom of the department ever since I had anything to do with it to endeavour to secure these options as quietly as possible, so that the government shall not be called upon to pay more than may be necessary. I am endeavouring to get a number of options in different places in that way at present. We usually endeavour to obtain options on several sites, and then send an officer of the department to examine them and report before deciding.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the minister ever compared the municipal assessment of any of these sites with the price the government is paying ?

Mr. HYMAN. Our officer has been asked to obtain that as evidence of value.

Campbellton public building, $16,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population ?

Mr. HYMAN. 3,500. The postal revenue is $4,836 and the customs revenue $13,686. This building is under contract. The amount of the contract is $16,600. The heating is estimated to cost $2,000, fittings and furniture about $2,000, extension of sidewalks, if necessary, $500, and adding $3,000, the cost of the building will be about $25,000. In addition, it is a question whether we shall have to put in electrical wiring.

Mr. FOSTER. What did the site cost ?

Mr. HYMAN. $4,000.

Mr. FOWLER. From whom was the site bought ?

Mr. HYMAN. Mr. Archibald Mackenzie.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the size ?

Mr. HYMAN. 100 feet square.

Mr. GANONG. This seems to be the only item for public buildings in New Brunswick, and I feel it just that I should again call the attention of the minister to the fact that there are three towns in my county all of them more deserving of public buuildings than the town of Shelburne. We have Milltown, with a very large cotton mill, employing over 800 hands and with a population of over 2,000. It has no government building of any kind. We have St. Andrews, which is as important as Shelburne, being a large watering place with the largest hotel in the maritime provinces—the shire town as well —without any public building. We also have the town of St. George, in which Mr. Gillmor promised a post office, I suppose on the authority of the government, although they disclaim it now. They have five large granite concerns in that place and a very large pulp mill, and still they have no public building. The post office in that town is a disgrace to the Canadian government. The surprise to me is that the postmaster will even stay in it. I would like the minister to take these matters into consideration. As I suggested to him this afternoon, if he would divide up the amount squandered in Antigonish, he might greatly improve the accommodation in these places. However, if money is plentiful in the treasury, we will be willing to accept a vote in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. HYMAN. It is only fair that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ganong) should inform the committee that he has a large public building in one of the towns of his constituency.

Mr. GANONG. And it is only fair to state that for its size there is not a town in Canada that gives so large a revenue either from customs or post office.

St. John drill hall, $10,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hyman) please give us the dimensions of this building ?

Mr. HYMAN. I shall be obliged to ask this vote be allowed to stand. I would prefer that it should be discussed when my colleague the Minister of Militia is present. I have not all the particulars I would like to have.

Mr. DANIEL. I would remind the minister that this sum was voted last year, and that in February, 1904, plans of a drill shed were displayed in my constituency. Surely if the plans were ready then, the minister might be able to give us dimensions and other particulars of the building now and tell us where it is to be erected. This drill shed is very much needed in the city of St. John. The old drill shed there, I believe, was the first, or among the first, of the drill sheds built in Canada. It is a wooden building, extremely leaky and it costs the government a great deal for repairs. Besides, it is absolutely inadequate for the force there. We have a regiment of artillery and a regiment of infantry. And, as the minister knows, St. John is one of the strategic points in Canada. It is the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway and one of the termini of the Intercolonial Railway and is at the mouth of an important river. No doubt, at no very distant day there must be a permanent battery of artillery there. The force now existing in St. John is a very good force. The artillery has more than once, I believe, taken the highest efficiency prize in the whole artillery of Canada, and their infantry corps is a very creditable force in every respect. The men are enthusiastic, and they should be encouraged. But they feel very much discouraged indeed because of the want of proper armouries and a proper drill shed. The artillery, to which I myself have belonged for a number of years, were forced to build two armouries, one in the north end and one in the west end of the city. I do not think any militia force in Canada should be imposed upon in this way. And I certainly think we should have some explanation from the minister why, this vote having been given for the last two years, we hear nothing about the drill shed, and why a commencement has not been made in providing a building so much needed.

Mr. HYMAN. I have asked that the item be allowed to stand, and I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Daniel) will not object. My reason for asking to have it stand is that I may be able to give him all the particulars he wishes. This is a matter that concerns the Militia Department, and I prefer that my colleague the Minister of Militia should be present when it is discussed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The item stands.

St. John immigration detention building, $22,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be done there ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is for a detention hospital at the port of St. John. The difficulty up to the present moment has been the acquiring of a site. I have a memo. from Dr. Bryce, who, at the present moment, is trying to arrange for a proper site. It is intended to keep the expenditure within the estimates.

Mr. DANIEL. This, I take it, is for a new building ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it now under contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a St. John Immigration building that has been under contract.

Mr. HYMAN. This is a detention building, a little different from the ordinary immigration building.

Mr. DANIEL. This is a sort of immigration hospital ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, something of that kind. When shiploads of immigrants come in, as I understand, the usual immigration sheds are used. But in all large bodies of immigrants, there are some who must be detained for examination or for reasons of health.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is it proposed to put the building—in the city or on Partridge Island ?

Mr. HYMAN. Dr. Bryce, who is the head of the department, informed me within the last two or three days that he intends to choose the site, but I do not know where it is to be.

Mr. DANIEL. It would be in the city.

Mr. OSLER. This building is to be used in case of immigrants held for examination ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. OSLER. If the government have not a building of that kind already, this ought to be erected without question, for, we are getting into this country a class of immigrants absolutely inferior to the class allowed to enter the United States. No matter what is said, as a matter of fact, they are coming in, and from here they are filtering into the United States. No time should be lost in providing the proper housing to care for and examining these men. If they are not all right, send them back. We are getting a lot of people who have no right to come here, especially men from southern Italy, who have contagious diseases. If the government has not proper quarantine buildings in St. John, Halifax and Quebec to look

after these people, the money should not require to be re-voted, but should be spent at once.

Mr. HYMAN. In Quebec they have a building for this purpose, erected, I think, last year. In the present estimates. I think, will be found a vote for a similar building in Halifax. This one is for St. John, and, as I have explained Dr. Bryce is there at the present time to choose the site. I have instructed the chief architect to call Dr. Bryce's attention to the matter immediately on his return, and we shall endeavour to proceed with the building at once.

Mr. DANIEL. Dr. Bryce was there last summer in plenty of time to have the building started. It is evidently intended not to make it an expensive building. If they have not the site, they know about where it is to go. There has been no delay, as far as I can gather, on the part of Dr. Bryce, but the delay appears to be on the part of the government. As the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) has stated, this is a building that is very much needed for the purpose of detaining the people who are physically unfit to be allowed to go loose in the country--people suffering from trachoma, favus and other contagious diseases. Such a building is now urgently needed. All this winter immigrants have been coming in through St. John ; and certainly we have heard no good reason why, when the money was voted last year, the work has not been carried out.

Mr. HYMAN. I know that Dr. Bryce has had some difficulty in acquiring a proper site. The very moment the site is decided upon, plans and specifications will be prepared. The Department of Public Works cannot prepare them until we know the character of the site.

Mr. DANIEL. Does this $22,000 cover the site and building?

Mr. HYMAN. No. The estimate for a building of this character is $18,000, the estimate made by the chief architect, which, with contingencies, will amount to $22,000.

Mr. DANIEL. How large will the building be?

Mr. HYMAN. We cannot tell until we first see what the site is. Dr. Bryce, who is at the head of that branch of the department, will give us two or three sites from which we will choose.

Mr. OSLER. I thoroughly approve of this vote. But I think no time should be lost in erecting the building, because there is nothing more important in the interest of Canada than to have the immigrants well looked after at these stations. For the sake of $2,000 I do not think delay should be allowed in the erection of a proper detention building.

Mr. HYMAN. I understand that in the winter time all the immigrants come to St. John, and I think the building will be ready for the coming winter.

St. John Quarantine Station, Partridge Island—hospital and two detention buildings, and acetylene gas plant and building ; also repairs to old buildings, water service, &c., $22,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Does this include any damages for the building that was blown down there last fall during the course of erection?

Mr. HYMAN. An arangement has been made with the contractor concerning the building which was blown down. We make no allowance for that.

Mr. DANIEL. Who is the architect for that building?

Mr. HYMAN. The plans and specifications are prepared in Ottawa. We have an agent of the department there, Mr. Waterbury, who looks after the local work.

Mr. DANIEL. I think the building must have been faulty, because it blew down during a gale, in the course of erection, and it was freely stated that the building was too narrow for the height, the stringers—if that is the technical term—were not strong enough, and if the architect had been more careful in drawing the building on safer lines it would not have blown down. It stands on an island exposed to every wind that blows, and in the winter time the storms from the Atlantic are pretty heavy.

Mr. HYMAN. It need not necessarily have been the fault of the architect if the building was blown down. I think in this case it was the fault of the builder, the building was not properly protected. The contractor should have known that these storms were likely to occur. I understand he did not even board up the windows, but allowed the wind to rush into the building, and in that way the accident occurred. The partitions were not even put up. The contractor stands the loss.

Mr. FOSTER. I see that this is to be lighted with acetylene gas. How much does the plant cost?

Mr. HYMAN. The plant complete for generating the gas, costs, $4,625. That was bought from the Acetylene Gas Construction Company of St. Catharines.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the only company in Canada?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not know of any other.

Mr. FOSTER. Were tenders asked for an acetylene gas plant?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not think so.

Mr. FOWLER. For the information of the minister, I can inform him that in the constituency I have the honour to represent there is a plant for the manufacture of acetylene gas, within twenty-five miles of

the city of St. John. So there can be no difficulty in getting a plant.

Mr. HYMAN. This plant was arranged for before I came into the department. I understand that we do not require to ask for tenders where the price does not exceed $5,000. But it is necessary for the chief architect to certify that the price is fair and reasonable, and that was done in this case.

Mr. OSLER. Was there a contract made with the company to supply acetylene gas?

Mr. HYMAN. No, we have no contract.

Mr. OSLER. Is that supplied by one company alone?

Mr. HYMAN. I cannot give the information.

Mr. BARR. Were tenders asked for?

Mr. HYMAN. That was the only tender.

Mr. FOWLER. What was the cost of this gas plant, and what the number of lights?

Mr. HYMAN. $4,625, including the laying of the pipes; 500 lights, and 2,500 feet of piping.

Mr. OSLER. In that contract is there any obligation to get the gas from that company?

Mr. HYMAN. No obligation of any kind.

Mr. FOWLER. This was let without tender?

Mr. HYMAN. No, it was not let without tender, but there was only the one tender.

Mr. OSLER. As a matter of fact, is there only one firm supplying that in Canada?

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman from King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler) has just told me there was another firm. I did not know that. But in a case of this kind where the use of acetylene has to be very carefully guarded, I think the department was justified in accepting the tender from a firm that is well acquainted with this business.

Mr. FOWLER. There is a company manufacturing acetylene gas plant in New Brunswick who are thoroughly capable, and thoroughly equipped, and have met with great success. One of the gentlemen engaged in the manufacture of this plant is the inventor of an improvement on the ordinary gas plant, which has been very successful indeed.

Mr. OSLER. That sum, I understand, includes the manufacture of the gas?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, includes the lights and the pipes.

Mr. OSLER. When this discussion came up a year or two ago, I think it was understood that there was only one firm in Canada supplying acetylene carbide. Is that the case still?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not know of any other company. I understand there is a company here supplying acetylene and a company in St. Catharines. I do not know whether they are the same.

Mr. SPROULE. I have been told it is a fact that the one company owns the three different establishments, the one here, the one in St. Catharines and the one at Shawenegan; and that Mr. Wilson, who was the original patentee, is in all these companies, and all the profits go to the same persons.

Mr. HYMAN. I suppose the hon. gentleman knows that is the case.

Mr. SPROULE. I am told by parties who ought to be well informed, one living in St. Catharines and another living in Woodstock and who knows Mr. Wilson very well that there is no competition in it and that the purchases which the government have made for lighting on the lakes and for their buoys have all been made from the same company without any competition and at their own prices.

Mr. HYMAN. I have no knowledge as to what has been done by the Department of Marine and Fisheries in regard to this matter, but in regard to what the hon. gentleman says about the purchases of acetylene carbide, I do not think that he has the right to draw any conclusions at all. There has none been bought, there has no contract been made by the department for any acetylene and when the question comes up the acetylene will certainly be bought by the department at as low a figure as it is possible to buy it at.

Mr. SPROULE. I think I have a perfect right, if I believe it to be a fact——

Mr. HYMAN. But it is not a fact.

Mr. SPROULE—that the only companies in Canada are under the control of the same combine and that the government have bought from them up to the present, and must buy from them in the future, unless they or other parties get the right to make acetylene gas, to assume that what has been done in the past is what will be done in this case. The hon. minister says that this contract was let before he took charge of the department. Who let the contract? He ought to know that.

Mr. HYMAN. The Department of Public Works.

Mr. SPROULE. Through the Minister of Public Works?

Mr. HYMAN. I presume through the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. SPROULE. And the Minister of Public Works is certainly one of the owners of these three concerns. That is the in-

formation I have and that is where it seems to be very objectionable.

Mr. HYMAN. As a matter of fact I have not the least information in regard to the matter. It seems to be somewhat unfair that the hon. gentleman should undertake to pass a criticism of that kind. I do not know whether the hon. Minister of Public Works owns one dollar's worth of stock in a company of that nature. I have no knowledge of the matter at all. It seems to me under all the circumstances that the words of the hon. gentleman might have been just as well left unsaid.

Mr. SPROULE. I am asking the hon. gentleman whether he knows it or not. He seems to be in a state of blissful ignorance which is very useful at times.

Mr. GANONG. As far as the price of carbide is concerned I think I can speak with some authority on that subject as I have used it for some years. There is but one price. It is sold under the Wilson patent so-called. It does not make any difference where you buy it there is just the one price, but as far as the machinery is concerned there are at least eight or ten reputable firms making carbide gas machines. I have been running a plant for the last three or four years of 125 lights, and I think the whole plant, outside of piping, cost me about $300. I do not know where the hon. gentleman is going to put the money.

Mr. HYMAN. As the hon. gentleman has made some insinuations in regard to the matter I do not suppose he has the facts before him. As a matter of fact this includes not only what may be properly termed the plant with a capacity of 500 lights, but it includes the building, and the gasometer.

Mr. GANONG. The gasometer is a part of the machine.

Mr. HYMAN. And in addition to that some 2,500 feet of piping.

Mr. GANONG. The piping is not very expensive.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the size of the piping ?

Mr. HYMAN. What is the size of the building ?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. HYMAN. 17 x 22.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the diameter of the piping ?

Mr. HYMAN. The supply pipe ?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. HYMAN. I have not the size of the pipe.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. minister is putting forward as a reason for the tremendous cost of this plant that there are 2,500 feet of piping. Then it is important for us to know what the size of this piping is because it varies in price as it varies in size. I have some knowledge of the cost of this acetylene gas plant and I believe that the cost of this is double what it should have been.

Mr. HYMAN. Of course this includes also the excavation.

Mr. FOWLER. That would cost about $20.

Mr. HYMAN. This includes excavation, a building 17 x 22, brick, hollow walls, stone foundation, with separate room——

Mr. FOWLER. You are going to bring in the whole cost of the building now ?

Mr. HYMAN. Surely the hon. gentleman is not insinuating that I am giving information misleading to the committee. There are brick hollow walls on a stone foundation, gas piping 2,500 feet, meter 9 x 12 with a capacity of 1,000 cubic feet, the gasometer to be sunk in the ground, rock or concrete. The plant will be of sufficient capacity to furnish 50 lights, the gas piping to be laid from the gasometer to the various buildings.

Mr. FOWLER. A building 17 x 22 one story high, and with a hollow wall—that is two bricks—would not cost more than $500 at the outside.

Mr. OSLER. I am not objecting at all to the cost, because I think the men who own the patent are entitled to a very large profit, but when the government enter into a contract I think they should be very free in their information as to whether there is only one company owning the patent. I think the company are entitled to make a lot of money out of this, having worked for many years with it, but I also think that the government should give us the fullest information when they are dealing with this acetylene gas as to whether this is a close corporation and whether they must purchase at the price at which these men supply it. They should ascertain whether they are charged the same price that the acetylene company charge the railways. I do not think any one would object if the price paid by the government is the same as that paid by the ordinary large consumers. As there are apparently several contractors prepared to put in the plant, fair competition can evidently be had in this respect. I think that is all the House would want and I think that in this case where there is apparently a close patent there should be the fullest information given, because in connection with this lighting we are going to spend a large amount of money.

Mr. HYMAN. The department have never purchased a pound of acetylene. The Department of Marine and Fisheries has its estimates before the House and I have no doubt that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will give all the information that hon. gentlemen opposite require.

Mr. OSLER. In connection with the contract for the plant if there are several firms building this plant then care should be taken to have tenders asked for from the different firms so that the owners of the patent should not have a cinch, on the machinery as well as on the gas.

Woodstock armoury and gun shed, $35,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What about this ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is a vote to complete the Woodstock armoury. There was a contract entered into with Mr. Fisher, of Woodstock, on the 25th October. The amount of the contract is $31,981.

Mr. FOWLER. What Mr. Fisher is that?

Mr. HYMAN. Mr. Wm. Fisher. I have no knowledge of him.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it not Williamson ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have just 'Wm.' in my notes. I presume it stands for William. I have no knowledge in regard to that matter. This is to complete the work.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the whole contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. The amount of Mr. Fisher's contract is $31,981.

Mr. FOWLER. What was paid for the lot ?

Mr. HYMAN. I understand that there was a lot purchased for $6,000. That included a rink which was on the property. The roof and a considerable portion of the rink were used in the construction of the new building. Of course the plans and specifications showed that. Tenders were called for in the usual way by public advertisement and the lowest tender was accepted.

Mr. FOWLER. Was an officer sent down there from the department to purchase the site ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Who was the officer ?

Mr. HYMAN. Two officers were sent down at different times—Mr. Shearer and Mr. Ogilvie.

Mr. FOWLER. Who purchased the site ?

Mr. HYMAN. Neither of them purchased the site. They reported to the department and the site was afterwards bought by the minister.

Mr. FOWLER. Did you not have an option on the site ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have not the particulars here in regard to the matter. I take the information from the officers of the department.

Mr. FOWLER. From whom was it bought ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is the Paxton, Baird and Rink property and a small lot purchased from Small & Fisher.

Mr. FOWLER. How much for the Small lot ?

Mr. HYMAN. $6,000 for the Rink property and $1,200 for the lot.

Mr. FOWLER. That will make the whole building cost about $40,000.

Mr. HYMAN. I gave the amount of the contract, it is for $31,908. That is for the building. For the heating and wiring the estimate of the department is $3,500, and then there will be fitting up of the armouries $3,500, for renewing the sidewalks, &c., the estimate will bring the total up to about $50,000 including the site.

Mr. FOWLER. Is the building going on?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, this is to complete.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you a clerk of works in charge ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. How long has he been in charge and what salary is he receiving.

Mr. HYMAN. $3 a day, the usual price.

Mr. FOWLER. How long has he been in charge.

Mr. HYMAN. Since February 1.

Mr. FOWLER. Of this present month ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. What was his former occupation ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have no knowledge of his former occupation.

Mr. FOWLER. It is of importance that the department should know his former occupation.

Mr. HYMAN. It may be.

Mr. FOWLER. Not only may be but is. There was an instance in the town of Sussex where I reside, the principal town in King's, part of my constituency. The clerk of works in charge of an important work was a tailor by occupation and was in active work as a tailor. He had no previous knowledge of building and was not a mechanic except with his needle, and yet he was put in charge of the construction of that building as clerk of works. He was paid $3, or I think it was $3.50 a day. This man must be a mechanic because he is only getting $3 a day whereas the other, on account of his superior qualifications as

a tailor, got $3.50. The contract price for the building was $4,300, but this clerk of works, who was a tailor, drew $1,900 as clerk of works.

Mr. HYMAN. I am not disputing the hon. gentleman, I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. FOWLER. He will find if he refers to the accounts that they will bear out the statement.

Mr. HYMAN. He must have been a good tailor.

Mr. FOWLER. He knew how to make a bill, which they say is a requisite of a good tailor.

Mr. FOSTER. He evidently found his goose.

Mr. FOWLER. Evidently there was lots of cabbage. It seems that the department forgot he was employed and he kept on drawing his pay all the time. The building occupied four months in construction but he was kept on for a year and a half. I hope the same mistake will not be made in this case, and that is why I asked the minister what this person was. I would like the minister to find out from his officers.

Mr. HYMAN. I suppose the hon. member from the constituency can give the information.

Mr. CARVELL. I think I can give some information to the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler). I can tell him that the clerk is Mr. Drysdale, who has been a contractor for probably 25 or 30 years, and who, some 15 or 20 years ago, had charge of the building of the record building in Woodstock. He has been engaged in work of this kind all his lifetime. My hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) I would imagine objects to the construction of this building.

Mr. FOWLER. Not at all.

Mr. CARVELL. I am glad to hear him say so. Perhaps no item here to-night is more necessary than this armoury and drill hall in Woodstock, in the county of Carleton, N.B. which I represent. We have there the 67th Regiment, an eight company regiment, the Woodstock Field battery and the Brighton Engineers, the oldest in Canada. For want of accommodation the Woodstock battery is still armed with the old 9-pounder guns and will be until we can get proper accommodation for the new equipment. The Brighton engineers have never yet received their equipment, although two years ago the establishment was increased to almost double its former strength and given 28 horses or whatever the ordinary equipment of an engineer company is, and yet on account of lack of accommodation they are not able to receive the equipment. The 67th Regiment is still armed with the old Snider rifle for want of the accommodation and four of five years ago it was felt by the department that they should build an armoury in Woodstock. The result was that in 1902 the vote was placed in the estimates for an armoury at Woodstock and then it was only intended to have an armoury. A site was purchased for $1,250 and before that site was purchased the Department of Militia and Defence took pains to find out the value of the land from independent sources, and it has never been questioned in this House or I think, in the country, that the price paid was reasonable and just. It was afterwards decided by the department that this building would not be large enough to meet the requirements of the militia under the new conditions. A battery of field artillery formerly consisted of 6 guns and 6 ammunition wagons; to-day it would be 6 guns and 24 ammunition wagons besides forage and store wagons. At that time the accommodation of the engineers would not occupy a space of more than 30 or 40 feet square, but now it would take four times that space, and therefore it was decided to be inadvisable to erect a building according to the plans, although tenders had been called for. The department then looked for another site and they found that they could buy the rink property for a reasonable price and that the owners were willing to take the other property in part payment. The result was that the Rink property was purchased, tenders were called for and the contract was let. I can assure the committee and the hon. member for King's that we will have ample accommodation for all the militia in the county. We will have, besides, accommodation for the Woodstock Field battery and the engineers, a drill hall which will be 60 x 100 feet. It will be a modern building, the front part of which will be 30 x 100 feet, will be solid brick, and when completed will be a credit to the department and to the town of Woodstock, and will fill a long felt want for the militia of the county of Carleton. I can assure the committee that the clerk of works is actively engaged, that the contractor is drawing materials to the ground every day and that there can be no objection to this clerk of works. I do not think any gentleman in this House would find fault with the construction of the building.

Mr. FOWLER. I was not raising any objection, I was simply asking if the department, having made a mistake in Sussex by appointing a tailor to superintend the erection of a building, were guarding against the occurrence of a similar mistake in this case. The hon. gentleman should be thankful to me for giving him an opportunity to fire off that battery of artillery with which he was loaded up.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Carvell) has pointed out that this is for an eight

company regiment. He seems to fail to recognize that these companies keep their arms at company headquarters and will not keep them in the drill shed. He pointed out that the Brighton engineers have no accommodation for their materials. I presume that the engineers' material and the guns of the battery can be kept in the drill shed, but I want the minister to explain these things to the House. I understood there was going to be an agreement made between the Department of Militia and the Department of Public Works as to some set form for these regimental or county armouries. If they are all to cost $35,000 or $50,000 I shall be delighted that the one for Victoria shall cost that sum. However, I hope that the Departments of Pubic Works and Militia will keep in mind the principle that these buildings should not be made too large at one point and too small at another, but should be commodious at all points and of uniform quality, so that there could be no fault found in any part. Is there any ground in connection with this drill shed other than the site of the shed itself? How many acres adjoin it

Mr. HYMAN. I understand there is no ground that could be used for drilling purpose.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is a serious mistake. There should be grounds outside in connection with all these as in the old plans. There should be a large area. The only time the regiment will form up there is when it happens to go to or come from the annual camp. Then it should certainly have a large area outside for a parade ground.

Mr. CARVELL. There are two pieces of land in the rear of the building which could be purchased a a reasonable price, and I will take the hint given by my hon. friend and ask the department to purchase them.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES I do not know the political stripe of the hon gentleman, but I do know that the Woodstock, N.B., battery gave a good account of itself on all occasions when under fire in South Africa, and the men were several times in action.

Mr. INGRAM. What would those two lots be worth ?

Mr. CARVELL. One is about 30 by 80 feet and the other about 80 or 90 feet square, and we have an offer to purchase them for $1,600.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the size of the lot on which this rink was placed?

Mr. HYMAN. 100 feet by 160 feet.

Mr. INGRAM. Then I think the rumour about the cost of this lot is well founded. If this lot cost $6,000, or rather $7,200, it is quite evident that the department has paid too much for it. That is borne out by the statement made by my hon. friend from Carleton N. B. (Mr. Carvell), who states that a larger space immediately in the rear can be got for about $1,600.

Mr. CARVELL. I think that the hon. member will agree that there is a great difference between a lot fronting on one of the principal streets of the town and two pieces of land in the rear of the building that could not be sold for anything else. The lot in question is within 300 feet of the post office and is next but one to the town building. The town has 4,000 inhabitants; its postal revenue is the fifth in the province, and it is one of the most important commercial and manufacturing towns of the province. The land on which the rink stands could not be bought in the open market for less than $2,500 or $3,000.

Some resolutions reported.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What government business will be taken up to-morrow?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The Minister of Agriculture will proceed with his Bill respecting the census, after which we shall continue with the estimates of the Minister of Public Works.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 15, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER AT STANHOPE, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. Has Henry Lawson been dismissed as postmaster for Stanhope, Prince Edward Island ?
2. If so, why, and on whose recommendation?
3. Were there any complaints ? If so, of what nature, and what are the names of those who made them ?
4. Were any petitions received for his dismissal ? If so, by whom signed ?
5. Did the postmaster or post office inspector in the province ask for Mr. Lawson's dismissal?
6. How long has Mr. Lawson held the position ?
7. When were complaints, if any, first made ?
8. Did the Postmaster General furnish Mr. Lawson any reasons for his dismissal ?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). It having been clearly established that this officer adopted an active political partisan course in connection with the recent Dominion elections, he was removed from office. He was appointed postmaster at Stanhope on the 30th June, 1884.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I do not think that the hon. Postmaster General has given an answer to the question. I asked the hon. gentleman if the Postmaster General had furnished Mr. Lawson with any reasons for his dismissal, and he has not answered that.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Mr. Lawson was not furnished with reasons. I fancy he knew very well the reasons for his dismissal. He is not in any doubt; he is quite cognizant of what occurred; there is no doubt of what occurred, and his dismissal is in accordance with the rule laid down eight years ago, of which he had ample notice.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I think this question has not been answered at all.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think I have answered that part of it.

Mr. A. MARTIN. The question as to who made these complaints against Mr. Lawson has not been answered. Mr. Lawson ought, in all fairness, to know who made these complaints.

HARBOURS CONTROLLED BY COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

1. What are the harbours in Canada under boards of commissioners?
2. What are the names of the commissioners in the different harbours?
3. How are they appointed; and how many are named by the Governor in Council?
4. What is the remuneration of the commissioners?

Hon. R. PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. The harbours in Canada controlled by boards of commissioners are: Montreal, Quebec, Toronto, Belleville, Three Rivers, North Sydney and Pictou.

2. Montreal — Robert Mackay, Jonathan Hodgson, Robert Bickerdike, Alphonse Racine, Eustache H. Lemay, His Worship the Mayor, James Crathern, Robert Reford, L. E. Geoffrion, W. E. Doran, Alexander McFee.

Toronto—J. T. Mathews, W. P. Hubbard, Barlow Cumberland, Joseph Oliver, Francis Stephen Spence.

Quebec—Jean Baptiste Laliberté, Narcisse Rioux, Dosithée Arcand, Harold Kennedy, William M. Macpherson, Felix Carbray, E. T. Etienne Dussault, George Tanguay, William Molson Dobell.

Belleville—T. S. Carman, the Mayor of Belleville, David Price.

Three Rivers—Henry E. Hart, Alexander Houliston, Richard S. Cooke, K.C.; the Mayor of Three Rivers, Louis Brunelle.

North Sydney — William Hackett, jr.; Peter McDonald, M. W. Lawlor.

Pictou, N.S.—Henry G. Ives, J. Robert Brown, Edward Doherty, John C. Reid, William A. McIntosh.

3. For the harbour of Montreal six are appointed by the Governor in Council, the Mayor of Montreal is ex officio a member, and four as follows:—One by the Montreal Board of Trade, one by the Montreal Corn Exchange Association, one by the Chamber of Commerce and one by the shipping interests.

At the port of Quebec there are nine commissioners—five appointed by the Governor in Council, the other four are: One appointed by the Council of the Board of Trade, one by the Council of the Lévis Board of Trade and two by the shipping interests. In addition to these, the Chairman of the Corporation of Pilots for and below Quebec is ex officio a member, so far only as respects pilotage matters.

For Toronto the common council of the city of Toronto appoints two commissioners, the Toronto Board of Trade two, and the majority of such commissioners to recommend another person to be a commissioner to be appointed by the Governor in Council; but if the majority of the commissioners cannot agree upon another person, then the Governor in Council appoints the fifth commissioner.

For Belleville the corporation of the town of Belleville, by an Act assented to on the 18th of May, 1870, are authorized and empowered to pass by-laws for the imposition and collection of harbour dues to be employed, after the expense of collection, for the purpose of assisting and liquidating the debts incurred or which may after that date be incurred, for the improvement of the harbour within the limits of the said town.

For the harbour of Three Rivers the Governor in Council appoints three persons the mayor, by virtue of his office, being a commissioner, along with the President of the Three Rivers Board of Trade—in all five persons.

For the harbour of North Sydney three commissioners are appointed by the Governor in Council.

For the harbour of Pictou the Governor in Council appoints three commissioners.

4. The commissioners at the port of Montreal receive $5 for each sitting of the board. The chairman of the board receives $2,000 annually.

The harbour commissioners of the other harbour boards receive no remuneration, except at the port of Quebec, and the returns of the department will not enable it to speak definitely about that port. The information is being asked for. So far as the returns in the department show, they have received no remuneration.

IMPORTS OF HAY.

Mr. BOYCE asked:

1. What quantity of hay was entered for consumption from the United States at the port of Sault Ste. Marie during the calendar years 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903 and 1904?

2. What was the amount of duty collected upon such imports in each of such years ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The total quantity of hay imported from the United States and entered for consumption at the port of Sault Ste. Marie, and the duty collected thereon during each of the calendar years mentioned was :—

Year.	Tons.	Value.	Duty.
1900	14	$ 144	$ 28
1901	61	647	122
1902	435	4,364	870
1903	188	1,886	376
1904	674	6,224	1,348

EMPLOYMENT OF R. A. E. LEACH.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE asked :

1. Is Mr. R. A. E. Leach in the employ of this government ?
2. If so, in what capacity, and at what salary ?
3. What is the date of his employment ?

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

1. Yes.
2. Inspector of Dominion Land Agencies, $2,000 per annum.
3. January 1, 1905.

WORK IN INLAND HARBOURS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked :

1. How much money has been spent by the Dominion government since 1896, upon each of the following : (a) Port Arthur harbour ; (b) Fort William harbour ; (c) Kaministiquia river ; classified into (1) dredging : (2) breakwaters ; (3) other purposes ?
2. What quantities of each of the following are to be excavated during 1905-6 in each of the three locations above named ?
3. What are the dates and terms of the contracts entered into with those engaged in dredging at the aforesaid points in 1903-4 and 1904-5?
4. Will the government lay the said contracts upon the table of this House ?
5. What are the horse-power, tonnage and dimensions of each of the dredges engaged in said work ?
6. What is the cost of dredges newly built, similar to those engaged at the above three points ?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works). I must ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) to move for a return for this information. It will be necessary to go over a considerable amount of correspondence and there is information asked for which is not in the possession of the department.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have asked the question and I insist that I am entitled to an answer. It is a very proper question and the information should all be available in the minister's own department. I want to know why he insists on a motion for return.

Mr. HYMAN. I must ask the hon. genteman to make a motion for the answer to question 5. Take for instance the 5th section of the question.

What are the horse-power, tonnage and dimensions of each of the dredges engaged in said work ?

There is no information of that character in the department and the question would have to stand a considerable time before I would be able to get the information.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries should be able to give that information.

Mr. HYMAN. It is the usual way where a question includes such a detailed answer as this, that the hon. gentleman should ask for a return.

YUKON ELECTION.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). In answer to a question that was asked yesterday by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) with regard to the return of the results of the election in the Yukon Territory, I would say the only information that we have upon this subject is contained in the following telegrams which have been exchanged recently.

Dawson, Y. T., Feb. 8th, 1905.

R. W. Scott,
Secretary of State, Ottawa.

Alfred Thompson was declared elected yesterday by a majority of 618. My report with writ will be sent in a couple of days.

PIERRE LEDIEU,
Returning Officer.

Another telegram reads :

Dawson, Y. T., Feb. 13th 1905.

R. W. Scott,
Ottawa, Ont.

Was served to-day with writ of subpœna in a case of conspiracy ordering me to produce on the 1st of March the writ of election, the voters' lists, the poll books and all other election papers. Shall I obey the order of the court or not ? Dr. Thompson is leaving for Ottawa on the 15th.

PIERRE LEDIEU,
Returning Officer.

The answer to this was as follows :

Ottawa, 14th Feb., 1904.

Pierre Ledieu,
Returning Officer, Dawson, Y. T.

If there has not been any demand for a recount under section ninety, Dominion Election Act, then your duty is to return the candidate-elect and conform to all the requirements of section ninety-two of the Act.

R. W. SCOTT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understood that some demand had been made upon the returning officer for an explanation of this very great delay in fixing a date for opening the ballot boxes and officially counting the ballots. The correspondence which has just been read by the Prime Minister does

not make any allusion to any such telegram to him or to his reply.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say that this part of the observations of the hon. gentleman escaped my attention. I thought that what was in his mind was the delay in the return of Mr. Thompson, the member elect for the Yukon. If there is any other correspondence I shall bring it down.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I alluded to that as a result of the action of the deputy returning officer in delaying the returns so unreasonably and I pointed out at the same time to the Minister of Justice that it would be perfectly competent for any returning officer to fix a date one or two years from the date of the election and thus disfranchise a constituency for that time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think that the writ has to be returned within a certain time and the official count cannot be delayed beyond the date of the writ.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was not able to find any date nor could the Minister of Justice. It simply says that he shall fix a date, whenever he sees fit. We have never had any trouble before and we may not have any trouble again, but this delay would indicate a possible necessity for an amendment of the law. The Minister of Justice on February 2, if I remember correctly from a perusal of 'Hansard' stated that a telegram had been sent to the returning officer asking him the reason for the delay—until February 6, which I think was the day for opening the ballot boxes and summing up the figures. As to that we have no information; if there is any information I would be glad if the Prime Minister would give it to us to-morrow.

THE ANSWERING OF QUESTIONS BY MINISTERS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that on a recent occasion the First Minister, who is nearly as important in the House as the acting Minister of Public Works, took occasion, in answer to a question asked him by one of his supporters, to give a deliberate answer taking about twenty minutes to read. He answered the question with great detail, but when a member of this side asks a question that requires a particular answer he is asked to make a motion for a return. There is not a question here to which, if the minister had his work properly prepared when he brought his estimates before the House he would not have the answer at his finger ends in five minutes. He says he cannot get the information as to the horse-power of these dredges. He has a colleague who poses as a very efficient Minister of Marine and in his department there should be a record of every matter of this kind. I must protest against the Minister of Public Works giving any such answer to questions that are placed on the order paper; it is not treating the House with proper respect.

Mr. HYMAN. I desire to call the attention of the House to the character of this question. The first section of it is as follows :

1. How much money has been spent by the Dominion government since 1896, upon each of the following : (a) Port Arthur harbour ; (b) Fort William harbour ; (c) Kaministiquia river ; classified into (1) dredging ; (2) breakwaters ; (3) other purposes ?

I am perfectly willing to leave it to the judgment of the House if that is not a question for which a return should be asked. It deals with expenditures since 1896 upon five different works and also for other purposes ; the quantities to be excavated during 1905-6 in each of the three locations named ; the dates and terms of the contracts entered into with those engaged in dredging at the aforesaid points in 1903-4 and 1904-5 ; the horse-power, tonnage and dimensions of each of the dredges ; and the cost of dredges newly built, similar to those engaged at the above three points. I think in the judgment of the House it would be impossible to answer a question of that character immediately. The notice given of questions is very short, and it is impossible for the department to obtain all that information at once. I have no desire to withhold information from the hon. gentleman or from any other member of the House. I am simply asking him to move for a return, and, if he does so, I will use every expedition to have it brought down.

Mr. SPROULE. If a minister cannot answer a question the first time it is asked, it is usual to request a delay until he can get the information, perhaps a portion of it from other departments. We frequently allow questions to stand for a considerable length of time until the information is obtainable.

ANGLO-AMERICAN CONVENTION RESPECTING PROPERTY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the government to be good enough to lay upon the table of the House any correspondence between this government and the Imperial government as well as between this government and the governments of the different provinces, with respect to a convention between the United Kingdom and the United States of America relative to the disposal of real and personal property which was signed at Washington on March 2, 1899, and of which ratifications were exchanged at Washington on July 28, 1900. My reason for adverting to it is that by the terms of the fourth article of the convention, the stipulations of the convention are not to be appli-

cable to any of the colonies or foreign possessions of Her Britannic Majesty unless notice to that effect shall be given on behalf of such colony or foreign possession by Her Majesty's representative at Washington to the United States Secretary of State within one year from the date of the exchange of ratifications of the present convention. So far as I can gather, no such notice has been given on behalf of Canada, and therefore I would like to know what is the nature of the correspondence between this government and the governments to which I have referred.

CENSUS AND STATISTICS.

House in committee on Bill (No. 5) respecting the Census and Statistics—Mr. Fisher.

On section 3,—permanent office of census and statistics and its officers ; appointment of census officers and commissioners,——

Mr. FISHER. The first part of this clause is new, and establishes the permanent office. The second part is the same as the provision in the Census Act, and gives to the minister the usual authority for taking the census.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the minister any persons in view to occupy these positions ?

Mr. FISHER. I would as much as possible take the men now in the employ of the department, to take charge of the work and to do the work.

Mr. BLAIN. Can the hon. gentleman give the committee any information as to what salaries these gentlemen will get ?

Mr. FISHER. There will be of course a number of employees, who will be paid in accordance with the responsibilities and duties. The office will involve the appointment of a chief and a secretary. I would suppose that the chief would have the same salary as the census commissioner, $4,500 per year, and the secretary probably $2,000 or $2,500 according to his qualifications and experience. I might be able to get a perfectly competent officer for $2,000, but might find that I could not get one satisfactory for less than $2,500. The salaries of the other clerks would be based very largely on the Civil Service Act and be determined according to their qualifications and the nature of their work.

Mr. SPROULE. You are giving the same salary as to the head of a department and the same status.

Mr. FISHER. The same salary, but not the same status as I have not the intention of making it a separate department.

Mr. SPROULE. If you give the same salary, that amounts to the same thing.

Mr. FISHER. No, the experimental farm is in the Department of Agriculture and the director, who gets $4,000 a year, is under the deputy head of that department. In fact he gets more than the deputy head, because besides the $4,000 he gets free house, furniture, light and heat.

Mr. SPROULE. If you lay out as much money on this new branch or department, or whatever you choose to call it, the result as regards the public exchequer is practically the same. We should have a more definite statement as to the number of hands that will be required and the salaries to be paid them. As it is we are only given the information about two new officers, and without having a pretty fair idea of what really this new department involves, I don't see how we can be in a position to pass upon the project.

Mr. FISHER. Until the work is organized it will be quite impossible to state definitely how many employees will be required. It is new work and the number of employees and their salaries will be limited by the amount voted. At present, in addition to those on the civil list, there are six or seven employees doing work in my department which is covered by the provisions of this Bill. That is they are employed on general statistics work. There are three others paid out of the vote for general statistics but who are merely working on the Year-book. The six or seven employed on general statistics would have to be increased if this Bill passes, and that increase would be determined when the work is elaborated. Probably as many as four or five more would be required to be employed permanently besides such temporary clerical assistance as may be deemed necessary.

Mr. SPROULE. My hon. friend has given us to understand that there will be at least twelve employed in that branch among whom the money voted will be divided. What will be likely to take place next year and the years following ? Those employed will require larger salaries and more money will have to be voted. We will find that additional third-class clerks will have to be engaged, and that clerks will be promoted from one class to another, entailing every year an increased vote, and in the end this branch will reach the dignity of a department, so far as the expenditure is concerned. It does seem to me that we have not got all the information we should have. We have no definite information as to what this branch will do beyond dealing in statistics.

Mr. INGRAM. It would be interesting to know what number of employees the department has now under the Act respecting the census, the Act respecting statistics, and the Act respecting criminal statistics and the salaries paid.

Mr. FISHER. I had a list yesterday of the employees, but regret that for the

moment, I cannot lay my hand on it. Speaking from memory there are at present four paid out of civil government; I think there were four more whom we paid out of the general statistics vote who were practically permanent in the department. Three have been in the department for many years. One is a sort of messenger and typewriter who was appointed several years ago. There are also six employees who have been engaged in working up certain tables from the compilations of the census. That makes altogether fourteen employees in this branch. Of course, none of these are paid out of the census vote, but all are paid out of the general statistics vote, except one or two who are paid out of civil government. There is one officer employed in preparing the criminal statistics. The statistics are secured by arrangement with the judicial officers all over the Dominion, who are paid for sending in the returns. These returns are edited and put into the form of a report, and there is no expense here for compilation except the salary of one clerk. I think he is a junior second-class clerk and is paid $1,100 a year. His salary is charged to civil government. All the others are paid out of the general statistics vote. There is no payment out of the census vote or under the Census Act this year.

Mr. INGRAM. Then, money voted by parliament for general statistics has been taken for the census?

Mr. FISHER. I explained yesterday to the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) that certain tables had been made up from the facts compiled in the census. I suppose this might be called census work, but it is a kind of work that I want to have go on under the Act we are now discussing all the time between the times of taking a census. There is a vast quantity of information in the census volume which it is important to the public to have published in tabulated form. That is the work that some of these clerks have been doing. Some of these tables will be finished before the publication of the last volume of the census—some of them are ready now. I think it would be advisable that they should appear in this last census volume. I confess frankly that I cannot define precisely the limit between what may fairly be called census compilation and tabulation of this kind. I would point out that, under the arrangements of the United States permanent census bureau, they have already published two or three very important volumes of information drawn from the census—not issued as part of the census, but as special volumes. And they have a list in the document we have here, of subjects some of which are now in course of tabulation and others of which will be taken up as opportunity offers.

Mr. INGRAM. Then, the figures the minister has given us as to the actual cost of the census are hardly correct because some of the money voted for general statistics has been taken to complete the census?

Mr. FISHER. The figure I gave the other day included all that could possibly be charged to the census, down to the date fixed—the 1st of January.

Mr. INGRAM. What was the amount?

Mr. FISHER. I do not recollect. It is recorded in 'Hansard.' I included in that aggregate every charge that could with any reason be charged to the census. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) that I do not wish in any way to minimize the expenditure in connection with the census.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it not the fact that when parliament voted the money for general statistics, it intended the money to be expended for that work?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot speak as to that. But I can say that I intend to go on drawing information from the census. Believing that there was information of a statistical nature to be drawn from the census compilation, I sought to have that information tabulated. As being in charge of the general statistics service, I have always had the power—and on different occasions have exercised that power—to instruct the proper officers to draw up such tabulations. I do not pretend, and never have pretended that we should refuse to regard the census compilation as one of the sources from which we should draw information for general statistical purposes. Those compilations contain an enormous amount of information of great value to the public, but the ordinary individual can not extract that information for himself. It is the duty of the statistical staff to do that work and to do it in a way which will meet, not perhaps, individual demand, but a general demand. In that sense and to that extent that work has been done during the last fiscal year.

Mr. INGRAM. I think the Minister of Agriculture does not use the best judgment in choosing how he should expend this money. He gives to parliament a very wide interpretation indeed. In fact, he has been known to devote money voted by this parliament to an entirely different purpose from that for which parliament voted it. The hon. gentleman has taken some of the money that was voted for the census and expended it in investigating the census that had been taken ten years previous, and parliament never voted the money for that purpose; and we complain that the hon. gentleman has diverted money voted by parliament to a purpose that it was never intended for. It may be so now, that the money voted for statistical purposes, and that should be expended in a certain way, has been diverted and put into the census expenditures of this year, and will never be shown in the total census expenditure.

On section 4,—census enumerators—collection of statistics—temporary clerks and employees.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister give us an explanation of the meaning of 'census subdistrict ?'

Mr. FISHER. Let me first explain that this section is a combination of the similar clauses in the two Acts that are here consolidated, the Census Act, section 9, and the Statistics Act, section 3. This is a consolidation of these two Acts, and I have brought the powers and authorities under these two Acts together in this section 4 and its subclauses. There is no additional power asked for in this Act. As to the meaning of a census subdistrict, a census district is the district for which there is a commissioner appointed, like the division of a riding or an electoral district, a subdistrict is the enumeration district.

Mr. BLAIN. What would that be in the province of Ontario ?

Mr. FISHER. Generally speaking, in the last census we used the polling subdivisions. We took them as the basis of the subdistricts—those are the exact words in the present Census Act—to provide for the division of census districts into subdistricts for enumeration purposes.

Mr. BLAIN. In other words, the minister will have power to appoint every year the same number of officers that he appoints every ten years under the old Act.

Mr. FISHER. I have that power to-day under the General Statistics Act ; but I would never think of exercising it. It is quite out of my plan, as I explained yesterday.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I understand from with reference to gathering statistics. Would it not be advisable to take into consideration the fact that there were imported into our country over one hundred million dollars worth of manufactured goods in the year 1904 ; and would it not be interesting to our people to know about how many men are employed, and the amount of money that is being paid to workmen in foreign countries to manufacture the goods that come into this country ? For instance, $100,000,000 worth of goods that might have been manufactured in Canada were imported in 1904, and outside of that, the increase in importations from Great Britain and the United States from 1896 to 1902 was $34,778,000. I would like to ask the minister if it is possible for him to obtain that information.

Mr. FISHER. No doubt that line of investigation might be very interesting, but I think it would be my duty first to investigate the conditions and productions within our country before undertaking to investigate those in foreign countries.

Mr. BOYCE. Could the minister tell the committee how much it costs to collect the criminal statistics ?

Mr. FISHER. Last year it cost $2,000.

Mr. BOYCE. How was that expended ?

Mr. FISHER. It was expended on a fixed scale, established by the statute, of payment to judicial officers of courts all over the country. Five cents, I believe, is the amount paid for each case, and in the case of summary convictions, two cents. We pay so much for each return ordered, which may contain one case or fifty cases. I am told we paid one dollar for each return. In many cases we pay the officer of the court so much for a return, according to the number of returns he sends in.

Mr. BOYCE. Will the minister discontinue that method of obtaining statistics ?

Mr. FISHER. No, I propose to continue it on that line.

Mr. BOYCE. Would the minister use the same staff to that extent, that he has been using for that purpose ?

Mr. FISHER. There is no staff except the one man here in Ottawa, who compiles the returns which are obtained from officials all over the country. I propose to use that same agency still. I am reminded that by law, and this law re-enacts it, those officers are bound to make these returns at the rate of pay which is fixed by statute.

Mr. HENDERSON. Under section 4, it appears to me that the minister is taking to himself full power to appoint all the enumerators. My impression was that heretofore the enumerators were appointed by the commission. I would like to ask the hon. minister if this is a change, or is he not taking to himself greater powers than he had before, and if so, what is the reason for the change ?

Mr. FISHER. I can assure my hon. friend that the wording of this part of the clause which applies to the appointment of enumerators is just the same as it is in the present Census Act. I take no extra power and I have no intention of making any change. The census enumerators have been appointed from Ottawa just the same as the commissioners themselves. The commissioners do not appoint the enumerators. They are appointed through the department here by Order in Council.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then, as I understand, the meaning of the Act is that these enumerators are to be appointed practically by the minister ; that is to say that he is not satisfied with the patrongae which former ministers had.

Mr. FISHER. No, the hon. gentleman will excuse me ; I am making no change. I am taking no power that I did not have before.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is quite possible, but I think the hon. gentleman is taking powers that were not exercised by previous governments showing that he has the disposition with this great 'I' that we hear so much about, to make all the appointments instead of the member for the county or the commissioner for the county having some little say in the matter. My impression is that the commissioners in the various counties will understand much better who are fit and proper persons to appoint as census enumerators, and if the Act is changed in regard to the census of 1901, and made different from what it was in 1891, I think it would be very well to take a backward step. I think the old rule was the best, that is to appoint the commissioner and let the commissioner from amongst the people living in the riding whom he knows well and with whose qualifications he is familiar, name his enumerators without having to fall back on the minister who could not possibly know the men who are qualified to do this work. I am not at all favourable to concentrating all the patronage of the country under the head of a department. I think we had a sufficient illustration of that in the province of Ontario and I am glad to say that the people have condemned it and I think they will condemn it here too. I think it is a bad principle for the government to persistently seek to take power from the people. Seventy-five or a hundred years ago the fight was to obtain power from the Crown and vest it in the people. Here we have a government calling themselves a Liberal government——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON——and yet they will not allow the people to have anything to say in the administration of their own affairs. That is for the purpose of keeping a string upon the people, of concentrating and centralizing every power that can be possessed under this great 'I' that we hear so much about. I think it is a mistake and I would advise the hon. minister to go back to the old rule and let the commissioners appoint the enumerators.

Mr. FISHER. I am ready to go back to the old rule; in fact, I have never departed from it. The minister who conducted the census in 1891 followed this very same rule. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) was in the House at that time and he did not object to it. The minister who conducted the census of 1881 under an administration which the hon. gentleman supported for many years carried out that rule and that practice and appointed every enumerator in the Dominion of Canada from the central office at Ottawa. I dare say the rule is wrong. I dare say that the principles which the hon. gentleman is enunciating are right, but if ever there was an occasion when the great 'I' was repeated and exemplified in this country it was before the present Liberal government came into power.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. HENDERSON. I remember when the census of 1891 was taken. I remember the gentleman who was commissioner in the county which I have the honour to represent, and I am quite satisfied that he appointed his own enumerators. I am not aware that he had to send to Ottawa to have his appointments confirmed; at any rate he made the appointments himself. There is no doubt about that. Whatever the statute was the practice was different. The practice was that the commissioner appointed his own enumerators, selected his own men and appointed them to the work they were to do. If that practice is not consistent with the Bill, then the words applying to the subject should be eliminated from the Bill so as to leave the appointment of these men in the hands of the commissioners without having to appeal to Ottawa to have these appointments confirmed. It seems to me that it is only dealing fairly with the commissioners and I am quite sure that a better selection will be made if some greater powers are given to the commissioners in the counties, because they certainly know a great deal better who should be appointed than an officer at the head of the department here. It is quite absurd to say that an officer here should know who is fit in the country to be appointed an enumerator. It is very nice—apparently the hon. minister thinks—to have the honour of that patronage. I am not aware that even the representative of the country is permitted in any way to interfere with the commissioner in his appointments. In the county which I have the honour to represent at the present time and which I represented at the time the census of 1891 was taken, I abstained altogether from attempting to influence the commissioner in his selection of enumerators. I think it should be made non-political, that the commissioners should be given a free hand, that these appointments should not be political appointments, but that the best men available should be selected. We are simply providing means to make these appointments purely political appointments, independently of fitness, honesty, or ability to do the work. I would advise the hon. minister to eliminate the words from this clause that vest in him powers to control the appointment of enumerators and to leave these appointments entirely in the hands of the commissioners.

Mr. INGRAM. I would beg to point out to the hon. minister that the statement he has made is not exactly in accordance with the fact. Under the Conservative regime the number of enumerators was very much less than under the hon. gentleman's regime. In my own city, for instance, under the Conservative regime there were four enumerators, while under the hon. gentleman's regime there were fourteen. The difference as between four and fourteen is very great, and when you apply this to the whole of the Dominion of Canada you will see

how it is that the hon. gentleman has increased the expenditure for the taking of the census. In the first place the census commissioner must collect these enumerators together and instruct them in their duties and for their attendance these men get so much per day. Take fourteen enumerators at $3 per day while obtaining their instructions and it will amount to so much, whereas, in our time, the instructions were only given to four men. Four men at $3 per day would mean $12 and if the hon. gentleman will multiply 14 by 3 he will see the difference between the two systems. That applies throughout the whole Dominion. The hon. gentleman has not only increased the number of enumerators but he has increased their pay, and the result shows the difference between the two systems. The hon. gentleman has stated that section 4 of this Bill is somewhat similar to the old Act. Section 9 of the old Act is section 4 of the new.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. But, the hon. gentleman has added these words to it 'and in remote or sparsely settled parts of the country the minister may appoint one or more assistants for each enumerator.' While in the census of 1901, as compared with the census of 1891, you multiplied the number of enumerators, you are, by the Act you are now introducing, going to multiply that to a still greater extent in 1911, and it can only mean the increasing of the cost of taking the census of this country.

On section 6,—forms, rules, regulations and instructions, and rates of allowance.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the minister propose to keep the commissioner down to the schedule referred to in this clause ? The minister will remember that when this matter was before us two years ago, many instances were recorded where enumerators had overcharged the department, and these amounts had been paid. The hon. member for East Simcoe brought up a case the other day where an excessive amount had been charged, contrary altogether to the Act. The minister or his officials had signed for it and the money had been paid. If we are going to endorse the old rules we should have a promise from the minister that he will keep his departmental officials down according to the Act and not permit them to collect too large amounts.

Mr. FISHER. I will try as much as possible to keep them to the rules.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose he will be more careful in the future in respect to the kinds of officials he appoints.

Mr. FISHER. Experience teaches.

Mr. BLAIN. Experience teaches, the minister says. It does not always teach, but I hope it will with my hon. friend. I would draw his attention to the fact that in North Hastings the commissioner who was appointed by his government had a bill of $653.14, and that mnay of the items were in excess of the table laid down by the hon. gentleman. Some little trouble took place in the county and Mr. Kelly thought he would bring some political pressure on the hon. gentleman, and so he brought down the famous Mr. A. B. Lott, who is well known in Canada at the present time.

An hon. MEMBER. What is he famous for ?

Mr. BLAIN. Ballot boxes at the bottom of the lake ; it was that same gentleman. He brought Mr. Lott down to the House and had an interview with the minister himself. That was brought out in the House two years ago and the hon. minister did not attempt to deny it. As soon as Mr. Kelly brought down Mr. Lott, who was a politician and had been a government candidate, the account was paid without any further trouble. The minister shakes his head.

Mr. FISHER. A part of it is paid.

Mr. BLAIN. The full amount $653.14 was paid. My hon. friend remembers that very well of course.

Mr. FISHER. A good deal more was asked for.

Mr. BLAIN. A good deal more was asked for ; there it is again. My hon. friend tells the committee the story. He says that the kind of officers he appointed under the old Act were the kind who asked a great deal more than they got, and that it was a question of compromise with the hon. gentleman. Here is a letter dated March 24, 1902, addressed to the hon. Minister of Agriculture :

> The Ontario elections are coming off at the end of May or the beginning of June.

That is what the commissioner appointed under the hon. gentleman said over his own signature in writing to the minister himself.

> The Ontario elections are coming off the end of May or the beginning of June. Mr. B. O. Lott is the unanimous choice of the Liberal convention. I have made up my mind to do some hard work in this north riding of Hastings. Mr. Lott is the best canvasser and the hardest worker ever went into a political contest.
>
> I have the honour to remain,
> Your old servant,
> WM. KELLY.

I hope that the hon. gentleman, when he is appointing his enumerators will not appoint old friends who will ask him to pay much more than the amount set out in the clause he is asking the committee to adopt.

On section 8,—census of the Dominion to be taken in the first year of each decade.

Mr. FISHER. This corresponds to section 3 of the Census Act, changed as to the time of year at which the census had to be taken. The Census Act says it shall be taken in the month of April. I believe that it would be much better to take it in June than in April, I think that that change would conduce to great economy and that a great deal more work could be done and done more easily and better in June, when the days are longer and as a rule the roads are much better, so that people could get about much more easily than in April when in the greater part of Canada the roads are breaking up and it is as difficult to get about as in the beginning of the year.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the minister considered that in June a great many people are away from home? On their wedding trips, the hon. member for West Toronto suggests. For instance in Ontario, a large number of workmen go to the west and stay out there for a great part of the summer while a great many are absent on pleasure, &c.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. And after all that he has arrived at the conclusion that June is a better month.

Mr. FISHER. True, but all of these would be taken by the de jure system, just as they are now. There is no time of the year when a considerable number are not away, and that is the reason for employing the de jure system. I think that is a good reason I think that really there are fewer people absent from home in the first half of June, than at any other time of the year. The other reasons are very strong in favour of taking the census at that time.

On subsection 2 of section 8,—census of Manitoba and parts of the Northwest Territories, to be taken in the sixth year of each decade.

Mr. FISHER. This is to provide for the taking of a five year census in the province of Manitoba which is required by the Subsidy Act of that province, and it also applies the same principle to the provisional territories. If an Act is passed during the present session of parliament constituting these provinces, that would have to be consolidated with this, and the change would be made applying it to the new provinces. The reason for taking a census in Manitoba every fifth year is that we are required to do so by the Subsidy Act, and I think the same reasoning would apply to the territories or to the new provinces when created. Therefore I have introduced this section, which carries out that requirement.

Mr. HENDERSON. I quite understand the hon. minister's intention to be that the general census shall be taken all over the Dominion every tenth year. Then subsection 2 makes provision that a census shall be taken in the province of Manitoba and the Territories in 1906 and every tenth year thereafter. The intention is quite apparent to my mind, but I am not sure that the language used conveys that intention clearly. Might it not be interpreted to mean that in the province of Manitoba and the Territories the census should be taken only in 1906 and every tenth year thereafter? Is that not an amendment to section 8?

Mr. FISHER. I would not undertake to give a legal opinion upon that.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the hon. gentleman should be able to give us a legal opinion, and let us know as a certainty.

Mr. FISHER. These clauses were drawn by the Department of Justice, who knew exactly what they were intended to do, and I supposed that they carried out the intention. I may say that I do not consider that subsection 2 can override the main body of the clause, which says that a census of Canada, which means the whole of Canada, including Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, shall be taken in 1911 and every tenth year thereafter. The next clause says that a census shall be taken in a certain portion of the Dominion in 1906 and every tenth year thereafter; but that does not in any way limit the first part of the clause, or provide that no census shall be taken in the province of Manitoba and the provisional districts in 1911 and every tenth year thereafter. I think the meaning is quite clear.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, we do not want to rest on a 'think.' If the hon. minister would say so absolutely, I would rest there. I am glad to know that the Minister of Justice drafted the clause, for I would not set up my judgment against his; but it seemed to me that there might be some doubt, and now is the proper time to settle it.

Mr. FISHER. We might pass the clause, and I will see that the attention of the Minister of Justice, with my hon. friend's view, is called to it again.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The census of Manitoba and the Territories is different from the general census. Is that the intention?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, the requirement is only for taking the number of the people. That is done for the purpose of fixing the subsidy. The other census is far more general in its scope. This Act empowers us to take more information in the fifth year, between the decennial censuses, if we desire.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It says something more than the population. It says a census of the population and agriculture.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, it is intended that we should take some agricultural statistics at the same time. I do not think those words are really needed, because in other clauses of the Act we have power to do that. But

the probability is that we shall make use of the machinery which we shall employ for taking the numbers of the people to get some other information though not so complete in its scope as we now get in the decennial census.

On section 9—division of country into census districts by proclamation—

Mr. FISHER. This is the same as section 7 of the Census Act, with some slight verbal changes. The scope of the section is precisely the same.

On section 10—details required for general census,—

Mr. FISHER. This is based on section 5 of the Census Act, the chief change being that we provide that the values shall be taken as well as the quantities. We add here : ' whatsoever other matters are specified in the forms and instructions to be issued as this Act provides. We have that power in the Census Act, but it is put in here so as to be a definite statutory department. There are some other changes in details.

Mr. BLAIN. I think that in the taking of our census there should be a column for fallow land. I pointed out to the minister some time ago that in none of the censuses of Canada taken hitherto has there been any column of that kind. The minister stated in the House two years ago that the reason for that was that there was now no fallow land of any importance in Canada. The minister could not have given attention to the matter, or he would have known that there is a great deal of fallow land in Canada. There is hardly a farm in Ontario which has not every year from ten to fifteen acres being cleaned and made better for crop in fallow, and I am informed that the same thing is true of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories to some extent, and I suppose of eastern Canada. I think we should have a column for the enumerators to take the quantity of fallow land. It is very important that people intending to come to Canada, should be able to realize, on taking up the census, that Canadian farmers are up to date. But if they find that there is no fallow land in Canada and then take the statement of the Minister of Agriculture, they will come to the conclusion that our farmers do not understand the most advanced methods of cultivation. Every one knows that one of the great essentials for successful farming is to set aside a certain portion for fallow purposes, and it is very important that in the schedule we are now adopting there should be a column showing what land is in fallow.

Mr. FISHER. I shall be very happy to adopt the suggestion of my hon. friend and I would propose an amendment that a column be inserted showing the land in fallow.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 15,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would ask that that section be allowed to stand as one of my hon. friends who is not here has something to say about it.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 16,—the minister may arrange with the authorities of a province or territory for supply of its statistics.

Mr. FISHER. This is practically the same as section four of the General Statistics Act. There are only one or two verbal changes.

Mr. INGRAM. I see that in the Ontario Act, the Ontario government take power for their Minister of Agriculture to make arrangements with the Dominion Minister of Agriculture regarding such statistics. Has the hon. minister endeavoured to make any arrangement?

Mr. FISHER. I have not undertaken to make any arrangement and will not be in a position to do so until this Bill becomes law. When adopted, I shall try to enter into arrangements with the various local authorities, as contemplated under this clause.

Mr. INGRAM. The province of Ontario has a very complete system of collecting statistics. Does the hon. gentleman intend compensating the local government for furnishing these statistics which they have gone to the expense of collecting?

Mr. FISHER. This section does not mean in any way that we should contribute to the collecting of those statistics or their compilation, but if we make an arrangement with local bodies under which they will supply us with the information they collect, we will have to come to terms with them regarding the expenditure. It is not proposed that we should go into a sort of partnership with them for the collecting of statistics.

Mr. INGRAM. I would ask the hon. minister to allow this section to stand.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 17,—minister may call upon public officers for copies of papers, &c.

Mr. FISHER. That is the same as section 5 of the General Statistics Act.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the hon. minister explain to what class of public officers he refers in this section ?

Mr. FISHER. The section refers to any and every public officer in the country, whether provincial or municipal. That, I believe, is the interpretation that has been put upon the clause, and I do not know that any question has ever arisen under it. The hon. gentleman will see that it says :—

——with or without compensation for so doing, as is regulated from time to time by the Governor in Council.

As I understand it, that contemplates an amicable arrangement with such officials as are referred to. I might cite, as an instance, the collection of criminal statistics. There is an arrangement with the officers of the courts to supply information for pay. A similar arrangement could be made by the office here, as the result of what I might call bargaining with the various provincial and municipal officers for returns of the information they possess.

Mr. LENNOX. I agree with the minister that this would include officers of the local governments and the municipalities. That being the case, it seems to me we are legislating far beyond our powers as a parliament. The wording of the section, it seems to me, does not bear out the minister's argument. He says an amicable arrangement is contemplated by the wording. Well, if it read 'upon making compensation,' or 'upon entering into a satisfactory arrangement,' or something of that kind, it would more clearly cover the idea of an amicable arrangement. But the words 'with or without compensation' may cover a different idea. A municipality may collect, at considerable expense, a large amount of valuable information. It is their own, and they have an absolute right to use it as they think fit. But if this clause were carried out according to its wording, we would assume the right to expropriate—because that is what it means—the results of their labour and expenditure with or without compensation. I do not think it advisable that this parliament should trench upon the rights of the provinces. It is not wise that, depending upon the chance of an amicable arrangement, we should pass such a clause as this until we have considered carefully, and until the Minister of Justice has considered carefully, the wording of the clause. To me it appears to go clearly beyond our powers and to assume to vest in the Minister of Agriculture authority which this Dominion parliament does not possess. I am in favour of clothing the Minister of Agriculture with all reasonable prerogatives, but I am not in favour of assuming to give him powers beyond the authority of the Dominion parliament.

Mr. FISHER. I would not undertake to give a legal opinion on a point of this kind. But I might say that this is a clause that has been on our statute-book since 1879, and, apparently, it has never been called in question or disputed in any way. I think it a power that must be used with discretion. And my hon. friend will notice that it can be exercised only under regulations by the Governor in Council—not by the minister—as is shown by the last part of the clause.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as the question of expediency is concerned, it is conferring rather wide powers upon the Minister of Agriculture to provide that he may command from provincial officers certain work without compensation. I am inclined to think that parliament has the right to give him that power, but, as a matter of expediency, I would not think it very wise legislation. We have a somewhat similar case in the Franchise Act. According to my recollection, it is provided in that Act that the government here shall have the right to demand from provincial officers copies of lists in their possession, but it can only be done on giving them reasonable compensation, which, if I remember the terms of the statute correctly, was to be regulated by Order in Council. So far as the Dominion officers are concerned, it is quite right that the minister should have power to demand this information of them without further compensation than they already receive. But I would doubt the wisdom of making it apply to provincial officers. It might be advisable that the minister should allow this section to stand for a moment, in order that we may consider that point.

Mr. FISHER. I have no objection to allowing the section to stand for a few minutes. But, as I have said, it has been the law for a long time, and no difficulty has arisen under it. Of course, the power granted must be exercised with great discretion. I think it only fair that when information is required from such officers, due compensation should be given for any trouble they take or labour they perform, and, certainly, for any expense they are put to in furnishing the information. That, I think, would always be the plan followed by the Governor in Council. I think this clause is more to require the officers to do the work, that we may not be at their mercy as to whether they shall do it or not, or as to the amount of compensation they shall demand. I think it is an authority that is required, and I think the Governor in Council should always be ready to afford reasonable compensation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On consideration, I would be inclined to the view that the section might pass in its present form. Perhaps the proper view is that the responsibility is imposed upon the executive of working this section out, and therefore parliament would very well conclude that, so far as provincial officers are concerned, this work will not be imposed upon them without provision for compensation. If you attempt to amend the section, you will make it a little cumbrous. In consideration of what has just been suggested, I would not, so far as I am concerned, ask that the section be allowed to stand.

On section 18—statistical abstracts of public reports and documents may be authorized—

Mr. FISHER. This is the same as section 6 of the General Statistics Act.

On section 20, examination for and correction of errors, &c.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course the minister will give the committee notice whenever these sections depart from the law as it stands at present.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) desires to make some suggestions with regard to section 15, if the minister will allow us to return to it.

Mr. FISHER. Certainly.

Mr. MACDONELL. I desire to draw attention to the fact that the manner of obtaining the information regarding commercial and manufacturing industries is really of an inquisitorial nature. This information has been obtainable at decennial periods in the past; and I think it is questionable whether it is a wise provision to give the minister power, every year, to obtain this information regarding commercial and manufacturing interests. We all know that capital is a sensitive creature, and commercial men often decline to give information for various reasons, reasons which I need not point out to the committee. But manufacturers do generally decline to give information about their private affairs, especially when that information is asked for every year. Agricultural information and statistics are of a different nature. But where you have capital invested in large enterprises, joint stock companies and other corporations, I question whether it is a wise provision to have this information collected and tabulated. The concluding part of the section also provides that the minister, in cases where he thinks it advantageous, shall cause such information to be published in such a form as the Governor in Council may prescribe. That provides machinery for the collection and publication of this information. It is, as I have said, of an inquisitorial character, and I would like to ask the minister if similar machinery has been working advantageously in the United States. In any case, I know that in the city of Toronto where this information is partially obtained municipally, great difficulty is experienced in dragging it out from manufacturing enterprises and concerns. If this is an experiment, if it is only pioneer legislation, I doubt its expediency; if not, will the minister tell us what the experience has been in providing this information for the census in the United States?

Mr. FISHER. At present this very system is going on in the United States, although the work is not completed. The permanent census office in the United States has the same power we are authorized to exercise by this Act, and the same power we have had under the Census Act in census years. I have found myself, and I believe my predecessors have had the same experience, that when information is asked from manufacturing establishments it often happens that they do not understand what use is going to be made of it, and a great deal of hesitation if not indignation is sometimes expressed at what they call the inquisitorial nature of the questions. A number of instances of that kind occurred during the taking of the last census. Wishing to avoid all friction and desiring to proceed cautiously, and with due regard to the feelings of the people, whenever any instance of that kind was reported by one of my enumerators, I sent up a special officer whose business it was to interview the individuals and explain the object of our proceeding. Also we wrote from the central office here a full explanation of the modus operandi of the census, showing to these people that although the information appeared in the schedule as regards their own business, in the published tables it only appeared as information in regard to the whole industry, the whole capital invested, the whole number of employees, the whole amount of products and so on throughout the list; and nobody could find out on examination of the published compilations what were the facts with regard to any individual industrial establishment. It was also pointed out to them that the original schedules containing all the details of their operations were absolutely secret, and nobody except the officers of the census had any access to them. When that was done their objections were removed, and with the exception of a very few cases, that I could count on the fingers of one hand, all the industrial establishments in Canada freely gave all the information we asked. What my hon. friend says in regard to the collection of this information in Toronto, is quite true, and it is true generally for the collection of industrial information for the province of Ontario. But I think that is owing to the fact that they have no authority under the law to extract this information, it is purely voluntary.

Mr. MACDONELL. Not at all, the giving of such authority is entirely a matter for the provincial legislature, it is a matter that concerns property and civil rights within the province, and they have a right to legislate and have legislated upon it, and actually obtain information along those lines.

Mr. FISHER. Then I have been erroneously informed. That may be the general law, but I do not think it is a provision under which machinery is operated for getting this information. I am not familiar with the Ontario laws, but I am informed there is no such provision or authority in

the Act under which this information is collected. It may be in the general law of the land, and there may be some provision in the Ontario legislation which, in a general way, gives that power to the government or to the municipality. I quite agree with my hon. friend that at first sight people engaged in industries are averse to giving this information until they are thoroughly satisfied that it is absolutely secret and confidential. When they are so satisfied, their opposition ceases immediately; and I am sure those people would themselves be the first to take advantage of the information thus acquired when it is published in tables covering the whole country. In regard to the United States, I may say that they have just the same authority we have here, an authority which is given to the Permanent Census Bureau, as it is called there, and they are working under that to-day. I have here a publication regarding the census in the United States, which alludes to that very thing, and shows that it is working satisfactorily.

I think it would be a great pity if an impediment should be put in the way of collecting industrial statistics as well as agricultural statistics. I think that the manufacturing interests of Canada would suffer if there were no such statistics collected. But I would say to my hon. friend that we have no intention or expectation of collecting these yearly, to begin with, at all events, and probably for a good many years to come one, two, or, at the most three such compilations between the decennial censuses were all we had any thought of. I think probably in this decennial period we would only be able to undertake one, or at the most two—probably only one. I am satisfied that after it had been once taken the very industries whose representatives have been speaking to my hon. friend would be amongst the first to say that the results of such industrial compilation were satisfactory and useful to them and that the dangers which they had anticipated had not resulted.

Mr. MACDONELL. In view of what the hon. minister has said I would still point out that this legislation is pioneer legislation. The experience of the working out of a similar clause in the United States is not before the people of this country or before the people of the United States. I understand the hon. minister to say that the American legislation was passed in 1902. Therefore, the real working or workability of the Act has scarcely been decided as yet. I desire to point out further that the information regarding industrial concerns that it is proposed to collect, is after all the private information of the parties to whom it belongs. It is the information of the corporations and individuals who own these establishments and it is in no sense a matter of penal legislation on the part of this House. It should not be made the subject of penal legislation such as this legislation is in that feature of it which provides penalties for non-compliance with the Act. There should be some evidence of the successful working out of similar systems in other countries before we adopt it here. I know a number of business interests that are protesting against this proposed legislation. They are satisfied to comply with the local Assessment Acts of the various provinces—I speak more particularly of the province of Ontario—and to supply the information called for in the schedules attached to these Acts. In the first place they have had something to say in the preparation of these schedules, and in the second place they are aware of what these schedules are. The hon. minister does not bring down a list of the questions that he is going to ask these people; he does not indicate what the schedules contain or what would be the nature of the information that he will require. There may be something in this regard in the mind of the minister, but he has not indicated to the House what information he is going to insist upon obtaining from these manufacturers. I think the people who own these establishments, who have their money invested in them, should be consulted. They should have some knowledge as to what inquisitorial proceedings are going to be taken in regard to their business. The hon. minister says that he is going to act with fairness and discretion in putting this Bill into operation and that the information shall be given in confidence, but his eternal continuance will end one day in this passing sphere. It may be that the hon. minister may not be always with us. Who knows who is going to take his place? What monument does he leave behind him in the shape of these tabulated schedules? This House has had no information as to what the intentions of the minister are nor has the country had any information. I think the least the minister should do in asking for drastic legislation such as is contained in this paragraph is to bring down to the House a statement of the information that he is going to ask from these establishments. I think that is required. It may be that the hon. minister has in his mind an idea of what this information is, but I think we are entitled to something more than the unopened and sealed mind of the minister. Succeeding ministers may have a different policy. It seems to me that there should be a uniform statutory policy which all ministers shall be bound by. I urge that this paragraph in its present form should not be inserted in this Bill. I think there should be some more detailed information given. The Bill is a pirate roving in provincial waters. I call it a piratical Bill because it provides for getting information from the provincial and other authorities with or without compensation. I think that before the power is given which the

hon. minister seeks, he should state what information he is going to ask from these people concerning their own private business affairs.

Mr. FISHER. I would be very sorry that the hon. gentleman should have such a bad opinion of the Bill as to characterize it as a pirate Bill, and to say that it is pioneer legislation and so on and so on. I do not think there is anything in the nature of a black flag or skull and cross bones in the legislation. Certainly this clause is not pioneer legislation. This power and authority have been given to the Department of Agriculture under the Census Act ever since we have had a census taken in Canada. It has been given in every country in the world where a census is taken. It is one of the absolute essentials of the collection of statistics. If you want to secure information and if you have no power to require the information your statistics are simply worthless because your information is not complete. Any bad natured or sulky individual in the community, or any small group of individuals could at any time defeat the whole object of the investigation if it were allowed at the caprice of an individual or a group who entertained some peculiar ideas as to their particular rights to refuse to give the information. That is one of the essentials of census taking. My hon. friend says that this is pioneer legislation. We have had the same kind of thing exactly in our Census Act for thirty or forty years.

Mr. MACDONELL. Only once in ten years.

Mr. FISHER. Only once in ten years but the principle is exactly the same. What does it matter whether you get certain information confidentially and secretly so that it cannot be published to the world once in ten years or once in five years? That does not interfere with the principle or the practical necessity of the thing. The thing is just as necessary in the case where you do it every five years or every three years as it is when you do it every ten years. My hon. friend says that this is pioneer legislation. The Act in the United States giving this power was passed in 1902 and it is working to-day. It has been working in regard to other things since 1902, and in the United States before that this same principle was applied to the taking of the census every ten years. I have here the report of Mr. Cortelyou who was the secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labour in the United States until quite recently and who had the management of this census. In this report he refers to the taking of the industrial census which is going on in the United States, and he takes credit to his bureau and to himself for doing this work and for requiring this information. That is the authority that I am asking for in regard to this matter. I do not think my hon. friend is quite right in saying that this is pioneer legislation and that it has not been tried. It has been tried, not perhaps in the degree in this country in which it is proposed to put it in operation but it has in this degree been tried in the United States, and the gentleman who has had the operation of it reports favourably on it and says that it is working satisfactorily. If I were to adopt my hon. friend's proposition and leave out this clause it would practically mean the prevention of the taking of industrial statistics of any kind whatever in Canada except in the census years. I would not undertake the responsibility, in establishing a census office for the express purpose of taking statistics, to exclude from its operations such a large, important and valuable class of statistics as those connected with the industires of the country. I think that the people engaged in the industries of the country themselves, in vast majority, would condemn me if I would agree to that exclusion.

Mr. MACDONELL. What I desired to suggest when I said it was pioneer legislation, was that the result of the operations of the American Act was not yet manifest to us, and I would again point out to the minister that under the language of this particular section No. 15, the information that the minister has a right to ask for and to insist upon obtaining, is not confined to the information authorized to be obtained under the existing law, upon the taking of the census. There is no limit to which he may not go. Further, he may demand the information which he is authorized to obtain, from one class of manufacturers and not from another or from one individual in a class of manufacturers; it need not be uniform. The minister may shake his head and say he does not intend to do so; I have no doubt he does not intend to work the Act oppressively, but I say that it is susceptible of that operation. You may pick upon a class of manufacturers engaged in a certain class of enterprise and insist on their making returns of their private enterprises year in and year out, and they might possibly be so harassed as to be driven out of business. The minister may again shake his head and say: 'No, no,' but the language of the Act permits that to be done. It may not be done by the present minister, but it leaves the way open for succeeding ministers to harass individuals. I am simply remarking on the loose framing of the clause, the indefinite character of the Act, and its wide, far reaching scope under which any information can be obtained.

Mr. FISHER. Does my hon. friend mean to say that I could ask one manufacturing industry to give information and not ask another to give the same information?

Mr. MACDONELL. I certainly think so.

Mr. FISHER. If this is my hon. friend's legal opinion, I would certainly ask the

clause to stand and have the opinion of the Department of Justice upon that point, because I would not wish for a moment to take that authority. If this meaning can be read into these words, I am willing to amend the clause to prevent this being expressed. The objection which the hon. member states is one to which I would at once give weight. The hon. gentleman, I understand, is a lawyer of high standing and he states as a lawyer on the floor of the House that this interpretation can be taken from the clause. Not being a lawyer and not pretending to have a legal opinion or knowledge I would certainly refer the matter to a competent authority before going further.

Mr. MACDONELL. I thank the hon. minister exceedingly for his kindness in that respect and I do urge the minister, not captiously but sincerely, in the interest of the House and of the industries of this country, that the information for which he can ask should be tabulated and placed in the schedule of this Act to be read concurrently, side by side, with clause 15. I commend that suggestion to the most respectful consideration of this House, and I think that the members of this House and the business interests of the country are entitled to know what they are to be asked concerning their own business. I think that the business interests of the country are entitled to know when embarking upon any enterprise just what information is to be asked of them and published more or less in the public records.

Mr. MONK. I think that clause 15 is susceptible of the construction which the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) has put on it, and that it is open to the minister, under the wording of that clause, to seek to collect information from a certain class of manufacturers. I think there is no doubt about that.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think there is any doubt about that.

Mr. MONK. And from individual manufacturers alone, not from the whole class.

Mr. FISHER. That is the point in question.

Mr. MONK. The legislation is not new as the minister says, but it is being applied in a very extensive way in the United States. The circumstances that exist here are different from those that obtain in the United States, and I have had complaints of the same nature as those mentioned by the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell). In the United States the inquiries made and the information collected have become exceedingly detailed because in the United States they have a law against trusts and combinations which we have not here. The inquiry at present being held into industrial affairs is, I think, being held by the Bureau of Corporations which is a branch of the permanent Census Bureau, a new institution, in order to be able to apply with some degree of efficiency the law against trusts and combinations. It is necessary for the Bureau of Corporations to have this inquisitorial power which they have in the United States, under almost the same wording as we find here in section 15. But here we have no law against trusts and combinations, and it seems to me that until we have such a law—and I believe we are approaching a time when we must have that law—it is fair for us to ask that we should know exactly what kind of information will be asked from us. A very interesting report has been made by Mr. Garfield, the chief of the Bureau of Corporations, who is proceeding with this inquiry regarding industrial progress and industrial conditions in the United States. He has called into operation that power which my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) is seeking to take here by section 15, and he had to ask from certain classes of manufacturers, or certain manufacturers in certain parts of the United States, questions which have not hitherto been asked, and which were not found in the usual schedules, such as the cost of production of the articles manufactured, the wages paid, the prices at which they sell an article in different parts of the United States, and the prices at which they sell in foreign countries. Mr. Garfield says that the securing of that information is absolutely necessary for him in order to place the government in such a position that it will be enabled to enforce the anti-trust and anti-combination laws. I may say frankly that I believe that we will soon have a similar law in this country and that it will then be necessary for the minister to have that power. Of course, as Mr. Garfield observes, he has had very few refusals from manufacturers and commercial men to give this information, once he has been able to ensure to them the privacy, between the government and themselves, of this special information he requires. As I said a moment ago we have not the anti-trust laws here, and I quite understand that our manufacturers under those circumstances would not feel inclined to give information in regard to the cost of production in regard to wages and in regard to the selling price of the articles they produce. Perhaps until we have such a law it would be better to fix exactly the nature of the information they have to give.

Mr. LENNOX. The point brought out by the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) is a most important one, as regards the necessity of having a schedule determined now. I did not fully appreciate the importance of that until I examined the Act from which the Bill is taken. Looking at part 4, which we are just approaching, and at section 26, and referring back to the statute from which the minister takes section 15, with which we are now deal-

ing, we are enabled to appreciate the effect of what is proposed. The member from Toronto says it occurs to him that we should have it prescribed what the schedules shall contain and the information that shall be demanded. Strangely enough, when we refer to the statute from which section 15 is taken, we find that there is a safeguard thrown about the transaction in the original statute which is not to be found in the section we are now dealing with. Section 15 has a foot note leading us to suppose that it is taken from Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 59, sections 1 and 2. Therefore, we are to assume that there is no material change—in other words, that this is not what the minister speaks of as pioneer legislation. Let me say that upon looking at this section, I find that we are having pioneer legislation of a very dangerous character, if the provision of the original section was necessary. That the minister may appreciate the importance of this, let me call his attention, in the first place, to the fact, that section 15 provides for the collection not only of agricultural, commercial, educational and manufacturing statistics, but also of criminal statistics. Then, part 4 of the Bill provides specially for the collection of criminal statistics, but in this case a special safeguard is provided, for section 26 of that part enacts that:

> All schedules transmitted under this part shall be according to forms from time to time approved by the Governor in Council and published in the 'Canada Gazette.'

On looking at section 1 of chapter 59, I find that although we have not in this Bill a provision to safeguard the public by providing that the form of schedule shall be determined by the Governor in Council, there is such a provision in the original Act. Section 1 of that Act says:

> The Minister of Agriculture shall, from time to time, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, make such regulations and prescribe such forms as appear necessary and expedient, for the purpose of collecting, abstracting, tabulating and publishing vital, agricultural, commercial, criminal and other statistics, and such rules, regulations and forms, when assented to by the Governor in Council and published in the 'Canada Gazette,' shall have the force of law.

In other words, exactly what my hon. friend from South Toronto regarded as a proper and necessary safeguard was provided in the original Act from which the minister takes his Bill, and from which we are led to suppose that section 15 is taken by reason of the reference at the bottom of the section. Now, I quite apprehend that the minister did not himself realize that such an important change had been made. It emphasizes the necessity of very great care, in making these foot references, to see that we have a substantial re-enactment. In this particular case, unintentionally I have no doubt, but fatally all the same, we have left out this most important safeguard—that this shall not be exacted from the public until the assent of the Governor in Council is obtained—emphasizing the entire propriety of the demand made by the hon. member for South Toronto.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend is correct as to one point, but not as to the other. The whole of clause 15 is subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, and I do not think any part of it can be acted upon by the minister without an Order in Council. That provision is in clauses 1 and 2 of the Statistics Act. My hon. friend is correct as to the publication in the 'Canada Gazette'; but if my hon. friend refers to section 6 of this Bill, which applies to the whole Act, he will find that all these things have to be published in the 'Canada Gazette.' Therefore the provisions contained in sections 1 and 2 of chapter 59 are contained in this Act, although the whole of them are not specifically mentioned in section 15. My hon. friend is not right, therefore, in saying that any part of the original safeguards is omitted. I would like to say a word in reply to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I am quite willing and desirous of securing that in no circumstances shall any arrangement be made for the collection of statistics which would permit us to ask from one industrial establishment, or from two or three or any number, what we are not asking from all industrial establishments of that class. Any wording that is necessary to make that clear I shall be only too glad to add to clause 15. As to the inclusion of the schedule in the statute, I think that is quite impossible. I say that not with any desire to prevent what my hon. friend is aiming at; but in the practical working out of the matter, I think it would be quite impossible. The different arrangements which might be found from time to time desirable, as to the kind and amount of information asked for, are so varied, and might require so many different schedules, that if we were to undertake to cumber the Act with those schedules, I think it would be quite impossible to carry on the work. I have a precedent for that: the Census Act does not contain the schedules or lists of questions—what my hon. friend is asking for in this case. The schedules are prepared every ten years for a census under the Act, and are authorized by the Governor in Council. So under this clause all schedules and questions must be arranged with the approval of the Governor in Council, and can only be issued and acted upon by virtue of an Order in Council. My hon. friend says that this is inquisitorial, and that there are great objections to it. For many years we have been asking questions under the Census Act, and there has been no practical objection. As I pointed out, at first, when these

schedules have been presented, a certain number of firms, not many, have objected, thinking them inquisitorial; but when they found that the information contained in the schedules was absolutely confidential, and was not to be given to the public except as contained in a compilation of the whole information in regard to that particular industry, their objection ceased at once; and I am satisfied that any objections made to this power will cease in the same way as soon as the matter is understood. The only position my hon. friend has practically taken in this respect is that this information is not inquisitorial when taken every ten years, but that it is when taken every five years or thereabouts.

Mr. MACDONELL. I desire to point out to the minister the difference between the old Act and the present Bill. The minister has omitted to mention that the word 'manufacturing' is in this Bill and not in the old statute. The statute says 'commercial and other statistics' and I do not think that under it the minister could obtain this information from manufacturing establishments.

Mr. FISHER. The words 'commercial and other statistics,' it seems to me would cover manufacturing.

Mr. MACDONELL. Why then insert the word 'manufacturing?'

Mr. FISHER. To make it clearer.

Mr. MACDONELL. I am still of the opinion that, read with the preceding words, the word 'commercial' would not cover manufacturing. But why not have the schedule so clearly defined that the people will know what information they will be required to give? People who are investing capital in manufacturing enterprises should know what kind of an inquisition is to be made into their private affairs.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. minister did not meet the point I made. Under the old statute it is left to the Governor in Council to determine what forms of schedules will be adopted as well as whether any shall be adopted at all. Two things are thus left to the Governor in Council, namely, to determine whether the minister shall collect the information, and, if so, what forms of schedules shall be used. But under this Bill the Governor in Council has nothing to do with the forms. The Governor in Council authorizes the minister to collect the information, but the minister alone decides what forms shall be used. I think the House will see the importance of having investigations into people's business first sanctioned by the Governor General in Council and the forms of schedules determined on by the same authority before the department can set to work. In the part of this Bill referring to criminal statistics, it is expressly provided that the schedules shall be approved by the Governor General in Council, and it is equally important that the same precaution should be taken in commercial matters. I quite agree with the minister that it may not be necessary to incorporate the schedules in the statute, but I think that they should be subject to the approval of the Governor General in Council.

Mr. FISHER. That is the intention, and in consequence of the doubt expressed by my hon. friend on that point and that expressed by the hon. member from Toronto on the other point, I would ask that this section should stand so that I may refer it to the Department of Justice and have it so worded as to clearly indicate the intention.

Mr. MACDONELL. This clause should be also amended so that information may not be published only partially. As the Bill is now drawn, a portion of the information may be made public and a portion not.

Mr. FISHER. What my hon. friend means, no doubt, is that no information should be published about one firm which is not made public about other firms in the same business.

Mr. MACDONELL. Yes, so as to prevent rival firms getting an advantage over each other.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I agree in the opinion that it is desirable to reconsider the wording of this section. I have listened attentively to the remarks of my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), and I agree with him that the same safeguards which are provided in the present law should be found here, and that they are in this section to say the least very doubtful.

Mr. FISHER. My intention was that they should be here.

Section 6 allowed to stand.

On section 15—agricultural, commercial, criminal, educational, manufacturing and other statistics.

Mr. INGRAM. I ask that this stand in order that I might get some information respecting the arrangements for collecting statistics. I find that the Ontario law is largely on the lines of the section in the hon. gentleman's Bill. I asked if any arrangements had been entered into between Ontario and the Dominion government regarding statistics, and he said no, but that it was his intention to make some arrangement.

Section 15 agreed to.

On section 21—Schedules of Criminal statistics to be furnished by clerks of courts.

Mr. FISHER. This and the succeeding clause are a repetition of clauses one and two of chapter 60, Criminal Statistics Act. There is no intention to make any change.

On section 29—this part shall remain in force and effect until it is declared to be no longer in force by a proclamation of the Governor in Council, stating that provision has been made for the collection of criminal statistics in accordance with the requirements of part III of this Act; and from and after the issue of such proclamation, this part shall cease to have force and effect.

Mr. LENNOX. Is that consistent with what has gone before? I would like the minister to explain why this is necessary and how it works out.

Mr. FISHER. The Criminal Statistics Act says, 'This Act shall remain in force and affect until'—and so on. We have to say, 'this part shall remain in force and effect'—and so on. That is, under the Criminal Statistics Act we have power to collect the criminal statistics in another way, and this part of the Act takes the place of the Criminal Statistics Act.

Mr. LENNOX. But does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) think that part 4 is necessary at all? In part 3 general statistics are provided for, and they would naturally include criminal statistics.

Mr. FISHER. There are certain special provisions of the Criminal Statistics Act which must be incorporated here, it seems to me.

Mr. LENNOX. It may be all right.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the minister utilized the work of the commissioners who are revising the statutes? Have they done any work on this part of the Bill?

Mr. FISHER. The officer of the Justice Department who drafted the Bill is thoroughly familiar with the work of the committee on consolidation of the statutes, and he had before him, when he considered this Bill, the first draft of that commission.

On section 30,—every person employed in the execution of this Act to take an oath of office.

Mr. FISHER. This is practically the same as the old section, with the addition of the words 'and to the secrecy of the statistics and information collected for the office.' We thought that should be inserted in order that it might be clearly understood that the oath of office bound the one who took it to secrecy in regard to the information coming into his possession.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) will remember a former discussion when a circular was produced that originated in the province of Ontario, in the office of the Reform Association, and which was brought to the attention of the House. I have a copy of that circular here, but it is useless to put it on 'Hansard' again. The hon. minister will remember that it was directed to the enumerators of the census, and ordered them to report in duplicate the names of young men approaching 21 years of age. They were to find out the politics of these young men and in what polling subdivision they lived and a copy of the report was to be sent to the Liberal candidate in the last provincial election or to the candidate nominated on the Liberal side for the next coming provincial election. Has the minister put into this new law any provision that would cause the instant dismissal of any enumerator who would fill up a report such as is required by this circular and have him dismissed immediately?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know that there is any provision of the law which would have that effect. I would certainly think that such an Act on the part of an officer of the department was entirely unwarranted and improper, and should not be allowed for an instant.

Mr. BLAIN. That is all very well. But the fact remains that this was done. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) himself produced on the floor of this House telegrams that had been sent out to those who were supposed to have received these circulars. He received answers from enumerators some of whom said the circular had not been placed in their hands, while others admitted that they had received it. The hon. minister did not make any investigation, although the leader of the opposition brought the matter to his attention and demanded that an investigation should be made. A clause should be inserted in this law—whatever may be necessary in the opinion of the Department of Justice—to provide for the immediate dismissal of any enumerator who will act upon such a circular in the interest of any political party. I should have thought that the minister would have a clear recollection of this case, and that he would have provided against it in some way. But it seems that he has neglected that—I suppose it is only neglect.

Mr. BARKER. I would remind the minister that there was a Quebec case also in which an officer of his own department issued a very important circular for which he had no authority whatever, and sent it all over the province of Quebec, demanding information that the statute in no way authorized. That was issued, I think, by Mr. Coté, a deputy, or a gentleman holding some position in the Census Department; it was issued without the knowledge of the minister himself, as he told the House, and was issued as a document from the Census Commissioner's office, and was franked by another minister's office, and sent broadcast throughout the province. Now, the hon. gentleman is providing, in section 31, that the neglect of certain duties by the officers of the department should be an indictable offence. I think the hon. gentleman should go further, and provide that if any officer, or commissioner, or agent of the

department, whether by letter or otherwise, requires information not authorized by statute, he shall also be guilty of an indictable offence.

Mr. FISHER. I would not like off-hand to give an opinion on that proposition; I would like to consult the Minister of Justice in regard to it. It may be advisable that such a clause should be introduced.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might it not be advisable to consider the necessity of some provision in the statutes to this effect, that any officer undertaking or assuming to obtain information other than that which he was instructed to obtain by the department, should be criminally liable, and any attempt on the part of any outside person to induce an officer of the department to procure information not authorized by the department under the law, should subject such person to penalty or imprisonment? It appears to me that might be a very proper provision, in view of the matter which has been referred to by my hon. friend.

Mr. FISHER. I think it would be proper to provide that the officers collecting information should not be allowed to collect any other than that provided for in the schedule. As to the other point, I should like to consult the Minister of Justice.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think the Criminal Code provides for that already; I know there is some provision.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think it very probable. The Minister of Justice would do well to consider that.

Mr. BOYCE. Section 12 of the Act prohibits the enumerator from obtaining any other information than that which he is required to obtain under the Act, but there is nothing in the Act to enforce the provisions of section 12. That is merely a statutory direction more honoured in the breach than in the observance. Therefore, it is vitally important that if the words 'and no others' provided for in section 12 are required, that any infraction be penalized in the closing clauses of the Act.

Mr. FISHER. I will look into that.

Mr. LENNOX. I would ask the minister to answer the question in reference to section 30, which says:

> Every officer, census commissioner, enumerator, agent or other person employed . . . shall take an oath.

Would that apply to section 17, in reference to public officers?

Mr. FISHER. I should think it would apply, at any rate, to this extent, that if these public officers supply information to this office they should accompany that by some declaration that it was correct as originally collected. But I do not think that would apply to the extent of requiring them to take an oath that the information they supplied was initially correct, because they have to take the word of somebody else for that. But we could require that all the information they supply was such as was given them.

Mr. LENNOX. There are some other matters in this section that would indicate that to be the case, and I would like to consider it further.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CALGARY AND EDMONTON RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill No. 22 respecting the Calgary & Edmonton Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

On section 2,

Mr. LENNOX. How much is this bridge to cost?

Mr. OLIVER. It is estimated by the railway company to cost $600,000 if built for railway purposes, or $1,000,000 if built for railway and traffic purposes.

Mr. LENNOX. Which is it to be built for?

Mr. OLIVER. Authority is being asked to build it either for a railway bridge alone or for a railway and traffic bridge as may be subsequently agreed upon between the different parties interested, that is to say between the railway company, the government and the municipalities particularly concerned in having the bridge made a traffic bridge.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not understand this very well and probably I am asking questions that may seem very absurd, but as no one else is asking anything I want to find out what it means. I understand that there is power to borrow $1,000,000 'in aid of the construction of the branch line from Strathcona to Edmonton.' Then paragraph 2 says:

> The said bonds shall be called bridge bonds and shall be the first preferential claim and charge upon the said branch line and upon the said bridge and its approaches.

Then this million dollars is not exclusively for the bridge?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No.

Mr. LENNOX. I think I see the point all right now.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 25) respecting the Walkerton and Lucknow Railway Company.—Mr. P. H. McKenzie.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 47) respecting the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Canada-Middlesex Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 56) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Bole.

Bill (No. 57) to incorporate La Compagnie de chemin de fer électrique de Trois-Rivières, St. Maurice, Maskinongé et Champlain."—Mr. Bureau.

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Lamont.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Public buildings, Quebec—Acton Vale public building, $8,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This, Mr. Chairman, is to complete the payments on the public building at Acton Vale in the county of Bagot. The contract for the building was let on the 28th of June of last year for $10,250. The population of the town and parish to be served by the office is 3,000.

Mr. MONK. I would like to say in a general way in connection with these public buildings and without my remarks being especially applicable to the public building at Acton Vale and without going over the ground that was gone over yesterday in connection with our system of procedure in regard to public buildings, that I have looked over the list of public buildings in the province of Quebec, and I find that there are 12, 13 or 14 public buildings as regards which I doubt if there has ever been any urgent demand upon the government for their construction, otherwise than by the desire exhibited by the sitting member to have a public building. I think that is about the genesis of the public building.—I have seen many of these buildings in Quebec and I suppose they are the same all over Canada—and it bears the date of its erection and the name of the minister prominently displayed; sometimes it bears the name of the sitting member, and the expectation of the sitting member is that if he gets a public building he will consolidate himself in the constituency. As a matter of fact a number of members have declared to me that public buildings have been the cause of untold bitterness to them.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It works the other way.

Mr. MONK. Generally it works the other way. The locality chosen gives rise to a good deal of bickering and heart-burning and often there are several possible sites chosen and the ultimate choice of the location leads to a lot of heart-burning. The contractor who erects the building finds many enemies for the sitting member and the man who is placed in charge of it generally makes a great many enemies for the sitting member also. That is what I have noticed in regard to public buildings since I have been in this House. The hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell), I think, pointed out what has been a ground of complaint since 1896, that there is no system in regard to public buildings, there is no rule and as a general thing we never have any information here in regard to these public buildings. I have heard time and time again the predecessors of my hon. friend tell us that such and such a sum which we were voting would finish certain public buildings, and the next year we were called upon for a new appropriation for the same buildings. I have asked for plans time and time again, before we started on a public building, and I have never been able to obtain them nor much other information which is absolutely necessary in order to proceed in a businesslike way to the execution of this policy of building public buildings, if it may be called a policy. Take the public buildings in Quebec for this year and we have no data; my hon. friend will admit that. My hon. friend (Mr. Hyman) is a stranger to the province of Quebec.

Mr. HYMAN. A foreigner.

Mr. MONK. Not a foreigner but a stranger, and I would not like to ask him a number of questions in regard to these public buildings which would prolong debate uselessly. As a matter of fact, many of the constituencies where many of these public buildings are to be erected are not even represented here to-night and probably the bitterness of which I spoke a moment ago is already in the souls of the members who have asked for these public buildings. We will vote to-night for the class of public buildings I have alluded to, some $500,000, about $200,000 for public buildings in localities that I am perfectly sure could be benefited infinitely more by another kind of expenditure. We will vote a couple of hundred thousand dollars to complete what? To complete a sum I have no hesitation in saying of about $600,000, nearly three quarters of a million dollars, in order to finish these public buildings, and when we have spent $750,000 or $600,000 or perhaps more than three quarters of a million dollars on these public buildings erected in localities of which I will say a word in a moment, we will have made a permanent charge upon the public revenue of nearly $60,000 a year. If my hon. friend (Mr. Hyman) will take these public buildings and have an estimate made of what they cost for repairs, gas, heating, and caretakers, I think I am making a moderate estimate in saying that he will find that it will cost us about $60,000

a year to maintain these public buildings. I am equally certain that I am within the limit of reason in saying that for the purpose for which these public buildings are being erected $60,000 a year of rental would give the public all the accommodation they required. I am prepared to go carefully over each of these localities—I am not speaking of the city of Quebec or Montreal or Three Rivers, but of the smaller places—and to say that with $60,000 a year we would secure sufficient accommodation for all the public services and be free in each case to change the office to lease more space and so forth. In these small localities the important part of the town is often changing. I could point out a number of public buildings in Quebec that were probably erected in the right places when they were erected, but which are not now in the most suitable part of the town. But they are there to stay and to remain a charge upon the public treasury. Yet if the government to-day wished to secure accommodation in the same towns it would probably erect buildings elsewhere. I desire very much to emphasize this fact, that I am not opposed to public buildings in any of these particular smaller localities; not at all. If the Minister of Public Works wished to put up a public building in every locality in my own county I would not refuse.

As a matter of fact, when I was younger in public life, I think it was in 1901, I called the attention of the then Minister of Public Works to the fact that he was putting up no public building in my own constituency, where one might be of use, and he promised to take the matter into his serious consideration. The ground I take is that we could spend the same amount of money in these constituencies with much better result than by continuing what I am told has been the slipshod policy of every government, of putting up a public building merely to satisfy a particular member, because a previous government had put up one in another constituency. Now, I have looked over this list of appropriations for public buildings in my own province, and I believe that in many of these instances, if the people at large were consulted as to whether they would prefer to have a public building in one of the villages—because most of them are villages—or to have some other improvement which would benefit the whole constituency, there would not be a moment's hesitation. Our policy regarding public buildings is one that rests very often upon the vanity or the individual ambition of the sitting member to do as much as some other man has done. For instance, take the first place mentioned, that is, Acton Vale, in the county of Bagot, a very strong agricultural constituency, where much dairying is successfully carried on. I have no hesitation in saying that we could do much more for that constituency in the field of agriculture than by putting up a public building at Acton Vale. What is the great complaint in Montreal and the other centres from which butter is shipped? It is that our present system of bonusing the steamship and railway companies to provide cold storage facilities for the conveyance of perishable goods is faulty—why? Because these companies would be obliged under any circumstances to provide accommodation for perishable products, particularly butter. Our produce men in Montreal say that the government, instead of spending so much in bonusing these companies, which must supply cool space for the purposes of their business, should give some aid to the farmers who after bringing their butter to the stations, are obliged to leave it there sometimes three or four hours in the sun and subject to great deterioration. It has been urged upon me very often in Montreal that the government had much better devote some money to the erection of cooling rooms or small ice houses at the principal depots where butter is received. That would benefit, not a particular locality or a particular contractor or a certain set of men, but the entire district. Then, improvements might be made in the mail service. If the hon. minister were to offer, as I do not think he will, either to put up a public building in my own constituency or to spend the same amount of money on improving the mail service, I have no doubt that my constituents would not hesitate for a moment to say, give us an improper mail service, or do what this government has been urged again and again to do—reduce the indebtedness to the government of the Montreal Turnpike Trust; and you will benefit all the farmers throughout the constituency. Then, everybody knows that, for the development which we require in most of these counties where public buildings are going to be erected, important railway communications are required; and I have no doubt that if the same amount of money were expended on improving the railway communications, a far greater benefit would be bestowed upon the people. I do not apply these remarks to large centres like Montreal and Ottawa. Consider the immense amount of money we are spending yearly in rents in Ottawa, I think over $30,000, with departments spread all over the city. It seems to me that it would be better for us to install properly the central offices of administration than to squander money all over the country in that way. I have given utterance as briefly as possible to the view which I have entertained for many years of the policy of the government in regard to public buildings. I quite agree with what has been said, that if we adhere to that policy, it would be a great convenience for us to have a clearer statement of the stage at which the work has arrived on each of these public buildings, of the site and of the plan, as we ought to have a cer-

tainty that the expenditure will not go beyond a certain fixed sum in any particular place. But there is no such rule. I make these observations because I know that candidates in the fever of an election contest take up any utterance that we have made here in connection with the erection of public buildings, and invoke it before the people in order to prejudice them against us. Therefore I do not see the use of singling out any particular building. The remarks I have made apply to all, and I thought it well to make them in the first instance in order to facilitate the business of the committee.

Mr. HYMAN. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I have to say, in the first place, that with regard to every building for which the government is taking a vote, there has been a very clear and concise statement made of the estimate by the chief architect, and all the details; and I will endeavour to see that the expenditure does not go beyond the amount voted, although there are often contingencies arising in building operations to make it impossible to keep the cost entirely within the estimate. For the first time, I think, we have learned the secret of some of the opposition given in the House to this expenditure. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier takes exception to the custom that prevails in the province of Quebec of putting certain names on the buildings. He says it is customary to put on a building the name of the member representing the constituency in this House, and also the name of the minister. Possibly I may soften his opposition to this particular building by assuring him that I shall be glad to forego the honour of having my name placed upon it, and that I should be very glad indeed to place upon it the name of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier if he thinks that will in any way add to the lustre and honour of his name after he departs from this sphere. With regard to the system of erecting public buildings, that did not originate with this government; it has been in existence for many years. As I said last evening, if you consider the system purely and simply from the dollars and cents standpoint, I have no doubt that it cannot be defended entirely as a business proposition. But it has been the custom, I think ever since confederation, to lay aside a certain amount of money for the construction of these buildings. With regard to the particular building at present under the consideration of the committee, I do not know what other expenditure could possibly be made in the county of Bagot. It is an inland county, in which there has never been any expenditure on wharfs or other public works. The hon. gentleman says that the money might be spent in improving the mail service. I feel quite sure that if the people of Bagot have any complaints to make in regard to the mail service, my hon. colleague the Postmaster General will see that these complaints are remedied. The hon. gentleman referred to the question of a public building in his own county. Well, I shall be very glad to give every consideration to anything the hon. gentleman may lay before the department on that subject; but after his gloomy picture about the granting of public buildings, and the bickerings and heart burnings which he says occur in most constituencies where public buildings are erected, I am sure he would not care to have one erected in his constituency.

As to public buildings in Montreal, Toronto and the other large cities of the Dominion, there can be no question of doubt in regard to the policy of the government. But I must say that I am not prepared, nor, I think, is the government prepared, to subscribe to the idea that, having provided buildings for these cities, we must stop at that. I believe that care ought to be exercised; but there are so many considerations that govern the decision as to erecting public buildings in smaller places that it is almost impossible to lay down a rule. The matter was discussed many a time when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, and they never were able to lay down a rule that could be always adhered to, nor do I think that any such rule could be framed.

Mr. BOYCE. Would the minister please state the post office and the customs revenue.

Mr. HYMAN. The postal revenue for the year last reported was $949. There is no customs house there at present.

Mr. BOYCE. Is it intended to establish a customs house there?

Mr. HYMAN. I understand that it is.

Chicoutimi public building, $15,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The site chosen for this building is a very desirable one and cost about $2,400. It is intended to put up a building there that will cost, for the building proper $21,000, and for the whole structure, including heating, wiring, fittings, &c., $30,000.

Mr. BARKER. Is the present appropriation intended to complete the work?

Mr. HYMAN. No, I have just explained that, we are to spend $30,000 and so we must ask for another vote.

Mr. BARKER. I ask, because last year, $8,000 was voted for this building and $4,000 spent. This vote will make a total of $19,000. The minister started last year with $8,000, then asked for enough to increase that to $19,000, and now we have a prospect of $30,000 expenditure.

Mr. HYMAN. Not a prospect—a certainty.

Mr. BARKER. I ask this, as I wish to do on every occasion, because I think it is the duty of the minister to tell us, not what he wants for the season, but what he expects ultimately to spend on the work. I think if that rule were followed on every occasion, we should have a little more sense of responsibility on the part of ministers.

Mr. HYMAN. The first vote was for $8,000. We are now asking for $15,000. I have already put it on 'Hansard' that it is the intention of the government to spend for this building $30,000. Of necessity, therefore, the government must ask for another vote to make up the total, and that vote will be asked for in the main estimates or, in the supplementary estimates, of next year.

Mr. BARKER. What is the population of Chicoutimi, and why is a $30,000 building required there? I do not profess to know much about the business of Chicoutimi. I was there a great many years ago. I am not aware that it has made any wonderful progress. This vote of $30,000 compared with the appropriations in other parts of the Dominion seems a very large sum and should call for some explanation.

Mr. HYMAN. I had the pleasure of visiting Chicoutimi, one of the few places I have been able to visit since I undertook the work of the department. Chicoutimi is advancing very rapidly indeed. It has now, I am informed, a population of about 6,000 or 6,400. A number of important interests have been centering there, and I have no doubt that when it is made, the great practical terminus of the Lake St. John Railway, it will become a very much larger town than it is at present. The lot on which the building is to be placed makes it necessary to construct a building rather more than usually expensive. The lot has streets on every side, and it is in a very prominent place. Every passenger getting off the boat, and every person who comes to Chicoutimi must see the public building. There are practically four fronts, each of which must have a certain amount of ornamentation. This will make it necessary to spend $2,000 or $3,000 more than would otherwise be spent.

Mr. BOYCE. What is the postal and customs revenue?

Mr. HYMAN. The postal revenue is $3,085, and the customs about $8,000. I may say that it is intended that this building shall also afford accommodation for the government telegraph service and engineering department.

Public buildings, Quebec—Dominion buildings—renewals, improvements, repairs, &c., $12,000.

Mr. MONK. How is it intended to apply this amount? We vote every year for the public buildings of Quebec $12,000, and every year we spend that amount. A strange coincidence. What is it intended to do with the money this year?

Mr. HYMAN. The vote is always $12,000, but I do not know that the expenditure will be $12,000 exactly. I have no data to show exactly where this money is to be spent. It depends upon contingencies that may arise and the decision of the architect with regard to them.

Grosse Isle quarantine station—improvements and repairs to buildings, &c., $12,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is called for by the Department of Agriculture, which department, as the committee is aware has charge of Grosse Isle.

Mr. MONK. An amount was voted last year, and we were told specifically what it was for. According to my recollection the installation of a fresh water system was one item of expenditure. What is to be done with the present vote?

Mr. HYMAN. It is partly a continuance of the work last year. Money has been or is to be spent on police quarters, drainage, plumbing, hospital fire escape, painting superintendent's residence, new quarters for sailors, plank walks and other items—it is a general vote.

Mr. BARKER. But this year we do not require to do that work.

Mr. HYMAN. Only a part of the work has been done. In this item there is completion of the quarters for sailors, an ice house, well, repairs to medical superintendent's residence and other items.

Mr. BARKER. Will this vote finish everything except the ordinary repairs that go on from year to year? 'Improvements and repairs' is a very general expression. The hon. minister can easily spend $100,000 on 'improvements.'

Mr. HYMAN. I am not in a position to promise the House that there will be no more improvements at Grosse Isle. I do not know whether the hon. member (Mr. Barker) has visited Grosse Isle, but I was there some time ago, and I must say that some of the buildings are not in a good state of repair, and must, in time, be renewed. So far as the Department of Public Works is concerned, it has no intention of asking more than this vote. But the hon. gentleman will understand that if the department in control of the quarantine station come to the Public Works Department and say that the accommodation is not sufficient and show good reason why a new building should be constructed, I am sure the hon. gentleman himself, considering the importance of that quarantine station, would not ask the department to pledge itself not to ask for another vote.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. minister misunderstood me. I am aware that repairs will be needed every year.

Mr. HYMAN. And renewals—there may be renewals.

Mr. BARKER. Government buildings are, or ought to be, of a very substantial character, and so they should not require to be renewed frequently. But I admit that repairs are constantly needed, because government buildings should be kept in the best condition of repair. I do not dispute that for a moment. But when we have the word 'improvements' stuck on every year, $12,900 last year, $12,000 this year, and so on, I think we ought to know when this is going to end.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman's remarks might apply to public buildings of the character we have been discussing a little while ago, but they do not apply to this case. These buildings are wooden buildings, or a large number of them; some of them have been in existence for forty-seven years. Under these circumstances, no doubt, they will have to be frequently repaired and renewed. It is the intention of the department to repair and renew them. Except for these purposes the department does not expect to have to apply for further appropriations in the way of buildings.

Mr. BERGERON. You are prophesying.

Mr. HYMAN. Of course, if the Agriculture Department makes a demand for works we have to supply them.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend will regret very much that he made such a promise. I think for the last twenty-five years these improvements have been on the estimates.

Mr. BLAIN. How much was expended last year on headquarters for sailors? I understood that in the vote last year a certain amount was to be expended on headquarters for sailors. How was the money expended?

Mr. HYMAN. It was expended by day labour. If the hon. gentleman knew the circumstances, he would know that we have to house all the men employed there and provide accommodation for their families, $8,000 was spent last year, and we require some $6,000 more to complete that building.

Mr. BLAIN. Last year we were told that $8,000 would complete; how is it the hon. gentleman comes forward now and asks for $6,000 more?

Mr. HYMAN. I understand that last year it was hoped that we would be able to put up this building on the same kind of foundation as was under the other building. But when the matter was further investigated it was found that this building, which was 150 feet long by 32 feet wide, would require to stand on a heavier foundation than the other buildings. That is the explanation of the increased cost.

Mr. BLAIN. How much money was spent last year on plumbing?

Mr. HYMAN. I read out in detail the whole of the expenditures for last year.

Mr. BLAIN. Last year the Hon. Mr. Sutherland, Minister of Public Works, said, speaking on this item:

> This is an addition to the vote of last year. Of that vote $1,058 was expended.
>
> Mr. LENNOX. This will complete the work?
>
> Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes, according to the estimates submitted by the Department of Agriculture.

Last year the minister asked for $12,000 to be voted and stated to the committee that it would complete the work. That is only a few months ago. Now, the hon. gentleman comes forward and, in a case where $8,000 was asked for last year to complete the work, he asks for $6,000 more. It is not to be wondered at that the representatives from Quebec are anxious to know when this work will be finally completed. My hon. friend will remember that for this plumbing he has mentioned this evening, about the same amounts were voted last year, with which he promised to complete the plumbing. One would imagine there were extensive buildings going up there every year. Preparation of the plans and specifications on which the estimates are based, would seem to show some recklessness in the department somewhere.

Mr. HYMAN. I see the point the hon. gentleman is trying to make. Last year the Minister of Public Works made certain statements to the effect that the vote he asked for would complete the plumbing, and it did not complete it. He had an estimate given by the architect of the department, which it was supposed would complete. But it does not follow that the amount voted last year would complete for this year. As I stated, there were old buildings which naturally require renewal and repairs. This is a very necessary work, at any moment we are liable to have 1,000 or 2,000 people landed on that island.

Mr. BLAIN. It is quite true that I am not acquainted with that island, but when the minister comes forward and makes a statement that $8,000 is to be expended for headquarters for sailors, and promises that it will complete the work, and then comes forward the next year and asks for $6,000 more, and without explaining the reason—

Mr. HYMAN. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not wish to be unfair. He asked me for explanations and I gave them.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not wish to misrepresent the hon. gentleman, but I ask him to be more careful in the preparation of his estimates. The committee does not wish to hold him down to exactly $8,000, we would not complain if he exceeded it by a few hundred or a thousand, but when he asks for $6,000 more, almost as much again, it does look either as if his officers were reckless

in the preparation of the estimates or as if the minister was not very careful in making statements before the committee. The committee is quite willing to vote the necessary money, so far as we are concerned, but we are anxious that the hon. gentleman should be more careful in preparing his estimates.

Mr. BERGERON. Were these amounts spent by day work ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. I see here a certain amount for electric lighting, Ahearn & Soper, Ottawa. Isn't that going far from Quebec for such things?

Mr. HYMAN. Some of these articles come from the United States.

Mr. BERGERON. They can be got in Quebec. I see also an item for wheelbarrows from Frost & Wood in the province of Ontario.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They have an agency in Quebec.

Mr. BERGERON. What county is that in?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Montmagny.

Mr. BERGERON. I see that they have been repairing some steamers there.

Mr. HYMAN. Yes ; we repair the 'Challenger' there every year.

Mr. BERGERON. That is one of the expenses in connection with that place ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Lachute public building, $10,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Will my hon. friend give us some explanation about this ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is a vote for the purpose of erecting a public building in Lachute, in the county of Argenteuil. The site has not been procured for the building yet, but it is intended to procure a site at an early date. There are some negotiations going on in regard to several sites. We are trying to get options on two or three sites.

Mr. BLAIN. How much are the site and building expected to cost ?

Mr. HYMAN. I cannot give the information in regard to the site. In a town of any size a difference of thirty or forty feet will make a difference of at least a thousand dollars in the cost of a site. We always try to meet the wishes of the inhabitants of towns and cities, and I do not know what we may have to do in this case. We will buy the best site available for the building.

Mr. BLAIN. Will this amount complete the work ?

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Mr. BLAIN. How much will it cost for the purchase of the site and the erection and equipment of the building ready for occupation ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have endeavoured to explain to the hon. gentleman that I cannot venture any prediction or estimate as to the cost of the site. I want to be perfectly frank with the committee, and I want to be left to exercise some judgment in regard to where the site ought to be. Therefore, it is impossible for me to give any estimate in reference to the site.

Mr. BLAIN. Have you no estimate in regard to the building ?

Mr. HYMAN. I expect to be able to put up a building there for about $13,000. I might explain that we have made careful estimates of several classes of buildings, which we designate in the department as A, B, C and D ; and when a public building is to be erected, I simply say that we will put up building A, B, C or D, as the case may be. It depends, of course, on the locality in which the building is to be erected as to the cost. The same building in one locality will cost $2,000 or $3,000 more than in another locality. I propose to put up what we call building B in Lachute.

Mr. KEMP. When is it intended to commence the work ?

Mr. HYMAN. Just as soon as we can get a site. It is intended to advertise for tenders immediately.

Levis public building, $30,000

Mr. MORIN. Is this building under contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. The building is under contract.

Mr. MORIN. Who has the contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. Mr. J. Couture, of Lévis.

Mr. MORIN. Have you bought the site ?

Mr. HYMAN. By some arrangement with the Railway Department we have acquired a site for this building.

Mr. MORIN. What will be the size of the building ?

Mr. HYMAN. 64 by 45 feet ; two and a half stories, with an annex 34 by 30 feet ; pressed brick on a stone foundation.

Mr. BERGERON. I suppose this will be the ordinary building to accommodate the post office, customs and inland revenue ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is to cover all the departmental wants of the town.

Mr. BLAIN. What will the total cost of this building be when it is finished ?

Mr. HYMAN. The contract for the building is $22,000 ; heating, $2,500 ; and electric wiring and fixtures, $1,500. The furniture and fittings will depend upon the number of letter boxes that may be decided on

after the building is completed. We have to ask the Post Office Department as to the number of boxes they will require, and for that we have figured $4,000 or $4,500. For sidewalks, if it is found that there is any necessity for replacing sidewalks, we estimate $500, and, with contingencies, it is figured that the building will cost $33,000 or $34,000.

Mr. MORIN. Was the building let by tender ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, the work was let by tender, and the contract was given to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. MORIN. When is it to be completed?

Mr. HYMAN. On the 30th October, 1906.

Mr. BLAIN. How much did the site cost?

Mr. HYMAN. I have just explained that the site cost nothing. It came from the Railway Department.

Mr. BLAIN. Government land ?

Mr. HYMAN. Intercolonial Railway land.

Longueuil public building, $11,000.

Mr. MONK. What class of building is this—A, B or C ? This distinction, which the hon. minister made a few moments ago, is the first one I have ever heard in connection with this policy of erecting public buildings.

Mr. HYMAN. This building has been under contract for some time, and this amount is to complete it.

Mr. MONK. This new classification of buildings has not been discussed or mentioned in this House before. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether he has plans, details and specifications of each of these four classes of buildings, because if he has made a classification of this kind, it would simplify our work a great deal if he would place on the table plans, details and specifications of each of these four classes of buildings. Then all we would want to know would be as to whether such and such a class of building had been adopted.

Mr. HYMAN. Notwithstanding the fact that the Department of Public Works may put up a building which we term A in a certain locality for a certain sum, we may not be able to put up the same building at another point for the same sum, but we adhere to the cost of the building as nearly as possible. In erecting the same building in two different localities we have found a difference of $3,000 in the cost of a $20,000 building. It depends on wages, the question of the availability of stone, the cost of brick and other local considerations. Within a distance of a hundred miles there may be a difference of between 10 and 15 per cent in the cost of the building. I understand the desire of the committee to be to as nearly as possible, arrive at what the department expects to spend on a particular work. I have endeavoured to reach a standard, and it is as close a standard as I have been able to get.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the cost of each of these classes of buildings—A, B, C and D ?

Mr. HYMAN. Building A would be a small building which we would put up where there is nothing but a very small post office.

Mr. BERGERON. B ?

Mr. HYMAN. B would be a building where the accommodation would be somewhat greater, and C where there would be a customs house in addition to post office. In addition to that, we have to consider the question whether we have a Public Works office in the town or not.

Magog public building, $10,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that completed ?

Mr. HYMAN. No, it is not begun yet.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister give us an explanation of this?

Mr. HYMAN. This is a vote of $10,000 towards the completion of a public building at Magog.

Mr. BERGERON. I understood it was not commenced?

Mr. HYMAN. Neither is it. The $10,000 is a vote for the completion of the building.

Mr. BERGERON. What does the site cost?

Mr. HYMAN. We have not bought a site yet but we are negotiating at the present time.

Mr. BERGERON. What class of building is this?

Mr. HYMAN. The postal revenue at Magog is $2,527, and the customs revenue is $3,609. The population is 3,516. The building we expect will cost $21,500 to complete. It is a building with a stone foundation with a brick superstructure.

Mr. BERGERON. Who has devised that kind of building? I have remarked it in many places. It is stone for the first story and brick above.

Mr. HYMAN. Not always.

Mr. BERGERON. I may say that it makes a very bad appearance. I do not know who has invented that building or why it was decided to make these buildings in that way.

Mr. HYMAN. I am sorry we have offended the artistic eye of my hon. friend, but I have always understood that the public buildings put up not only by this government but by the late government under the

present chief architect and his predecessors compared, as a whole, very favourably with the buildings of the larger corporations. I do not think the committee would desire to put up a building costing $20,000 with a brick foundation. I think the extra cost is warranted by the longer life of the building and the lower expense for repairs.

Mr. BERGERON. We will come later to some buildings which I want to discuss. I think that this class of building is an eyesore in some cases and I do not think it would cost more to make the buildings all nice brick or stone. I must say that the buildings which have been put up by this government are not at all to be compared with those erected by the late government. I do not know if they cost as much. Take for example the public building at Sorel, which is really a very nice building.

Mr. HYMAN. It is an all stone building.

Mr. BERGERON. That is what I am saying; I do not think it costs much more and it looks a great deal nicer than the new ones.

Mr. BLAIN. This I understand is in Stanstead county. The first knowledge we had of this was an item of $5,000 asked by the Minister of Public Works to put up a public building at Magog. The minister said that the building would cost $12,000 but now the acting minister comes forward and says it will cost $21,000.

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Mr. BLAIN. What does my hon. friend say?

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman says it will cost that amount. I said that the estimate of the department of the cost of the building is that amount but in addition to that there are the boxes, the fittings and the heating.

Mr. MONK. The peculiar feature of this is that generally there is a vote for a public building a year before an election in a constituency, and then nothing is done. Parliament votes $10,000, as in this instance, for the immediate construction of a building, but nothing is done, the election takes place there is a terrible scuffle about the site and the whole thing is put off from year to year.

Mr. HYMAN. Of necessity the votes we are asking now were asked last year. Every vote, practically, in the estimates is a vote that was initiated last year except for buildings that have been running more than one year.

Mr. BLAIN. I misunderstood the hon. gentleman then. I understood him to say that the total cost of the building and site would be about $21,000.

Mr. HYMAN. I have said that $21,000 is the estimate of the cost of the building. I have said that when the site is not purchased it is impossible to put any estimate on it as a few feet difference in the position of the site makes a difference in its cost. I estimated that the building would cost about $14,000 that is, for the contract itself; the heating would cost $2,500 and if there is any wiring to be done it will cost $500. and the fittings are estimated to cost $2,500. We will have to get from the Post Office Department the number of boxes that will be necessary. Renewals of sidewalks, &c., may cost $500 and contingencies $1,500, making a total of $21,500.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend says $21,500. The first statement by the minister (Mr. J. Sutherland) was $12,000 and at another place he says $25,000.

Mr. HYMAN. I am cutting it down.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend is getting economical but he has not bought the lot, I notice. I wish the minister would be a little more careful in the statements he makes to the committee.

Mr. HYMAN. What statement does my hon. friend object to?

Mr. BLAIN. I am not objecting to the statements the hon. gentleman himself makes, but I suppose he is responsible for the statements made by the minister (Mr. J. Sutherland). In the selection of a site I suppose that, as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier suggests, the members are perhaps consulted.

Mr. HYMAN. Why not?

Mr. BLAIN. Because the hon. gentleman does not consult the members on this side, and he is supposed to be non-political in the expenditure of public money.

Mr. HYMAN. I should be glad indeed to consult the members.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps he might explain whether it is the 'A,' 'B' or 'C' building that will be erected in constituencies represented by hon. members on this side of the House.

Mr. MONK. I would like to have a 'B' building.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood the minister (Mr. J. Sutherland) to say that it was supposed $500 or $1,000 would be paid for the site. What I find fault with is that we do not have the same statements in successive years. We have a variety of Minister of Public Works and each minister has a different statement.

Mr. HYMAN. And we are getting worse all the time.

Mr. INGRAM. One minister makes a statement on which his estimate is passed and the gentleman who succeeds him enlarges a little on that. That has been the general history of the Department of Public

Works. In the general elections the candidates assist the ministers in promising their constituents public buildings. They generally have a promise of a post office or public building on which they ask support; occasionally they have a private letter in their pockets which they show to their friends privately, but they have not the courage to produce the letter publicly so that their opponents could get a chance to see whether the Minister of Public Works takes a hand in promising these buildings. I think it is high time that this sort of thing should stop; let us fight these matters on fair grounds. If a public building is really necessary in any place I am sure the opposition will assist in passing estimates for all reasonable expenditure, but it is like striking below the belt when government supporters have these private letters in their pockets and endeavour to make votes in that way.

Public building Montmagny, $10,000.

Mr. MORIN. Will the minister state what he proposes to do about this building?

Mr. HYMAN. I propose to put up a new one.

Mr. MORIN. Then you will throw the old building down. Remember that it has fallen down itself. How much money do you propose to spend on it?

Mr. HYMAN. I hope to be able to put up a building there at a cost of about $10,000.

Mr. MORIN. I do not wish to be hard on the minister or to prevent that building being erected; but I wish to tell him that there has been a regular farce about that building for the last six years. In the first place, there was a building there, and our friend Choquette took a friend there, and he got the government to buy that building for $7,000. To hear him talking in the House, you would suppose that it was a first-class building; but the postmaster was in it for only about a year and a half when the whole thing went down on his back. The foundations were no good, and the building went down three or four years ago, and every year since there has been $5,000 or $6,000 asked for a new building. How soon will you put it up?

Mr. HYMAN. We are going to put up a new one.

Mr. MORIN. Will you have a good foundation?

Mr. HYMAN. I promise the hon. gentleman that we will try to have a good foundation. I understand that the other was a little shy of foundation.

Mr. MORIN. Ask the postmaster how shy he was when he got caught. It was very lucky for Mr. Choquette that he was not there.

Mr. HYMAN. I will see that the foundation shall have the particular care of the department.

Mr. MORIN. The ground there is very soft, and you should go deep enough and put up a good building; and after you have it built, do not ask us for any more money. Ask enough now.

Montreal barracks for permanent corps, $20,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is that going to be built?

Mr. HYMAN. This vote is put in to enable the department to start the work. There has been no decision as to the location of the barracks, nor am I able to state at the present moment the exact size of the building.

Mr. BERGERON. Has the minister any idea of how much it will cost?

Mr. HYMAN. I am not able to state the exact amount. It depends on the number of men, the quarters and the character of the building. If I am pressed closely in regard to this vote, I must ask to let it stand.

Mr. BERGERON. I thought the minister had some idea of the cost, because this has been spoken of in Montreal for about eighteen months. I may say that I do not see any politics in this at all. The building is very much wanted. I understand that there has been some correspondence between the city council or the authorities of Montreal and the Department of Militia and Defence. Perhaps the Minister of Marine and Fisheries can enlighten the House on this subject. I imagine that as soon as the site is chosen the work will be commenced; for I do not suppose the government have put the amount in the estimates simply to make people believe that they intend to do so.

Mr. HYMAN. May I suggest that possibly it will meet the views of the hon. gentleman to allow the vote to pass, with the understanding that at any time when the estimates of the Minister of Militia are up the information may be asked from him.

Mr. MONK. I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may be able to give us some information on this matter, which is one of considerable interest in Montreal. I understand that under the agreement the city of Montreal is to furnish the site. For my part, I have no objection to the item passing, but I think we should have some explanation as to how far the negotiations have proceeded. One site suggested was behind the mountain and another east of the city.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am aware that ten years ago the city of Montreal voted $25,000 towards the erection of this military

school building. The matter has been in abeyance since. The military authorities have represented that it is necessary to go on with the enterprise, and last year, before the elections, it was about concluded that the school would be placed at Point aux Trembles where the shooting grounds are. Later it was represented that the site was not near enough to the city of Montreal, and the negotiations were resumed. It was almost decided to choose a site in the east end near Lafontaine Park; but protests were made. No arrangement having been arrived at, the Department of Militia notified the city of Montreal that it would establish the school on Lafontaine Park, which belongs to the Dominion government; but I understand that the city of Montreal object very strongly to the school being established there, and is trying to secure a site elsewhere. The city has been trying to secure some land on Montreal park, partly on the Brunet estate and partly on property that belongs to the city. That site was objected to, however, and I understand that the city is at the present moment negotiating with regard to three or four other sites which the Department of Militia will have to consider. I am not aware that any particular site has been chosen apart from the notification given by the Department of Militia to the city of Montreal that if they could not secure another site, they would have to erect the school on Lafontaine Park.

Montreal examining warehouse, $20,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is mainly for elevators. There are six, and this is to complete the work.

Montreal inland revenue building—additions, repairs, &c., $50,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Where are you going to put that building?

Mr. HYMAN. As hon. gentlemen from Montreal who are acquainted with the present building know, it is a very old one, and understand the city has offered, if the department will extend it, to transfer to the department a small piece of ground now used as a park. I am unable to give the committee even an approximate estimate of what the building will cost. It will depend on the extent to which we can use the old building, which I understand has been built fifty or seventy-five years. In this case, I shall have to ask the committee to trust the department to incur no greater expenditure than will be necessary.

Mr. MONK. Has the government acquired the site which the city has promised—the Place Royale?

Mr. HYMAN. No, simply because the department has not been able to make up its mind as to the extent of the work it can undertake. I understand that the city is prepared to transfer the site, and this amount is appropriated with that understanding. For the reasons I have explained, the department has not started the negotiations. They do not know what the requirements will be.

Mr. MONK. I am told that the inland revenue building is entirely too small.

Mr. HYMAN. That is the reason for the vote.

Mr. MONK. But the enlargement cannot be effected for the amount of the vote. I cannot understand how it is that the department has not closed the matter of the site, because it has been pending for much more than a year? I understand that some of the neighbouring proprietors signed a petition against the site being deeded over to the government. That opposition was made, I think, over a year ago.

Mr. HYMAN. The first of this vote was only last session, and it was only then the department were in the position to negotiate.

Mr. AMES. Do I understand the minister to say that he has any authority for the statement that the city will provide the site?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not know that I am in a position to say that I have any authority in black and white, or that I am in possession of exact information. But I know that the question of the extension of this building came up, and it was intimated to me—I do not remember by whom—that if we desired to extend the building, the city of Montreal would give a site for that purpose.

Mr. COCHRANE. I have listened to this style of argument for a long while. In our part of the country we would not consider building until we knew where we were going to build. Yet, here we have the minister asking money for building after building, though he cannot tell us anything about the sites. We are simply voting this money blind. And, from what I know of human nature, I think the minister will find that, the announcement having been made that he intends to put up a building, he will hardly be able to secure the site except at exorbitant figures. I understand him to state that the city of Montreal will give the site if he will agree to enlarge the building, but when he is asked for particulars, he cannot tell us anything upon which he bases that statement; he cannot tell us where he got the information, or whether he got it at all. It seems to me absurd for the minister to ask us, as representatives of the people, to vote public money when he does not know anything about where that money is to be put. The excuse is made that the building is seventy-five years old. What difference does that make?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is too small.

Mr. COCHRANE. But it is no harder to enlarge a building one hundred years old

than it is to enlarge one five years old. The question is, not the age of the building, but whether it is in a good state of repair. I have no objection to vote money for proper public buildings in this great country of ours, but I think we ought to know from the minister what the cost is to be, and not have further repetitions of what we have seen here—the minister asking for a few thousand dollars and, before the building is completed, asking for three or four times what we were led to believe the total cost would be.

Mr. GALLERY. I am a member of the city council of Montreal, and I think application has been made by the department for the small piece of ground that has been referred to. Speaking as a member of the city council, and judging from what I have heard other members of that body say, I think they will not hesitate to give it in order to secure this fine improvement. I think my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) will back me up in what I say.

Mr. AMES. I do not wish to suggest for a moment that this vote is not needed. The building at present occupied by the department is a very old one, and should be exchanged for a modern building within the least possible delay. But the part I object to is the intimation on the part of the minister that the putting up of this building is conditional upon the site being provided by the city. We have voted this evening a great many appropriations for post offices and other public buildings throughout the Dominion, and in every case the site was deliberately purchased by the department. I do not think it quite fair to the city of Montreal to discriminate by saying that unless the city of Montreal provides the site this money will not be spent. The city council, I am sure, are prepared to enter into legitimate negotiations. I listened carefully to learn whether the minister had any authority on which to base his statement that the site was to be provided by the city. In regard to that statement, I have a letter from the acting city clerk of Montreal saying that he has looked up the matter of the proposed extension of the inland revenue building, and he does not find any resolution passed to furnish the land gratuitously. There are a number of matters pending to be arranged by negotiation between the city of Montreal and the government. These questions will probably be settled some day by an interview between the representatives of the city council and the various departments at Ottawa that are interested. I think it only fair to leave the city of Montreal in these negotiations free to offer the piece of land for this building. I desire to enter my protest against making this vote conditional on the city gratuitously providing a site. As the hon. member for St. Anne's (Mr. Gallery) said, I am sure the city will be ready to negotiate in a friendly spirit, but I do not think you are justified in making the enlargement of the inland revenue building conditional upon the city handing over to the government a piece of valuable property.

Mr. GALLERY. As a member of the city council of Montreal, I remember that three or four years ago the city council made application to the government for a piece of ground, and the government were so kind as to give that ground. I do not see why the city of Montreal should now object to give the government this ground, which is of no earthly use to the city, especially when the government is going to use it to put up a good building. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) will help me in the city council, especially as the government will spend probably $100,000 in putting up this building. The present building is an eyesore. I think the city will not object to giving this property as a site for a public building.

Mr. AMES. I would ask the minister if he would have any objection to striking out the words 'site for addition to be furnished by the city'? That is a discriminating proviso, and does not treat the city fairly. Strike this out, and the question of the site will be a matter of negotiation between the city and the government, and I am sure both will enter into it in a spirit of fairness. But the vote in its present form seems to say that if the city does not provide a site the building will not be constructed. That means that the consent of parliament is made conditional upon the decision of an outside and independent body.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Has my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) forgotten that the city of Montreal has received from this government already very valuable sites? There is the Champs de Mars, there is Logan's farm and Fletcher's field handed over to the city for nothing.

Mr. MONK. I understand that the properties referred to have not been deeded over, but leased to the city.

Mr. LEMIEUX. At a nominal rental of $1 a year.

Mr. MONK. But this is a question of handing over property absolutely. I go back to the point referred to by my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane). We are asked to vote an amount for an improvement which cannot be carried out unless the site is provided in some way or other, and, when we ask if the site is provided, the only information we have shows that no site has been secured. The building which the government has on the Place Royale is an eyesore. And the little strip of land adjoining the present building cannot be of much use to the city of Montreal. It cannot be of much use to anybody, so far as I can see, except the government. If the government secures that site and puts

up a building costing $100,000—I think it must spend that much before that work is ended—it seems to me the city of Montreal will get good value for what it has given.

Mr. GALLERY. I understood the minister to say that if the city would not give the site, no building would be put up.

Mr. HYMAN. I do not want to make it so strong as that.

Mr. GALLERY. I understood the minister at the beginning to say that.

Mr. MONK. That is what is meant by that condition.

Mr. GALLERY. I think the city of Montreal cannot afford to lose such a fine building as that. If the hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Ames) will help me here to-night, we ought to be good for this small piece of land.

Mr. BERGERON. We have to consider that this building must be in a certain place. It is at present near the custom house in the business centre, surrounded by wholesale stores and warehouses. If the city of Montreal gave a piece of land too far away, it could not be accepted, because the building has to be in the centre of the city. The present building is a small one, on a small square. There has been a tendency in Montreal the last few years, as the members of the city council know very well, to enlarge the squares.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It cannot be done at that place.

Mr. BERGERON. Unless it is all taken up, and even if it were all taken up, it would still be objectionable. My impression is that the only way to solve the question would be, if the foundations of the present building are not solid enough to support two or three stories—because we are having some skyscrapers now in Montreal—if the foundations are not strong enough, it would be better to take down the old building and put up another very high one where the present one stands. That is the only way that we can have the Inland Revenue offices in the most proper place in the city, and if we went anywhere else they would not be convenient for the public. It is of no use talking about getting a piece of land from the city; the government had better make up their minds immediately to put up a building which will be a credit to themselves and to the city.

Mr. AMES. I would like an answer from the minister whether he would object to striking out that clause in the estimate.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is clear from the estimate itself that the government has made up its mind to have a new building; but if there is to be an addition to the building the city will have to furnish the site. I know the site very well. The building is an eyesore, everybody admits that, it must be demolished and rebuilt, and it can be rebuilt five, six or ten stories high, as need may require. But if it is thought proper to enlarge the building, and the city of Montreal is not willing to give us the extra ground, then we will have to build on the same ground. The city must understand that if they want more accommodation they must furnish the site. The place which it is in contemplation to use for an extension of the building, is perfectly useless at the present moment; it is only a place where a lot of idle people congregate, there are no trees on it. So if the city does not think proper in its own interest to give a little piece of that ground in order to have a larger building, then we shall have to renew the building as it exists. There are many precedents for cities furnishing sites for public buildings. There is an item in the estimates for a military school at Three Rivers, the site to be furnished by the city. It rests with the city council of Montreal to say whether they will take interest enough in the city to furnish the land for a larger building.

Mr. AMES. I find it necessary in discussing this question to speak not only as a member of parliament, but as an alderman of the city of Montreal. As an alderman, I have been cognizant that certain negotiations have been going on with the government from time to time to settle a number of matters in dispute. We are anxious to secure certain favours from the government, we are anxious to secure certain privileges on St. Helen's Island, also on Lafontaine Park, also on the ancient burial ground on Papineau Avenue; we are anxious to secure these from the government. Now it is a matter more or less of barter, in which we have some things the government wants, and we are prepared to make reasonable exchanges with the government. We have this piece of property which the government desires in order to extend one of its necessary public buildings, we are probably prepared to grant that; but we want it to be considered as one of the commodities which we have in our barter and sale with the government. Now I want to point out that you are bringing to bear undue pressure on the city council to make them part with one of their assets, which is a valuable one when we come to the matter of settling up these difficulties with you, because you are in the position of saying that unless the city council gives you this land for nothing, the Inland Revenue Department shall continue in its present congested condition, and the citizens of Montreal shall continue to cry out, and you will say, It is not our fault, the city owns the land, and unless the city gives the land we cannot put up the building. You are therefore bringing pressure to bear upon the city council to part with one of its assets, which they are holding in view of making eventually a fair settlement with you of the various questions at issue. Further

than that, I think you are discriminating against us, because you are voting a sum of money, the expenditure of which depends upon concurrent legislation on the part of another body over which you have no control. Unless the city council practically ratifies your decision, why, the building cannot go up. I think therefore it would be far better to strike that line from the estimates and allow that matter to be dealt with in an amicable spirit along with the other questions which are at issue between the government and the city. I am sure you will find on the part of the citizens of Montreal no desire to get the last pound of flesh, no disposition to mete out Shylock treatment to the government. But we do not wish to part with one of our assets absolutely, aside from a settlement of other outstanding questions.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We are wasting a lot of valuable time in discussing this question. The item must pass in its present shape or not at all, because the committee has no authority to add anything to the item that is brought down, and it will add to the burdens of the country if you take that rider out, because it would add to the item the value of the site. If we pay for the site we add to the vote. You cannot do that constitutionally.

Mr. AMES. It is not a matter of payment for the site, it is a matter of exchange for the site.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman forgets the most important part of the whole question. If we get the site we will extend the building; if we do not get the site rather than pay for the site, we might possibly prefer to make the building higher. That is the gist of the whole question, and must be taken into consideration by the department.

Montreal military buildings—new stores building, $10,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is one of several military buildings that are being erected at the headquarters of the different military centres. There is one to be erected in Montreal, one in Winnipeg and one in London. They are for the purpose of storing military equipments of all kinds, and have nothing to do with armouries. At present, buildings are being rented for that purpose in certain places, and at large rents.

Mr. SPROULE. How many years has this item been in the estimates?

Mr. HYMAN. Only last year.

Mr. SPROULE. I object to that principle, as I did last year. To my mind it is a very bad principle for the government to follow. The government either require that money for expenditure or they do not; if they do not require it they should not have it. If it is not intended to expend it, but to keep it on the estimates dangling before the people, it is always available when elections come on, though it may never be used—I say that is an unsound principle. The government should not ask for anything they do not intend to spend.

Mr. BERGERON. Has anything been done to that building yet?

Mr. HYMAN. No. I think there are some negotiations going on with the permanent corps in Montreal. I have no objection to let the matter stand.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not know anything about it.

Mr. HYMAN. This item is for erecting a stone building in the city of Montreal for the purpose of receiving the militia stores. Ten thousand dollars was put in the estimates last year but we have been unable to obtain a site. We have not started negotiations for a site for the building. If the committee desire me I am satisfied to let it stand.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not objecting to the expenditure of the money. If the government desire to spend the money and are prepared to spend it, all right. I am not objecting to the item at all but I am objecting to the principle of voting money year after year for three or four years as we have been doing in this case and not a dollar of the money spent.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We are so economical. Why should you be pressing us to spend money?

Mr. SPROULE. I am not pressing you to spend money but I am objecting to the improper course of asking for money that you do not intend to spend. The government ought first to make up their minds that they intend to spend so much money on a public building, ask parliament for it and, if it is granted, expend it. But, if there is no definite object in view to have an item in the estimates dangling before the public it is wrong.

Mr. HYMAN. There is no doubt that would be wrong, but this item was put in the estimates only last year and it is being revoted now.

Mr. SPROULE. I asked if it were put in before last year and the answer was 'yes.'

Mr. HYMAN. No, the answer was not 'yes.'

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) to say 'yes.'

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I said that it was put in last year.

Mr. HYMAN. It was passed last year.

Mr. SPROULE. I can understand that you might pass over a single year without

expending the money, but we have many items that are voted two or three years when no expenditures are made.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This is in connection with the Montreal barracks, and no site has been chosen because this building is to be put near the barracks for the permanent force.

Mr. BERGERON. When the matter of the barracks is decided this will follow ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. HYMAN. Not necessarily. I would not like to say that.

Montreal post office—improvements, $25,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is for the purpose of improving the front of the Montreal post office and giving more accommodation. This vote is asked for by the Post Office Department for the extension of the front of the building to make more accommodation downstairs.

Mr. MONK. There is very serious ground of complaint as to the size of the post office.

Mr. HYMAN. This is for the purpose of extending it.

Mr. MONK. How can you extend it unless you add another story ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is a certain area between the front walk and the door which it is intended to take into the building, so that it may be used for post office purposes.

Mr. MONK. What is the plan of the building ?

Mr. HYMAN. The plan is not yet completed although nearly so.

Mr. BERGERON. And that will cost $5,000 ?

Mr. HYMAN. It will cost $25,000.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not understand without having seen the plan how you can make an enlargement of the building there?

Mr. HYMAN. There is an open vestibule in front of the building. It is intended to move the main wall out in front and include the open space which now forms the vestibule in the building so as to increase the accommodation.

Mr. BERGERON. It will be down on the steps then.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, there is a lot of space in front. There will be just double the floor space.

Mr. AMES. Can the hon. minister give us the additional floor space that will be created ?

Mr. HYMAN. The lobby at present is 85 x 15. It will give about 85 x 15 feet extra space.

Mr. BERGERON. This will be the proper time to find out whether there is going to be a new post office in the city of Montreal. Instead of spending $25,000 to do something which I think will not improve the appearance of the present building and which will not give much additional accommodation would it not be better to adopt the view which has prevailed in Montreal for a long time that a new post office should be erected in the eastern part of Montreal ? My hon. friend the Postmaster General will perhaps remember that the other night we had a very long talk about that. His answers to me showed that he was not very well posted because I had the honour to receive a note from him afterwards explaining that some of the answers were not quite correct. I want to remind you, Mr. Chairman, that there is nothing in these estimates for a new post office. The item for the new postal station has nothing to do with the question I am putting to the government as to whether a new post office building will be erected in the eastern part of Montreal. I stated the other night that there has long been talk of such a building in St. James division of Montreal. It has been very truly said that the present post office is entirely inadequate to the demands of the service in Montreal and we were led to understand in some little political meetings we had in St. James division during the last two or three years that such a building would be erected. I believe there was some correspondence between the government and the representative of St. James division (Mr. Gervais) to that effect, although, of course, he can speak more authoritatively on that subject than I can. This is the proper time to find out whether the government intend to have such a building erected in the eastern part of Montreal, either in St. James, or in St. Mary's division, or anywhere in the eastern part of Montreal.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) takes exception to the accommodation furnished by the present building on St. James Street, Montreal. It is quite true that the building to-day is not adequate to the demands upon it owing to the growth and prosperity of the city and to the increased volume of mail matter, but the congestion at the central office will be relieved and entirely done away with when we carry out the policy we have in view of erecting a postal station near the Bonaventure station and enlarging the vestibule of the present building on St. James street. My hon. friend, if he has a plan of that building in his mind, will remember that when you seek to enter the building you first of all ascend a flight of stairs and then there is a space

between the street line and the entrance of the building of perhaps 12 or 15 feet.

Mr. BERGERON. Ten feet, I think.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I cannot say how many, but it is quite a substantial space. It is proposed, I think, to include that space in the lobby ; that is the part of the post office which is available for the general public to enter there to transact postal business. When that improvement is made it will afford very great advantage and accommodation to the people. Then, when the Bonaventure postal station is established there will be a large amount of mail that comes in and leaves Montreal that will never pass through the main post office on St. James street at all. That will get the go-by. For example, newspapers and parcels will practically all be handled at the postal station opposite Bonaventure station. Moreover, a large quantity of the ordinary mail matter which comes in to be distributed throughout the city of Montreal, instead of being sent up to the main office to be there rehandled and sorted and given to the mail carriers, will be dealt with at the postal station, and from that point the letter-carriers will serve a considerable part of the district immediately around Bonaventure station. This will very greatly relieve the condition of affairs at the main post office.

Mr. BERGERON. Will that be a building ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It will, of course, be a building in which whatever post office work is transacted at any post office will be transacted.

Mr. BERGERON. What will be the size?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I could not say. I do not know if the lot has been secured, there has been some trouble. The minister says that the lot has been secured on Cathedral Street opposite the Grand Trunk station.

Mr. GALLERY. I may state that the lot has been secured, because I know that the owner has been paid for it.

Mr. LENNOX. I would ask the Postmaster General to explain the situation here. When this new postal station is established—which will, I understand, relieve to a large extent the central post office—and the contemplated improvements are made at an expenditure of $25,000, does the Postmaster General think that that will relieve the congestion for a number of years? I do not regard the expenditure of $25,000 as being very large in this connection at all, but still it would be a pity to expend that $25,000 to make improvements which might prove insufficient within a few years.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If it was only patchwork that was proposed such a proposition would be open to question, but today in the advanced and progressive post-office world—and we claim to be a part of that world—the old system of having a grand pile for post office work is being abandoned; instead of having all the work of distributing the mail matter concentrated at one point, the policy now is to have substations at different points and as a city grows to multiply your substations and to despatch the mail matter from the incoming trains to those substations for distribution to the district immediately around, and, of course, in like manner to collect out-going mail matter from different points and deliver it from the substations to the railways without its ever passing through the main post office. I have no doubt in the world that the day of large post offices, great architectural piles, is a thing of the past so far as Canada is concerned. This will be a good and wise expenditure, and if in time the progress of the city demands more postal accommodation, it would not be to the interest of the mail service to supply that accommodation by erecting a larger building in one spot, rather by erecting substations throughout the city.

Mr. LENNOX. I have had the advantage of hearing the Postmaster General before dealing with this question of decentralization. I quite approve of it and I thought that when the Postmaster General began he was going to answer the question I asked, but, unfortunately, like many hon. gentlemen he has mystified himself in a multitude of words and has not answered the question which I asked ; he has not done what I think he intended to do when he got up. I asked the Postmaster General to tell the committee whether, when that expenditure of $25,000 is made upon the central post office in Montreal, having regard to the fact that there is a policy of decentralization, and that another substation is to be established to relieve the congestion, we would have all that Montreal would require at that particular point for several years to come or whether this small addition to the Montreal central post office would be found adequate only for a short season of time. I was not talking about 'great monumental piles' or anything elaborate. I was speaking about what I understand the city of Montreal as a great commercial centre would require. I want to know from the Postmaster General, and I think we should know that distinctly, is this to be a wise expenditure in this sense that it will meet the requirements of Montreal at that point for some years to come ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think it will.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not share the opinion of the Postmaster General on this point. I really believe it would be a great deal better not to vote $25,000 for that purpose. In view of what the Postmaster General said before about the policy of decentralizing post offices, I would think it would

be better to spend a little more in different parts of the city. We are going to build a station near the Bonaventure railway station, I understand from the Postmaster General, and I think that is a very good idea; I believe it will be money well spent. We have many railway stations in Montreal. Montreal is a terminal. We have not one railway that goes through Montreal, properly speaking. If we are to have one station at Bonaventure which will serve both Windsor station, the terminus of the C.P.R. and Bonaventure station, the terminus of the G.T.R. and the I.C.R., why not have one post office station at the Place Viger station in the eastern portion of the city of Montreal. When I speak of the eastern portion I am not speaking of that part of Montreal in a particular way. I join with my hon. friend in his idea of enlarging the facilities for the distributing of mail in Montreal, but we are here going to spend $25,000 that in my mind will not be well spent. I am afraid we are going to disfigure the present post office, which is a handsome building, and it will not attain the results the minister hopes to obtain.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. What do you mean?

Mr. BERGERON. Because it will not give you increased room commensurate with the amount of money you will spend on it, and if you would only spend a little more and put a substation near the Place Viger station you would have three distributing centres, the central office and the two railway stations at the two ends of Montreal. I believe that was the idea the hon. member for East Simcoe had in his mind when he put that famous question to the Postmaster General.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If it were the case that this expenditure would not add to the accommodation furnished the public I would agree with what my hon. friend says, but the architect informs me at this moment that this expenditure will give a floor space available to the public of 2,000 feet, as against the present floor space of 1,200 feet. The present space available for the public is 80 feet by 15 feet, and my hon. friend can multiply and determine that amount himself.

Mr. BERGERON. It is no use multiplying: I do not believe the figures are correct.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I give the figures of the architect, who must know what he is talking about. The present space is 1,200 square feet and this will give 2,000 square feet.

Montreal post office—installation of pneumatic tube system for post office purposes, $55,000.

Mr. GERVAIS. Before this item is passed, I would like to make a few remarks. I would like to acquaint the House with this fact, that the condition of affairs in Montreal, as far as postal facilities in the constituency of St. James are concerned, has become unbearable. I represent the constituency of St. James, and in this electoral division you will find 43,000 inhabitants. Adjoining that constituency you find the electoral district of St. Mary and that of St. Louis, and if you add together the inhabitants of these three wards, you will find that they contain over 117,000 inhabitants. Do you know how much is spent each year for postal facilities in Montreal east? A few hundred dollars, for the maintenance of two little stamp-selling establishments, whereas in St. Antoine division, where there are just 47,000 inhabitants, $5,000 is spent annually for postal facilities. I think this is unfair treatment to the east of Montreal, and it cannot be suffered to continue. I know quite well that the Postmaster General of Canada, under section 36 of chapter 35 of the Revised Statutes, has to decide whether or not it would be useful to establish a sub post office in Montreal east; I know quite well also that it is the duty of the Minister of Public Works to build such a post office; and this is the reason I am bringing this question forward tonight; because I want to know, in the first place, from the hon. Postmaster General whether he has made up his mind that this is the proper time to give adequate postal facilities to the east of Montreal, and whether it is the intention of the Minister of Public Works to build a sub-post office there. You must bear in mind that the east of Montreal has built up a trade larger than that of Montreal west. On this point I refer the hon. Postmaster General to the letter which has been sent to him by Mr. Jones, the cashier of the Quebec Bank; I refer him also to the resolution which was unanimously adopted by the Montreal city council, recommending the erection of a sub-post office in the east of Montreal. I may say, too, that one may find there about one thousand wholesale and retail merchants. In St. James division one may find about eight banking houses. You will find either in or close to that constituency one branch of the Bank of Montreal, two branches of the Bank of Hochelaga, one branch of the Montreal City and District Savings Bank, one branch of the Quebec Bank, one branch of the Molsons Bank, and two branches of the Provincial Bank of Canada. I may remind the hon. Postmaster General that most of the newspapers in Montreal have recommended the expenditure. I may say too that it will be highly beneficial to the inhabitants of the eastern part of the city. Do you know that the business men of the east of Montreal have to take the street car or drive or walk one mile and a half to buy five or six stamps? We want in Montreal east the postal facilities which every good post office to-day affords to the people. We want a good sub-post office in which

money orders will be issued at which our letters will be received, from which our letters will be distributed, in which a savings bank business will be done, in which a letter may be insured, in which we shall be able to secure a service of late mailable matter, and from which we could enjoy a special delivery service. We want for the electors of St. James division, as well as those of St. Mary's and part of the St. Lawrence division, these postal facilities. We do not wish to suffer any longer the conditions of affairs which I have described. We want the government to spend in the east of Montreal at least as much as it is spending in Montreal west. I am not complaining of the favours which have been shown to the good people of St. Antoine.

Mr. AMES. St. Anne's.

Mr. GERVAIS. No. You have two post offices on St. Catharines street, one near Metcalfe street, and one near Mountain street. For the building of these post offices over $10,000 was spent last year. This government is spending in that constituency over $5,000 yearly. I believe in the expenditure of money for the establishment of good postal facilities. I am satisfied with the expenditure which has been incurred by the government for the establishment of sub-post offices in the division of St. Antoine; but, on the other hand, I want equally adequate treatment for the constituency which I represent. This is the reason why I ask the government to build a sub-post office in St. James division, on St. Catherines street, and to connect it with the central post office by means of the pneumatic tube system which is referred to in the item under discussion.

M. CAMILLE PICHE (St. Mary's, Montreal). (Translation). Before the hon. Postmaster General makes the statements which my hon. friend from St. James (Mr. Gervais) may reasonably expect from him, I think it is incumbent on me to join hands with my hon. colleague and to raise my voice in support of the just claims of the east end. It cannot be gainsaid that this very important part of the metropolis is not provided with adequate postal facilities under present conditions, and I entirely agree with what has just been said in this connection. However, I would not give to my few remarks the aggressive tone which my hon. friend seemed intent on giving to his, as I have no complaint to make regarding what has been done for the west end. In fact, the improvements which have been enacted there are of recent date, and it would not be fair, to my mind, to suppose that the government do not intend effecting similar improvements in the east end. As regards the remarks made by my hon. friend from St. James (Mr. Gervais), I am not ready to follow him when he brings forward the name of my electoral division to strengthen his contentions regarding the necessity of putting up a building in St. James division and in St. James division only. I think the east end is entitled to such expenditure as the public service requires. I am inclined to believe that the government is very favourable to this view owing to representations which I have made personally and others which have been forwarded by numerous electors and especially through a petition bearing a great many signatures of electors in my division, business men, bank managers, &c. In order that the favourable disposition of the hon. Postmaser General may not be doubtful for any one, I am pleased to state—and in passing that may also restore the confidence of my hon. friend from St. James—that this very day I have received from the hon. minister a letter stating that he will be glad to discuss that important question with the parties interested or their representatives. I await with confidence the explanations which the hon. gentleman is to give on that subject, and I trust that he will not fail to listen attentively to any suggestions which will be made to him on behalf of the east end, which, I believe, is entitled to as much consideration as the west end of Montreal.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Mr. Chairman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. (Translation). Speak French.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend from St. James division (Mr. Gervais) addressed the committee in English, and I will respond to him in the same language. After that we will see. My hon. friend from St. James division, with proper pride, has announced to this House the growth and development of that great centre of commerce which has done him the honour of choosing him as its representative in this House. I appreciate extremely the zeal which he has manifested on behalf of his constituents, and I can take no exception whatever to the force with which he represents their interests in this House. However, if I may be permitted to debate the subject, he rests his demand for an additional building upon the fact that there are two in the west, on St. Catherines street. Perhaps that is hardly a reason that will commend itself to our hon. friends opposite at least. They might ask me to justify in each case the expenditure of public money by showing that it was serving a public purpose ; and I am sure that my hon. friend would expect that I should not ask for a building in one place simply because we had erected one elsewhere, but that in each case I should be able to defend the expenditure by showing that it was wise and in the public interest. With reference to St. James division, I would say, without promising anything whatever, that as my hon. friend is aware, the subject is engaging the consideration of the government. More than that, my hon. friend is aware that, with the

object of trying to inform myself better than I could by remaining in Ottawa, I went to Montreal to study the question; and my investigations there have not yet been completed. I hope to be able to reach a conclusion before a very long time; and if that conclusion should enable me to say to my colleagues in the government that I thought the erection of a substation or postal building in St. James division would be in the interest of the people there, if it were necessary or wise in order to improve their mail service, I would have great pleasure in making the necessary recommendation under the statute to which my hon. friend has referred. But I would ask him to be kind enough to let me have an opportunity, with his assistance, of visiting the place and studying with him the merits of the question, that I may reach a fair conclusion.

Mr. GERVAIS. Let me declare at once, Mr. Chairman, that I shall be entirely at the disposal of the Postmaster General for his visit to my district. If the hon. gentleman is ready to go next week, I shall be glad. I should like to have a decision reached by his department before the supplementary estimates are brought down.

Mr. PICHE. How about St. Mary's?

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation). Speak French.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. (Translation). Well, I shall make the same request to the hon. member from St. Mary's, that is to wait until I have the opportunity of visiting St. Mary's division with him.

Mr. BERGERON. Whereabouts is this new post office that is to be opposite the Bonaventure station?

Mr. HYMAN. The installation of pneumatic tubes will require the construction of a building, which building is to be on Cathedral street, immediately opposite the front of the station. The new postal station is to be on St. Catherine street west.

Mr. BERGERON. And where will the pneumatic station be on Cathedral street?

Mr. GALLERY. Between St. James street and Chaboillez square.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend from St. Anne's (Mr. Gallery) says that the land has been bought and paid for. From whom was it bought, and how much did it cost?

Mr. HYMAN. It was bought from Mrs. McGrory and Mrs. Myler, and the total cost was $37,000.

Mr. BERGERON. What are the dimensions of the property bought?

Mr. HYMAN. One lot is 130 feet 3 inches by 75 feet in depth, and has a superficial area of 9,769 square feet. The second lot is 98 feet by 33 feet.

Mr. BERGERON. That will run from the private property of the Grand Trunk Railway to Cathedral street?

Mr. GALLERY. Yes; it will go from Depot square to Cathedral street.

Mr. BERGERON. Who bought that property for the government?

Mr. HYMAN. Mr. U. H. Dandurand.

Mr. BERGERON. Was there any arbitration, or did he simply go and buy the property?

Mr. HYMAN. One parcel, that of Mrs. Myler, was bought from the court, and the other was bought by private sale.

Mr. BERGERON. How much did the part bought from the court cost?

Mr. HYMAN. It cost $12,000.

Mr. BERGERON. And the other cost how much?

Mr. HYMAN. It cost $25,000.

Mr. AMES. And on that Mr. Dandurand got 5 per cent?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes. The information on that subject was given the other day in answer to a question of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames).

Mr. AMES. Have tenders been called for the pneumatic tubes?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes.

Mr. AMES. I will save the time of the minister by taking certain information for granted and will ask for some that I want. In the installation of the pneumatic tube system, has it been deemed advisable to call for three tenders—the first for digging and filling the trenches——

Mr. HYMAN. That has not been considered—no tenders have been called for.

Mr. AMES. Have tenders been called for for laying the pipes and supplying the machinery at either end?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, that has been called for.

Mr. AMES. Have tenders been asked for the supply of the pipe?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes; tenders have been called for, and one has been accepted.

Mr. AMES. Will the hon. minister tell us where the plans were that contractors were expected to see in this matter.

Mr. HYMAN. In the post office building in Montreal. The usual methods were adopted—advertisement inserted in the

usual way calling for tenders and stating where the plans had been deposited.

Mr. AMES. Is the hon. gentleman sure that the plans and specifications were deposited in Montreal where they could be seen by Montreal contractors ?

Mr. HYMAN. I am advised that they were in the department here, and the advertisement so stated. In the case of voluminous plans, it is quite the custom for the department to have the plans here.

Mr. AMES. I understand that in the specification it was intimated that the contractor would have to see the machinery in operation somewhere in order to ascertain its nature. Where was it possible for a would-be contractor to see that machinery ?

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman asks me a good many technical questions. As I understand, the only place to see this machinery would be in England or in two or three of the large cities in the United States, where the system has been inaugurated.

Mr. AMES. I understand that the department did not supply working drawings, from which the contractor could see what was to be done ?

Mr. HYMAN. Oh, yes.

Mr. AMES. Plans of the machinery ?

Mr. HYMAN. The department furnished full plans and specifications on which a tender could be made. Of course, it was impossible to show the machinery in actual operation.

Mr. AMES. The point I am endeavouring to make is this. For work to be done in Montreal it was necessary for Montreal contractors to come to Ottawa or Toronto to see the plans, and then to go to Buffalo or some other American city to see the machinery in operation. Would it not have been possible to have suitable plans left in the city of Montreal where contractors desiring to bid might have studied them ?

Mr. HYMAN. If any Montreal contractor had desired to see the plans, he had only to drop a post card to the minister or deputy minister, and every facility would have been given him.

Mr. AMES. Was it not necessary for the would-be contractor to go to Buffalo ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. He could go to Buffalo or some other city.

Mr. HYMAN. The work was advertised fully. There was no desire to keep any Montreal contractor out of the work.

Mr. AMES. As a matter of fact, the method pursued did keep the Montreal contractors from tendering.

Mr. HYMAN. If any Montreal contractor was prevented from tendering by the conditions, it can hardly be said that he was pushing business very hard. All he had to do was to drop a line to the department to say that it was inconvenient for him to come to Ottawa.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister at first said that the plans and specifications were deposited in Montreal as usual.

Mr. HYMAN. I was so informed by the officer of the department.

Mr. LENNOX. In regard to the machinery, I think it would be a proper thing for the minister to have in future a working model of that kind of thing, which is new in Canada, so that parties wanting to contract would not have to go to the United States.

Quebec immigration buildings—new landing sheds on Point à Carcy breakwater, and additions and alterations to present buildings, including covered passage to those on Louise embankment, $45,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This vote is for the purpose of furnishing a suitable landing place on the embankment. The reason there was no expenditure last year was because the department were in consultation with large shippers, and were most desirable of selecting the best place for the landing station.

Quebec hospital for treatment of immigrants suffering from trachoma and kindred diseases, $10,000.

Mr. MONK. I notice we are building hospitals for the treatment of trachoma, one down in the maritime provinces this year, and we are also proposing a building in Montreal for the treatment of the same disease. Of course I am aware that a matter like this can only be exhaustibly treated when the estimates of the Department of the Interior are under consideration. But I wish to protest strongly against this expenditure. It is altogether the result of the careless policy we have adopted in regard to immigration. The spread of trachoma throughout Canada is so great as to constitute a national danger. If my hon. friend will inquire in Montreal from the specialists for eye diseases at the Royal Victoria hospital, he will find that that disease is now implanted in Canada. I have here the annual report of the Commissioner General of Immigration for the United States, for last year, and it points out, with details, how diseased persons are now entering the United States, and describes the measures that have been taken to prevent them from entering from Canada. During the year 1903, they refused, in all American ports, 1,700 immigrants affected with contagious diseases, of whom 1,400 came from Canada, and were therefore sent back into Canada. The number of diseased persons suffering from trachoma examined in Mont-

real and who must have remained in Canada, was over 400. There were 171 refused by the immigration inspector in Winnipeg who wanted to cross into the United States, but who had to remain in Canada. The matter is one of very great importance to this country, a matter of urgency.

Mr. HYMAN. If the hon. gentleman would pardon me for interrupting him—would it not be better to bring this matter up on the estimates of the Interior Department?

Mr. MONK. That is what I intend to do, but the urgency of the case is my excuse for mentioning it at present, because we are going to be involved in an immense expenditure for the treatment of immigrants who have arrived here affected with contagious diseases, and particularly trachoma. Another point to which I wish to call attention is this: I believe that at the present moment Mr. Preston is travelling in that part of Europe where this disease originates and where we get it from. I put a question upon the order paper the other day, and was informed that Mr. Preston is not in London, but we learn from newspaper despatches that at the present time he is in Austria, and is seeking to obtain immigrants in that part of Austria and Hungary where the disease is a national plague. If my information is correct, I think the government cannot too soon warn Mr. Preston against that kind of immigration. The matter is treated at length in this report of the American commissioner, who took the trouble to send over to Austria and make a special investigation to find out what were the conditions prevailing there in regard to trachoma. There are 60,000 people in that part of Europe anxious to come here, who are under government surveillance on account of this terrible disease. At the present moment the government, at large expenditure, is seeking to promote immigration from that country. The result is that we have to provide protection for these people when they arrive here, and we have to protect ourselves against a disease that was unknown here before this kind of immigration began. It is a matter deserving of the immediate attention of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. For the last few years this matter has been discussed in this House, and the government nearly always took the ground that little or no trachoma was imported. Now we are asking for money to build hospitals to treat those afflicted with it.

Sherbrooke drill hall, $10,000.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I would like to ask the minister what he thinks the building will cost, and when it will be ready for occupation?

Mr. HYMAN. I have not got the full information from the Militia Department of the requirements of this building. The dimensions are 224 feet by 115 feet. I have not got a memorandum from the Militia Department. The Militia Department, when it wants a building, sends to the Department of Public Works a memorandum of the floor space required, and the kind of structure. As I have not got the full requirements here, I am unable to answer the hon. gentleman's question.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I would like to ask if there are any reasons other than political why the drill shed is to be placed on the site that has been selected. There was a very good site offered to the Militia Department but which was not considered. I would like to know in what way the present site was selected, whether somebody was sent down to Sherbrooke who obtained the cadastral plans and merely shut his eyes and put his finger on a certain spot, or was there some other reason for the selection? I can tell the minster, and can give him the proof, that at a certain council meeting in the city of Sherbrooke a motion was made and seconded condemning this site as unhealthy. A part of this property consists of an old canal and an old clay pit which was left from a brick yard, and which is being gradually filled in with refuse from the upper part of the town and with sawdust from the mills. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can give me some idea how this particular site came to be selectel for this purpose. On whose recommendation was it selected?

Mr. HYMAN. Of course, the site was purchased before I had anything to do with the Department of Public Works, and I have no memorandum here as to the information upon which the department acted. The initial information upon which the department generally act of course comes from the Department of Militia. In the selection of these sites the Militia Department are consulted and then an officer of the Department of Public Works is sent to look into the question of cost, and if his report is favourable the site is purchased and paid for.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I suppose the hon. minister would not put up a handsome public building upon a site which was not a proper one even if it were recommended by the Department of Militia and Defence. I see that the first estimate for this drill shed was made at the same time as the appropriations were made for drill sheds at St. Hyacinthe and Three Rivers, but I see that in this short space of time these other two places have outstripped Sherbrooke and that there has been an expenditure in these places of $30,000 or $35,000.

Mr. HYMAN. That would not affect the question of the building. If we were making a contract we would ask for another sum in the supplementary estimates. Of

course this sum is available; we can go on and prepare the plans of the building and call for tenders.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. In making a few remarks about the site selected I do not condemn the part of the city in which the building is to be erected. We would be very glad to have the drill shed in any ward of the city. The question is not whether it is to be in one particular ward or in another. It is the site itself which is objectionable.

Mr. SPROULE. If the site is objectionable and no money has been spent surely this is a good time to remedy it.

Mr. HYMAN. There has been no money spent on the building but there has been money spent on the site. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Worthington) will allow the vote to pass I will be very glad to discuss it with him.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I should be very glad to have the hon. minister do so.

Mr. KEMP. Did the recommendation of the site come from the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence?

Mr. HYMAN. This matter has been discussed in the House before but this is not the initiation of the vote. If it were the initiation of the vote we would have prepared fuller particulars in regard to the matter.

Mr. KEMP. But the hon. gentleman was a member of the House at the time this was discussed and as he has his deputy here perhaps he will be able to answer that question.

Mr. TOBIN. I believe the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington) is aware that a majority of the citizens of Sherbrooke are in favour of the present site for the proposed drill shed.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. In reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tobin) I may say that if that is the view of the citizens of Sherbrooke I cannot understand why they sent two deputations to the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence objecting to the site. I may say in regard to the composition of these deputations that they were selected not entirely from military men but from men of both political complexions, and that they waited upon the hon. minister, and asked that this site be reconsidered and if possible changed. I am not objecting to the locality in which this drill shed is being built nor to the ward but to the particular site on which it is to be placed. It is an old disused brickyard and it is not a suitable site for a drill shed.

Mr. HYMAN. I notice in the memorandum which I have here that the council of Sherbrooke made a contribution to this site.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. The council made a contribution in this way that there was some exchange between the government and the council in regard to the old site.

Mr. HYMAN. They were accepting the new site. They were parties to the negotiations that took place between themselves and the department. The council that were in charge of the matter would be parties to the negotiation with the Department of Public Works in regard to the question and they accepted this site.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. They voted a certain amount for a drill shed site before the site was selected, not after.

Mr. HYMAN. But, there is no protest from them and being contributors they would naturally have an interest in the site.

Mr. TOBIN. My hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington) knows very well that the majority of the council are in favour of the present site and he is only giving expression to a kick that comes from a small portion of the citizens of Sherbrooke. I live within six miles of Sherbrooke, I am well acquainted with the citizens and I am sure that seventy-five per cent of the citizens are in favour of the present site. I have been informed by parties in Sherbrooke that eight-tenths of the council are in favour of the present site.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. In reply to the hon. gentleman I may say that quite a number of the citizens of Sherbrooke are in favour of the site that has been selected, but as I understand it, this drill shed is being built for the accommodation of the militia. It is not being built for the accommodation of the majority of the politicians to capture votes. It is being put there for drill purposes. There was a site offered to the Militia Department which is adjacent to and fronting the parade ground, the only available place for drill purposes in the city, and that is only distant from the rifle ranges about 600 yards and is reached by a ferry which was put on by, and at the expense of the militia. Then, a man is sent down from Ottawa with instructions to go to somebody there and select a site for the drill shed. This he did without even going to any of the militia men in Sherbrooke and it was done entirely at the instigation of the hon. Minister of Agriculture who does not deny it.

Mr. HYMAN. Possibly the hon. gentleman has in his mind some site in Sherbrooke that would be more suitable than the one which has been selected, and if so I will be very glad to take the matter into consideration. I am not aware of any protest having been filed by the council against the proposed site.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. The hon. gentleman is certainly aware of a protest having been filed by the militia. We are not building it for the council.

Mr. HYMAN. It is the citizens' money which is going into this building. I am perfectly willing to agree that to a large extent the militia authorities should be consulted. The militia authorities are consulted in the person of the hon. the Minister of Militia and through the department here, and I am quite willing to admit that the local military authorities should be consulted also. But, I am hardly prepared to say that the residents of Sherbrooke should not have something to say about it. They are citizen soldiers. In so far as the city of London is concerned I would not be prepared to say that the regiment for whom the drill shed is being provided should have the whole say as to where the site of that building should be. I do not think the hon. gentleman himself would take such a strong position as that.

Mr. KEMP. I am very glad that the hon. acting minister admits that the citizen soldiers of Sherbrooke should have something to say about the location of the drill shed. These men give their services to the country without compensation of any kind. It seems to me that for an officer to go down to Sherbrooke and select a site there without consulting the militia is not right. He did not even call on them as my hon. friend (Mr. Worthington) says. If no money has been spent on that site——

Mr. HYMAN. The site has been bought and paid for.

Mr. KEMP. If no money has been spent on the building it would be a generous act for the hon. minister to take this matter into consideration and thus relieve the deplorable situation caused by the hon. Minister of Agriculture in interfering with a matter entirely out of his department.

Mr. HYMAN. I shall be very glad to give the matter full consideration before the expenditure is made.

St. John's public building, $20,000.

Mr. BERGERON. What kind of a building is this ? Is it A, B or C ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is neither, it is a larger building.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the population of this town ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is a large town, the population is 4,000, the postal revenue $7,200 and the customs revenue $96,000. The lot has been purchased for $2,500 from Mrs. J. R. Boisvert.

Valleyfield public building, $12,000.

Mr. BERGERON. When will that be finished and how much will it cost ?

Mr. HYMAN. It will cost $42,000.

Mr. BERGERON. This was the case I had in mind particularly when I reminded my hon. friend (Mr. Hyman) of the practice of building these public buildings half of stone and half of brick. My hon. friend might have put up a very good stone building there that would not have cost any more, and that would have looked a great deal better.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. You are too extravagant altogether, too wasteful of public money.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend should not speak about extravagance.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. BERGERON. Oh, that will not do it. I want to say that my hon. friend has finished his estimates and is very happy.

Mr. HYMAN. Oh no, I am not.

Mr. BERGERON. We have not been criticising very much, except to do our duty. We have been reproached very often in the country with not having criticised large estimates. This government has spent three or four times as much as the late government spent, and it is the fault of my hon. friend's friends in the country that we are criticising the estimates as we now do. My hon. friend (Mr. Hyman) has been very kind and courteous in answering questions tonight and I wish to acknowledge his courtesy, because I know he has not been long in the department, and is not in the position to answer all the questions that may be put to him, as readily as if he were an old minister. All the criticism we can make will not change this amount, it is there and must go through. I am reminded of years gone by when we would sometimes spend whole nights discussing amounts of a great deal less than we voted to-night which was criticised by my hon. friend, and it shows that while the government may change, bad habits do not. We used to vote $35,000,000 to $40,000,000, and now we are asked to vote $60,000,000 or $75,000,000 and yet if we criticise any amount proposed for any county we are told immediately: You do not want that building to be put up there. If there is an election in that particular county then an opposition speaker is pointed to, as the man who had been trying to prevent the electors from having a public building. What is the inference to be drawn from that ? It looks as if hon. gentlemen opposite thought that by putting a building or a wharf or a breakwater here or there, they are in a position either to buy that county or to show it that by voting for their candidates it is likely to obtain favours. It is immoral, purely and simply immoral. It seems to me that we should put up public buildings where they

are absolutely necessary. I am not prepared to say that the old government did very well on that line; they might also have been carried away like the present government by the requests of their friends for public buildings, but when I look at all these estimates I think we were angels to hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. BUREAU. Where are the wings ?

Mr. BERGERON. We were good, and I would like the people in the country to hear me in order that they might see what an immense difference there is between those who sat here ten years ago in opposition and those who sit here in power now.

Some resolutions reported.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to inquire what business will be taken up to-morrow ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The Minister of Agriculture will proceed with the Bill respecting the census and statistics and perhaps, he may take up the Bill respecting seeds. When the Bills are disposed of we will then proceed with the estimates of the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 16, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

QUEBEC DRILL HALL.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. What amount was appropriated by parliament in 1904 for the extension of the drill hall at Quebec ?
2. What part of said amount has been expended in the purchase of land ?
3. To whom has the said amount been paid ?
4. What is the date of the payment ?
5. Before whom was the deed of acquisition received ?
6. Was there a regular proceeding in expropriation for the said acquisition ?
7. Who were the expropriation commissioners ?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. $30,000.
2. $20,000.
3. To Hon. P. A. Choquette, through Mr. C. E. Taschereau, agent of the Department of Justice.
4. December 3rd, 1904.
5, 6 & 7. Expropriation was made through notice issued by the Department of Justice, by virtue of 'The Expropriation Act.'

EMPLOYEES-INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Are C. C. Weldon, C. B. McDougall, R. S. Legère, M. C. Lockhart, M. L. Tracey, and N. L. Rand, in the employ of the Intercolonial Railway ? If so, in what capacity, respectively?
2. Is the Minister of Railways aware that these persons took an active part as political workers in the late federal campaign on behalf of Honourable H. R. Emmerson and Oliver J. Leblanc, Liberal candidates in Westmoreland and Kent in said contest ?
3. If the attention of the Minister has been called to the matter, will he take steps to have an investigation under oath into the conduct of these persons, if they are now in the employ of the Department of Railways ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Yes, namely : C. C. Weldon, clerk in Audit Office ; C. B. McDougall, clerk in Audit Office ; R. S. Legere, clerk in office of engineer of maintenance ; M. C. Lockhart, fuel inspector ; M. L. Tracey, inspector of car cleaning ; N. L. Rand, master mechanic.
2. The minister is not aware that the gentlemen named took an active part as political workers in the late federal campaign : one of the gentlemen named, Mr. C. B. McDougall, was absent from his duties on leave, and was not on the pay-roll of the Intercolonial Railway during the period named ; and, so far as the minister knows, the other gentlemen named attended strictly to the duties of their respective positions during the last federal campaign.
3. The attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals has not been called to the matter.

CANADIAN HERRING INDUSTRY.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. Has the government erected or contributed to the erection of a bait freezer establishment at Canso, N.S., upon property which is not owned by or vested in the Crown ?
2. If so, upon whose property has such bait freezer been erected ?
3. What amount has the government contributed or agreed to contribute, or what does it propose to contribute toward the establishment of such a bait freezer ?
4. Under what conditions or safeguards, if any, has such money been contributed ?
5. What amount has the government expended, or undertaken to expend, at Canso, in connection with the establishment of improved methods of curing herring or other fish ?
6. What has been accomplished in this regard during the past year ?
7. How many barrels have been cured, and what was the cost of the work ?
8. Was any steamer engaged by the government in this connection ?
9. How long was such steamer employed in such work, and at what cost ?

10. In what work was such steamer engaged after ceasing to be employed in connection with the herring industry ?

11. What is the name of the said steamer ?

12. Was the said steamer chartered to Messrs. A. N. Whitman & Company for any, and what period, and for what remuneration ?

13. What is the value of the said steamer, and by whom is it owned ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes.

2. Messrs. A. N. Whitman & Son.

3. One half the cost up to $25,000 and a bonus for the first three years of $4 per ton on bait frozen up to 500 tons.

4. The plant is to be operated under regulations sanctioned by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and a representative of the department at Ottawa shall be on the board of directors.

The paid-up capital of the company shall not be less than $60,000.

No mortgage shall be placed on the building or plant without the sanction of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Bait shall be sold to bank fishermen and boat fishermen at the current market rate, and Canadian boats and vessels shall be given a rebate of 10 per cent on the current market rate.

The freezer is to be operated to the fullest extent for at least fifteen years after the expiration of the bonus.

Failing the fulfilment of any of these conditions, the building and plant is to revert to His Majesty.

5. $13,807.35.

6. Information was obtained by the herring drifting operations respecting the movements and resorts of the herring schools offshore, which information has hitherto been very imperfect.

The superior quality of Canadian herring for curing purposes, after the Scottish methods, has been established beyond question.

New and highly remunerative markets have been practically opened by the sample shipments of Scotch cured herring from Canso, which were pronounced by New York buyers to be equal to the best Scotch or Norwegian herring.

Such widespread interest has been created amongst the herring fishermen all along our Atlantic shores that, by the continuation of the experiment for a longer period, a general and immediate improvement of Canadian cured herring is inevitable.

7. Forty barrels. Answered by No. 5.

8. Yes.

9. From June 3rd to November 23rd, $6,375.68.

10. It was arranged with Messrs. A. N. Whitman & Son to keep the vessel in readiness for use when needed.

11. Herring drifter No. 33.

12. No.

Mr. LEFURGEY.

13. $16,546.67. The Department of Marine and Fisheries.

IMMIGRATION IN 1904.

Mr. BARR—by Mr. Lewis—asked :

1. What number of immigrants arrived in the Dominion of Canada during the year 1904?

2. What number of children under 12 years of age arrived during the said year?

3. Were they examined by medical experts before leaving Europe ?

4. What was the amount, if any, paid for such examinations ?

5. Were the said immigrants examined by medical experts on arriving at our ports ?

6. What was the name of each examiner, and what was the amount paid each ?

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

1. Total immigration for calendar year 1904, 134,223.

2. Total number of children under twelve years of age from Europe, 17,056.

3. Yes.

4. Nothing paid by Dominion government.

5. Yes.

6. Dr. A. C. Hawkins, $1,201.51 ; Dr. W. L. Ellis, $1,800.02 ; Dr. A. Potvin, $1,019.75 ; Dr. J. C. Howe, $1,400 ; Dr. A. D. Stewart, $1,233.32.

DREDGING IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked :

1. How many dredges are employed in Prince Edward Island by the government of Canada? What are their names, and where are they now located ?

2. What harbours were dredged in that province during the season of 1904 ?

3. Is there a new dredge in course of construction for use in Prince Edward Island waters ? If so, where is it being built, and when will it be completed ?

4. Is the department in charge of these public works aware that the harbour of Crapaud is in a dangerous condition for navigation, by reason of the harbour channel being recently filled in with sand?

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. The dredge ' Prince Edward.'

2. Dredging was done at Belfast, Morell and Vernon River Bridge.

3. Yes, building by the Bertram Engine Works of Toronto, to be completed in July, 1905.

4. No report to that effect has reached this department.

PRESCOTT LIGHTHOUSE DEPOT.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What is the total area and the cadastral designation of the properties acquired by the government for the establishment of a Dominion lighthouse depot at Prescott.

2. What were the prices paid ?

3. Who were the vendors, and what were the commissions on the sale, and to whom paid ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. The department has acquired two properties at Prescott for the establishment of the Dominion Depot ; the first known as the Labatt property has an area of 3·35 acres ; that known as the Buckley lot, an area of ·16 of an acre. The Labatt property is described as part of lot 27 south side of King street in block 3 of the town of Prescott, 1⅝ acres, and water lot 1⅝ acres lying in front thereof, at one time forming part of the east half of township lot No. 4 in first concession of the township of Augusta in the county of Grenville. The Buckley lot is described as part of lot No. 27 on the south side of King street in block 3 of the town of Prescott.

2. For the Labatt property $26,500, and $1,000 for the Buckley lot.

3. For the Labatt property, John Labatt, London, and James Buckley of Prescott. Commission on sale of Labatt property 2½ per cent and $209. Expenses paid to George F. Thompson, Ottawa. No commission was paid re Buckley property.

GLENN ROSS POST OFFICE.

Mr. PORTER—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. How long had the post office at Glenn Ross, Ontario, been in existence before its abolition during last year ?

2. Why was this office abolished, instead of another postmaster being appointed on the resignation of the last incumbent of the office.

3. Is it the intention of the department to re-open or re-establish this office ? If so, when?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General) :

1. From the 1st December, 1882.

2. This office was closed owing to the fact that the postmaster resigned and almost immediately afterwards left the locality. The retiring postmaster expressed the opinion that nobody was willing to accept the office, and, as he pressed to be relieved at once, the inspector decided that he had no recourse but to close it.

3. The office was re-opened on the 1st November, 1904.

TORONTO METEOROLOGICAL BUILDING.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

Is it the intention of the government to bring down a vote for the erection of a new building for the meteorological service in Toronto ? If so, when ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The matter is under consideration.

WHARFAGE REPAIRS AT STE. FAMILLE.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. Did the government, or the Department of Public Works, or any other department of the government, send to or place at the disposal of one François-Xavier Gosselin, or any other person of the parish of Ste. Famille, Island of Orleans, a sum of money, during the course of the months of September, October and November last, for repairs to the wharf of the said parish ?

2. If so, what sum ?

3. Was the said sum spent and did the person to whom it was confided render an account thereof ?

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works). No such sum of money was placed in the hands of the party named, or any other person, but authority was given on the 12th October, 1904, to F. X. Gosselin, foreman of works on Ste. Famille wharf, to expend $500 on urgent repairs to the flooring of the old part of the wharf. Pay-lists and accounts have not yet been received, and consequently no money has been paid.

WHARFAGE DUES.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. Has the government received a request for the abolition of the wharfage dues on the wharf belonging to the government at St. Laurent, St. Jean, St. Francois, and Ste. Famille, Island of Orleans ?

2. If so, by whom was that request made, and what is the date thereof ?

3. Is it the intention of the government to abolish the wharfage dues in question ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. No, so far as the wharfs at St. Laurent and St. Jean, are concerned. The other wharfs are not under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

2. None, so far as the wharfs at St. Laurent and St. Jean are concerned.

3. No, so far as the wharfs at St. Laurent and St. Jean are concerned.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—PLANS.

Mr. BOYCE asked :

1. What plans, if any, showing the general location of the proposed line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, the termini, at the Pacific coast, Port Arthur, Fort William, and Winnipeg, and showing the physical features of the country through which said railway is to be constructed, have been prepared and deposited under section 122 (1) of the Consolidated Railway Act of Canada, 1903 ?

2. Has any application or applications been made to the Minister of Railways, under subsection 2 of said section, for approval of said plan or plans ?

3. If so, what are the dates of such applications, respectively ?

4. Have such plans, or any of them, been approved ? If so, which ?

5. Have any plans been rejected ? If so, which, and for what reasons ?

6. What is the reason for suspending approval of any such plans not yet approved ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. There are no plans of the general location deposited in the department, but plans of proposed termini at Fort William, Port Arthur and on the Pacific coast have been deposited in the department, but they have not been approved.
2. Yes.
3. Fort William, August 2nd, 1904. Port Arthur, August 16th and December 12th, 1904. Pacific coast, August 16th, 1904.
4. No.
5. No.
6. Because it would be premature to approve them.

EMPLOYMENT OF R. E. A. LEACH.

Mr. BOYCE asked :

1. Is R. E. A. Leach at present in the employ of the Canadian government at Winnipeg or elsewhere ?
2. If so, what position does he hold ; when was he appointed, and at what salary ?
3. What are his duties ?
4. Is he at present performing his duties in the employment of the government ?
5. Is the government aware that complaints have been made as to the unwarranted activity of Mr. Leach during the last parliamentary elections ?

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

1. Yes.
2. Inspector of Dominion Lands Agencies. Was appointed January 1, 1905, at $2,000 per annum.
3. He inspects the offices of the local agents of Dominion Lands, and supervises the Homestead Inspection service.
4. Yes.
5. No.

INQUIRIES FOR REPORTS AND RETURNS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask the Prime Minister when it is expected that we shall have the remainder of the Auditor General's Report ? If I remember rightly, under the terms of the statute it is required to be laid on the table of the House by the 31st of January if the House is then in session, and, if the House is not then in session, within seven days after the opening of the session. I understand that the work has been completed as far as the Auditor General is concerned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As my hon. friend knows, the time when the Auditor General's Report should have been on the table of the House has expired for some time. I understand that the report is completed, but I cannot to-day tell my hon. friend when it will be ready to be laid on the table. I have been told on Monday, but I cannot say for certain.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If it is not likely to come on Monday, perhaps the Prime Minister will give us the information to-morrow or on some early occasion as to the probable date.

Mr. SPROULE. The other day, when I asked in regard to the report of Mr. Justice Britton on the Yukon and the report of the Royal Commission to inquire into the employment of alien labour, I understood the First Minister to say that they were both down.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. Judge Britton's report is down, but I did not say anything about the other.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the other one ? I see that it is mentioned in the report of the Department of Labour, but although it is a long time since the commission was appointed, we have no report of it yet. The gentleman was appointed a judge since then and there ought to have been a report made to parliament about what he did.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I shall inquire and inform the hon. gentleman to-morrow.

THE RETURNING OFFICER, YUKON.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has my right hon. friend any further information regarding the matter I mentioned yesterday and the day before, namely the reasons which induced the returning officer in the Yukon to postpone so long the counting of the ballots ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall lay on the table the correspondence between the Secretary of State and the returning officer to-morrow.

MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is administering the Department of the Interior at present and when may we expect the minister ? There are certain matters of more or less importance to be brought up and which are waiting his return.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I had a report some time ago from the minister himself that he expected to be here on the 15th. I understand, however, that he will not be able to return for some time as the progress in his health, I am sorry to say, is not so rapid as was expected. In the meantime I shall be happy to give my hon. friend any information in my power.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND MAIL SERVICE

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY. Would the hon. the Postmaster General give us some information as to the condition of the mail service to and from Prince Edward Island at present ? There are only four boats available to cross each way, and the mails are piled up on either side to such an extent

that it is impossible to handle them. A great part of the mails have been transferred from the Straits to the steamer 'Minto' and will probably be lying on that boat until the end of March unless we get much milder weather than has prevailed this last month. The 'Minto' and the 'Stanley' have been tied up since the 24th of January and are likely to be tied up another month. I understand that the service at the Capes has not been such as should have been provided to meet an emergency of this kind. I have reliable information that in one case when there was a boat available in the boat house at the Capes, they had to telegraph to Ottawa for permission to get it out and and have it manned and it took three days before they could get an order from Ottawa. When the department are aware that the steamers are tied up, they should use every effort to have a sufficient force put on the other boats available to carry the mails across. The people on the Island have had no newspapers and very few letters since the 4th of the month. During the space of 16 days, there was only one mail. This is certainly a discreditable state of affairs and I call the attention of the hon. the Postmaster General to it.

Mr. LEWIS. As the government and its ministers should be as much interested in this matter as the people immediately concerned, I would suggest that the ice boat now in use between Montreal and Quebec should be put on this route between the mainland and Prince Edward Island.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). My hon. friend from West Huron is quite right in saying that the government are as much interested as any one could be in keeping open communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. The other day, I explained what the difficulties were, and I do not believe that Divine Providence has been any more gentle with us in the matter of storms since then. In fact I see in the press that the storms have been repeated especially in the maritime provinces, and the trains are being delayed in all directions. My hon. colleague the Minister of Railways has just handed me the following telegram :

Moncton, N.B., Feb. 16th, 1905.

D. Pottinger, Ottawa.

Another heavy snow storm with high north east wind commenced early this a.m., and extends all east of Bathurst. Number 34, one hour and a half late. Number 9 arrived St. John two hours late. Number 10 about three hours late, has two engines and plough. Mr. Jarvis reports quite useless to move any trains until storm abates. Numbers 1 and 25 will be held at Halifax until weather improves. A train of important freight for Halifax stuck on main line at Sandy Cove, engine ran to Wellington to report ; cars will have to remain where they are until relief train can be sent. Superintendent Campbell reports cancelled all trains west of Strait.

(Sgd.) T. EVANS.

My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island has drawn attention to an instance which occurred, but he did not give the name of the boat or the information which would enable me to inquire into it. I would ask him to give me such information as will enable me to inquire into the matter and see whether any of our officers were guilty of delay. I think it will be found on inquiry that everything human beings can do, has been done, and is being done to keep open the mail service.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I do not think that these boats which cross at the Cape have any particular names. They are simply small boats on runners, manned by seven or eight men. They are pushed across the ice until open water is reached when they are propelled by oar.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Will my hon. friend give me the dates ?

Mr. LEFURGEY. I have not got them just now, but this is not a new matter. It is the same old story of unreadiness on the part of the department to meet the emergencies of winter, and I am very sorry to have to bring it to the attention of the government every session. In fact the government seem to suffer from an apparent lethargy in this matter and are unable to grapple with the situation. I cannot recall any particular date, but I have reliable information that these delays have occurred and are still occurring. I call the attention of the government to the fact now, and on another occasion I hope to address the House more fully on the subject.

OBSTRUCTIONS AT CHATEAU RICHER.

Mr. MORIN. When may I expect an answer to the motion I made on the 23rd January last, regarding the removal of rocks and boulders in the parish of Chateau Richer below Quebec ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall take a note of it.

Mr. MORIN. How am I to get an answer, Mr. Speaker ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understood my hon. friend (Mr. Morin) to ask concerning the removal of rocks from Chateau Richer. I will try to get an answer as soon as possible.

Mr. MORIN. And how soon will that be ?

SALES OF NORTHWEST LANDS.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask my right hon. friend to request the officers of the Interior Department to hasten the return of lots sold in the Northwest ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall be happy to do so.

INSPECTION AND SALE OF SEEDS.

House in committee on Bill (No. 7) respecting the Inspection and Sale of Seeds.—Mr. Fisher.

On section 3,—seeds to be free from seeds of certain weeds; seller's name and address on package; exception :

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford). I had hoped that the minister would make some report of his consideration of this clause since our last debate upon the Bill. Before entering again upon the discussion of this clause, I desire to call the attention of the House to a statement that appeared in one of our leading newspapers with regard to what I said of this clause on that occasion. I refer to a statement that appeared in the Toronto 'Globe' of February 1, representing me as saying that I desired the farmers of my district to be brought under the operation of the Act. I wish to state that that is a gross misrepresentation of what I said. I asked for no special favours for the farmers of my district, nor did I ask that any restrictions should be placed upon the farmers of my district that were not equally placed upon the farmers of the whole Dominion. This was a very unfair and a gross misrepresentation of the remarks I made on that occasion. I was discussing the Bill with the desire of making it as perfect as possible, and was offering the minister the suggestions I had to make as one engaged in the business. I was not considering how it might affect my district when the next vote came on, but addressed myself to the question simply with a view to making practical and useful suggestions. I think it is not right that such misrepresentations should be made.

I do not take back anything I said on that occasion, in spite of the misrepresentations. Since the last debate on the Bill, a large deputation waited on the Minister of Agriculture; and I think he will agree with me that it carried weight. There were practical men there who have spent their lives in the study of this great question. There were men there with technical knowledge such as few of those on the floor of this House or either side possess. These men gave their best energies for two hours and a half to lay before the minister the points on which they thought this Bill would conflict with the best interests of trade and agriculture. The minister knows what took place on that occasion, so it is unnecessary to advise him. I wish to say here, what appeared very evident on that occasion, that the Bill, if it has a principle at all is the supply of seeds of purity to the farmers and growers of the country. But, having declared that principle, the Bill proceeds at once to throw down the fence it has raised. The Bill hedges the trade about with restrictions—they shall only sell seeds of purity—and then, in a later clause it throws the whole thing open so that every grower and every farmer may sell these seeds to his neighbours irrespective of any law. I took issue with that on the occasion of the last debate, and I stand by that still. If our object is to assert the principle of pure seed, it is absurd to make such a distinction in the selling of seeds that what will be a criminal act on the part of one man will be perfectly justifiable on the part of another. Not only is this a violation of the principle laid down in the Bill, but it is class legislation that, in my opinion, this country is not prepared for. I say there are many very good reasons why this clause should apply to the grower. I would like the minister to state here to-day why a dealer might not be a grower also; and if I, as a dealer, become a farmer and grower, shall I be free to sell from my barn seeds that I am prohibited from selling from my warehouse? That would appear to be the case under the Bill as it is framed. The minister permits the sale of seeds from a barn, storehouse or granary that would be prohibited if from a store. This is plainly class legislation. Further, I contend it is not in the interest of the farmers themselves. It is universally admitted by agriculturists, I think, that seeds should be planted in a different district from that in which they are grown. The interchange of seed by immediate neighbours is not a good thing. It is better by far to bring your seed from a distance than to buy it from your next-door neighbour. Now, I do not know whether the minister is aware or not, but I am aware, that some farmers are not only growers but dealers also. I could give him the names of farmers in my own district who not only grow seed of their own but also buy from their neighbours.

They have got a name for handling seeds well, they are good cleaners, they grow it well, and they have a name of buying a good class of seeds. These men not only grow their seeds themselves, but they buy seeds from their neighbours' fields. Though this Bill says the seed should be grown upon their land, what is there in the Bill to show that the seed that is sold from a barn is grown upon the farm in which that barn stands ? Who is to see to that ? Does he see the farm ? The farmer may have a show field in front of his premises growing fine seed, so that all the neighbours will say, see that beautiful clean field. Though he might sell the product of a hundred acres from his barn—there is nothing here to prohibit him from doing that, and there is nothing here to prevent him from selling seed that he has obtained from some other source than his own growing. He may do that. Therefore, I submit that that clause is not in the interest of the dealer, it is not in the interest of the farmer himself and it is not in the interest of the grower. If the minister will examine that point carefully, I think he will see his way to alter that clause.

Further, I desire to point out what I pointed out on a previous occasion, that it is impossible—I make that statement deliberately—to placard every bag, receptacle or package with all the names there designated. Further, there is nothing to limit the size of the bag, receptacle or package. A receptacle, under the clause, so far as I can read it, may contain a thousand bushels of seed, it may be a large bin in which there may be a thousand bushels of seed. If that seed is not right, the man may be fined $5, but if he proceeds to put that thousand bushels into a thousand separate bags, he immediately becomes responsible for a thousand times that fine. Why should the quantity affect the fine? He may put this into smaller packages still. When I raised the point the other day the minister said I had in mind ten cent packages. Not at all. Grass seeds are always put up in sacks. Let me refer to the white, Dutch clover. That is sold very generally by druggists, almost in every town and city, it is used in towns and cities almost entirely. It is impossible to placard that small bag containing five or ten pounds with all these names. Further, having placarded those bags with all these names, it becomes necessary not only to placard the bag with the names of the weeds contained therein, but also the seed that is sold. Now I wish to remind the minister that there is a very large amount of valuable seed that is grown in a mingled state. I cannot find in this clause or in any other clause that provision is made for handling that class of seed. It is not uncommon that in the same field there may be red clover, alsike clover and timothy seed, all grown in the one field, all nearly pure; and still under the Act I do not find that the minister makes provision for the handling of these seeds, which every one knows are perfectly legitimate articles of trade. In fact the farmer in buying them often brings one sack to contain the three lots, and takes them all home in the one bag, they having been mixed in his presence. Surely it does not appear that the minister has given that consideration to this clause that he should have done. I contend that it is desirable to put practical and workable legislation on our statute-books, and I say that if this clause goes through as it is it will do a great wrong. It throws down the principle that has been laid down regarding the purity of the seed. It permits one man to deal in an article that it condemns another man for handling, and it opens the door for the minister to allow the sale from one premise of an article that he would not allow to be sold from another. That is a system of legislation we are not ready for. It is going to do great harm, not only to the agriculturist, but also to the dealer and all concerned in the trade.

I asked a question the other day, which was answered, I regret to say, in my absence, the answer showing the various countries to which these seeds referred to are exported. I notice there is a list of thirteen countries to which these seeds are exported. That is in spite of the fact that we have no law at present governing seeds. We sell thousands of bushels of seeds to the very best countries, to men who are well acquainted with seeds. We will be prohibited to a large extent from doing that, because we will be compelled to label them with the names of certain weeds. I wish to point out to the Minister that under his Act he does not recognize the standards that rule in the trade at all. On the next clause, perhaps, I may more fully touch upon the point I refer to now, and that is with regard to the test which he submits the seed to. He submits it to a test with regard to purity and germination. Now purity and germination are only partial tests of the value of seeds, as any one knows who is engaged in the trade, but a comparatively small part of the test. You may have a perfectly pure seed but very weak. It may germinate, but it will be very weak. It may be a seed that is not matured, it may be perfectly pure of its kind, but it is only about half size. Now to have a No. 1 seed you must have a seed that is fully developed, and it must not only be fully developed in size, but well developed in colour. Any man who handles seeds will tell you that those are the requisites that go to make up a first-class sample of seed. After the minister has laid down his law as to what constitutes a first-class seed, he has not got a first-class seed at all—not nearly as good as is sold to-day under a less high grade than he proposes to establish here, for the reason that it may be perfect in purity and germination, but it is deficient in size and colour, two of the requisites of a first-class seed. I do not like to refer the minister to anything so small as small potatoes, but I can show him perhaps, just what I mean. You take five bushels of potatoes and cull from them one bushel of small size, only fit for hog feed. You give those to the hogs, and probably that is the best end of them. But these potatoes you culled out were, according to the minister's test, pure of their kind and would germinate. Now both of these points are fully established, they are pure and will germinate, and still they are very far short of what they should be according to the standard set up. Therefore, I contend that the minister is not laying down a proper law in endeavouring to force us to label a seed if it has got ten weed seeds to a thousand good seeds. It may be possible to have ten weed seeds to a thousand, and still be a far better article than we will have under this Bill. Any one that knows the state of the trade, knows that is a fact. Why should we be compelled to brand that package with all the imperfections in it? Who would be able to sell a horse if he were obliged to brand all the imperfections on that horse? Who would

be able to sell any article under those conditions ? Yet the hon. gentleman asks the seedsmen to brand upon their package every impurity and every imperfection, and then says, buy it if you dare. It is not a fair way of doing business, it is not a right way, it is not a way that will commend itself, I believe, to the intelligence of this country and this House.

Further, it is calculated to do an immense amount of damage to trade that has been established. I say that this trade has been well established under great difficulties. You heard the First Minister the other day, in answering my question, say that upwards of $1,300,000 worth of clover and grass seeds were exported from this country during the last year. Remember too that we have to supply almost the whole Dominion of Canada, because Ontario grows almost all the clover and grass seed which are sown throughout the Dominion ; and after we have done that, we ship $1,300,000 worth of seed to foreign countries. That seed did not go as a pure article, it went as the best seed that goes to the markets of the world, and the proof is that it brought the price. There is the proof of the quality of the seed, that it brought a profitable price in the world's markets. I have here a report of the British Committee of Agriculture dealing with this question.

I do not know whether the hon. minister has seen this or not but there are some items in it that are well worthy of his reflection. The same class of committee I have asked for was appointed to deal with this question and it is the only proper way to deal with it now. It should either be referred by this House to the committee on agriculture or to a special committee selected by the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) or by some other gentleman in whom the House has confidence, and every one of these clauses should be dealt with and threshed out in the presence of men who have a full technical knowledge of the subject they are dealing with. I hold here the report that deals with the evidence collected. The committee says there that after travelling throughout the length and breadth of Great Britain and after receiving testimony from growers, farmers, dealers and men of every class interested in the trade it believes that it is not in the interest of the trade that government control should be set up. It is not palatable reading perhaps but it is a true statement made after a most thorough examination. Every one who knows anything about agriculture in Great Britain will say that they are away ahead of us in this country, and still, after weighing this whole subject, after taking evidence from men of all classes and from men who are engaged in all the different branches of the seed business this committee were compelled to say that in their opinion they did not believe that government control would conduce to the advantage of the trade or to the advantage of any agricultural interest. I trust the hon. minister will take into his consideration the proposition that I made privately to him the other day and that I make here again now, and that is that this Bill, before it becomes law, in the interest of the country at large, should go before a committee where every single clause can be threshed out and everything shown up that is in it, seeds, weeds and all. Let that be done and the hon. minister will perhaps have a workable Bill, a Bill that can be carried out. But, put it on the statute-book as it comes before the House and it will either become a dead letter or else it will drive out every man who is now in the trade. That is not my word, it is the word of the gentlemen who waited on the hon. minister the other day. I ask him if he will not consider the matter and if he will not allow a committee of the House to thresh out every clause of the Bill. Let him deal fairly with every interest and let every agriculturist in this House have a chance of hearing the technical side of the question presented. We cannot have the evidence brought before the House. These technical men cannot be heard here but they have their views. I have a lot of correspondence which has come to me since the Bill was up before, and I believe that other hon. gentlemen have also received correspondence. I hold in my hand a letter from Lieutenant Colonel Bruce, a former member of this House, and a gentleman who is highly respected on both sides of the House not only as a man of high standing but as a man who is in a position to speak with authority upon this subject. He protests against this measure and says that he believes it will never become law. I have also a letter from a gentleman engaged in the trade in my own city, Mr. Horold, who writes in opposition to the Bill in clear and strong terms. These are men who are engaged in the business, who have spent a large portion of their lives in it, who understand the question thoroughly and who say that the Bill is unworkable and that it can never become law without driving out of the trade many who are now in it. Will we allow such a measure to go on the statute-book ? Will the hon. Minister of Agriculture persist in the face of the deputation that waited upon him the other day asking for the amendment of this clause ? This is more than a party question. It is more than party capital. What we want is a fair and workable measure that will not trammel the interests of any class or individual but will operate equitably all around. I trust the hon. minister will adopt the suggestion I have made in this respect, that he will permit this Bill to be referred either to the committee on agriculture or to a special committee. The fact has been brought out in this discussion that in the opinion at least of hon. gentleman on this

side of the House the Bill will not be a workable measure, but that if it is adopted in its present shape it will inflict an injury upon the trade. I do trust that this House will see to it that before the Bill goes through the proposed amendments which are most important and which are most necessary in the interest of the dealer, in the interest of the country and in the interest of agriculture shall be introduced. If the hon. minister will accept these amendments he will have the co-operation I believe not only of his own friends but of every hon. gentleman on this side of the House. Our desire is to assist the hon. minister to the utmost of our ability in making this a workable measure. I have letters and telegrams received since the discussion the other day, from a great many friends, backing me up in every point I have taken in the amendment of this Bill. I trust that I have not trespassed too long upon the time of the House, but I desired to make this statement.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman has dealt not only with the clause under consideration but with, apparently, all the clauses in the Bill. I will rather confine myself to the question he has treated as regards the clause under consideration leaving any other questions which he has raised, to be dealt with when they come up under the various clauses of the Bill. My hon. friend has spoken about the interest of the trade generally and about the importance of certain suggestions that were made to me by a deputation which he accompanied a few days ago to my office. I met that delegation with the greatest pleasure, I heard their suggestion and I pointed out to them that as a result of the discussion which took place in this House a few days ago I had already agreed to one or two points which they pressed very strongly. I pointed out to them that I was quite ready to meet them on other points, and if my hon. friend would wait until we reach the clause referred to I will show him that I propose to introduce certain amendments in deference to the desires of the trade where the trade seems to show a reasonable consideration for other interests and where their representations have carried conviction to my mind. My hon. friend has spoken at considerable length generally and I was rather surprised and I take issue with him in one or two of the illustrations that he gave and especially perhaps I should allude to his illustration in which he likened this trade in seeds to what I might call horse-jockeying. I do not think it is a very happy illustration because I think those who are engaged in the commerce of seeds are an honourable body of men who are not engaged in any dishonest practices and who would not like themselves to be classed for a moment with those who are dealing in unsound horses. But, there are one or two points in which this trade differs from most trades in the country, and even differs from that in horses because the individual who buys seeds has no possible way of testing what he is buying. Seeds as a general rule, especially grass seeds and clover seeds, are of a character that no ordinary man, even an ordinary farmer accustomed to the growth and handling of seeds, can carefully judge the value of. The essence of the whole Bill, the most important principle in this whole question, is that we are dealing with a subject, a trade or a product, which requires to have careful test to show its real value. Therefore we require to throw safeguards around the transaction so that the purchaser shall be fairly protected.

Mr. SPROULE. If it is surrounded with safeguards that cannot be applied in practice what is the use of it?

Mr. FISHER. I do not wish now to enter upon the discussion of another point, which of course is of general application, but which does not apply to what my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) whom I am now answering, has alluded to. The question at issue in this particular section, as I understood the hon. member from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) is as to whether we should amend and modify the clause which exempts farmers selling, on their own premises, seed which they have grown to other people. My friend wants that provision modified; he says that it is a very dangerous blow at the trade, that it is going to bring about the sale of impure seeds. I take issue with my hon. friend on that point. I maintain that when the farmer who has raised these seeds sells them on his own premises to a person who has come to his premises to buy these seeds the purchaser has his eyes open and probably has a knowledge in regard to the quality and character of those seeds which no purchaser from a seed merchant or a dealer could possibly have. Therefore the two transactions are entirely different in their character.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did the minister say that a purchaser from the grower has better opportunities of knowing what he is purchasing than the purchaser from a dealer? Is that the point?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, and I say that the purchaser who buys from a farmer seeds which have been raised on that farm, presumably and almost surely, has opportunities of knowing what he is buying which the farmer who buys from a dealer has not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What means ?

Mr. FISHER. Where the seed is sold on the premises by the grower the chances are 100 to 1 that it will be purchased only by

a person who lives within a reasonable distance of that farm. It might be that a purchaser might come from a distance to buy but if he did so, he would probably come because he knew something about the grower of that seed and the conditions under which it was grown, as the grower would probably have a reputation for growing clean and pure seed. It is inconceivable that a farmer from a distance who knew nothing about the farm or the man should come to the premises of a farmer who grew certain seed and buy seed from him. I say that is practically inconceivable.

Mr. SPROULE. That happens repeatedly and repeatedly.

Mr. FISHER. I do not believe it does.

Mr. SPROULE. Now there is a flat contradiction.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I can tell the minister that I have seen men who have driven sixty miles, go into a locality where clover and other seeds were largely raised and inquire of farmers around where they could buy seed, and I have seen load after load taken out of the neighbourhood.

Mr. FISHER. And why? Because——

Mr. SPROULE. Because the seed was grown largely in that locality.

Mr. FISHER. And because he wanted to buy that seed from that farmer. That farmer had a reputation for raising seed.

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all. I have seen a man make inquiry generally, at a hotel, as to where he could buy seed. I have seen this over and over again and I have given instructions to a buyer to go to a certain locality where they raised large quantities. The buyer knew nothing about the farms.

Mr. FISHER. He then has the privilege under this section of demanding that the purchase should be made under the provisions of the Act, and it is only if the purchaser wishes it that the seller is exempted from the provisions of the Act, and I cannot myself believe that any people would go, as my hon. friend says, and deliberately put themselves at a disadvantage in regard to their purchases when they have within their own power the privilege of requiring that the seed shall be sold to them under the terms of the Act. I want the committee to understand fully the provisions of this section; it might be inferred from what has been said that this is a wholesale and special exemption. It is a very limited exemption, which only applies to the sale of seed on the premises of the person who has grown it to another person who is going to use it for seed and not to sell it, and then only if the purchaser does not require a certificate that the seed is sold under the provisions of the Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand the minister to say that any one purchasing from a producer has better opportunities of knowing what he is buying than if he purchased from a dealer. We will allow that to pass for the present. Does it not follow from the very reasons the minister urges that the man who has produced and is selling the seed would know better what he is selling than the man who is simply dealing in this seed and does not know anything about the manner in which it has been grown? How does it follow under the terms of the Bill that you impose a certain penalty upon one who is only dealing in the seeds and knows little about them and at the same time impose no penalty upon one who has raised the seeds and who is supposed to know all about them and the manner of their growth? That is the difficulty I see.

Mr. FISHER. Under this provision the transaction has to take place on the premises of the farmer who raises the seed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And who knows all about the seed?

Mr. FISHER. And who knows all about the seed. He sells the seed to an individual who can if he chooses bring the transaction under the provisions of the law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Certainly he can.

Mr. FISHER. If he does not do so, it is presumed that it is because he is satisfied of the quality of the seed he is getting. If he feels any doubt about the seed he is getting, he can require that the transaction shall be brought under the action of the law. If he knows enough about the farmer and the seed he need not do so. The reason, however, for this exemption is that the grower of the seed himself, the farmer, has practically no way of knowing what the seedsman, who is in the business and who does as a matter of fact clean seed and who has machinery for cleaning seed, can easily know, but which the farmer selling as he does on his own premises seed which he grew himself would find it very difficult indeed if at all possible to know. This Bill provides especially for the sale of cereals where in small transactions between neighbours seed may be sold and not be subject to the provisions of this section of the law.

I want to point out further that this exemption applies only to one section of the law. It does not allow the farmer to mark his seeds as first quality. It only exempts him from the necessity of putting upon them the name of certain weeds, for the reason that he cannot and ought not to be expected to know the seeds of weeds in the way that a dealer or seedsman would know them. The intention of the section is to

permit of transactions between neighbours such as are common in all sections of the country. The farmer at one season may be out of clover seed or grass seed, or he may want a little oats or wheat or barley to sow his fields with, and he is to be allowed to go to his neighbour to get them. He knows his neighbour's fields and method of farming, and may, therefore, be supposed to be able to judge fairly well of the quality of the seeds he is buying. If he chooses to risk buying them without bringing the transaction under the operation of the Act, he can do so, but if he wishes to protect himself he can demand that the transaction shall be brought under the operation of the Act, and then it shall be subject to all the penalties and restrictions which the Act provides. It seems to me that we should not interfere with transactions of that kind. Interference would not only be unnecessary, but it would be unfair and would create a hardship in the business of agriculture. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) has referred to this as a means of selling bad seeds. I do not think it is. I do not think it will produce the same kind of difficulty in the seed trade that the sale of bad seeds by seedsmen or dealers would do; because this sale of seeds would not spread the weeds which may be contained in them over a large area of country. My hon. friend from Grey said a few minutes ago that he had known men to go sixty miles for seeds. That is a pretty long distance, I should think about the limit of the distance that could come under the operation of this clause. But a seedsman may sell seeds in another province, to some one a thousand miles away. Nobody knows whether he is going to sell seeds to be used on the next farm or at a great distance. The origin of the seed is quite out of reach of the knowledge of the purchaser. As a matter of fact, I do not think the seedsmen themselves, when they fill an order, can generally tell where the seeds came from. I may say that when this subclause was first drawn it was not even limited to the sale of seeds by a farmer on his premises. If a farmer sold seed to another person, to be used for seeding, he was to be allowed to do so. I think I have hedged this exemption round with every possible limitation which could be introduced without creating a very great hardship and hinderance to the agricultural operations of farmers, and I do not see how it is possible for me to go any further in that respect. When representations were made to me the other day by the deputation of seedsmen, I told them that I would be glad to consider what they proposed, and all they proposed was that the effect of the certificate should be reversed, that is to say, that the sale should come under the operations of the Act, unless the seller required a certificate from the purchaser. One would imagine, from what the hon. member from Brantford has said, that the deputation had deliberately asked for the elimination of this clause altogether. They said that they would be glad to have it eliminated, but finally, when the matter simmered down, the amount of their request in the end was as I have said that we should reverse the certificate. I feel that I cannot go as far as that and that I must ask the committee to adopt the clause as it stands in the Bill.

Mr. WARD. Is it the intention of the minister to press the Bill through the committee to-day? My reason for asking is this: Recently, at the request of a prominent seed dealer in my own county, I sent him a copy of the Bill. His desire was to send me his objections to it, and his suggestions for its improvements. In the course of a casual conversation with him, he presented to me many of the objections which have been brought before the committee this afternoon by my hon. friend from Brantford. I would, therefore, ask the minister not to press the Bill through the committee to-day so that I may have an opportunity of bringing my constituent's views, if not before the committee, at least before the minister, before the Bill passes the committee stage.

Mr. FISHER. I do not wish to force things, but I would point out to my hon. friend that this Bill has been before the House now for nearly a month, that a good deal of the Bill was in committee before, and adopted some three weeks ago, that opportunity has been given for a full consideration of it, and that it is not at all likely that the gentleman to whom my hon. friend alludes is going to bring out anything new beyond what the delegation of seedsmen have already presented to me and what has been presented to me in various representations made on their behalf. I do not wish to be in any way discourteous to my hon. friend, and I am not going to insist, but I would like him to consider these points. I would like also to go on with the Bill this afternoon and propose some amendments which I have agreed to. It is quite possible that some of these may meet the views of my hon. friend's constituent. I do not know, of course, what those views are, or what he proposes to suggest, but I can assure the committee that this subject has been threshed out now for nearly two years, that the seedsmen, collectively and individually, have appeared before me and have written to members and have presented their views over and over again, and that to-day I have modified the Bill very considerably so as to try and meet their objections. I have met nearly all their objections and they have expressed themselves to me, a number of them privately, as being quite prepared to go on with their business under the provisions of the Act as here printed with the amendments which I am going to propose. Having laid these points

before my hon. friend, I would promise not to take the Bill out of committee if he will not delay it in committee too long, because I wish to treat him with every consideration.

Mr. WARD. I only ask to have it held over one day more in committee, and then, if I have no objections to offer, I shall not delay it further.

Mr. BARR. This Bill affects two classes, the farmers and the seed merchants; and while the seed merchants have waited on the minister in large numbers and presented their views to him, the contrary is the case with respect to the farmers, and consequently they are not in a position to receive that consideration which is given the seed merchants. I regret that the hon. minister did not see fit to accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), and refer the matter to the Committee on Agriculture. That committee is particularly in a position to look after the interests of the farmer, and the farming interest is far more important than that of the seed merchants seeing that they outnumber the latter ten times. We are all aware that whilst we have received communications from almost every seed merchant in the Dominion, we have not heard to any considerable extent from the farmers, nor have the farmers in this House taken advantage of their position to look after the interests of their constituents as carefully as they should. Clause 2, as it stands, is a safeguard to the agricultural community, and I hope it will not be changed. I know that the seed buyers are putting forth every effort to have it changed and thus throw the responsibility from their own shoulders to those of the farmers. So far as the province of Ontario is concerned, the agriculturists there can do very well without the Bill, and it is not in the interests of that province. There may be stronger reasons in Manitoba and some other provinces why the Bill should be adopted, but what I wish to impress on the hon. minister is that no change should be made in this clause, and that the farmers be allowed to sell the one to the other without coming under the provision of this measure except indeed by their own consent. If you change this section, what will be the result? A farmer might not understand the provisions of this Bill and give the purchaser a certificate which would bring him under its provisions and render him liable to heavy damages. I hope that the hon. minister will be firm as regards this clause, and I think it would be greatly in the interests of our farming community if this Bill should be sent to the Agricultural Committee. It must be remembered that our farmers are not in a position to send deputations to wait on the minister or to understand the proposed law and instruct their representatives as they should. It has been contended that the farmers should be placed in the same position as other people. In that contention, I do not agree. When one farmer desires to buy seeds from another, he is in a better position to judge of the quality of that seed by looking over the field while the crop was growing than he would be by testing the seed. And even buyers from a distance could inquire from other farmers whether there were obnoxious weeds in those fields from which the seed they are purchasing was taken, and in this way be in a better position to know what they are buying than if they went into a seed store.

Mr. OSLER. The Bill, as I understand, is intended to protect the buyer. Is not that the case?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. OSLER. I shall not attempt to discuss the details of the measure as others more competent are in a better position to do this. But it strikes me that clause two is a reversal of the position which the minister has taken. In this particular clause the whole object is to protect the seller. But the farmer who raises the seed ought to know more about it than the man who buys from him, and the latter is the one you are trying to protect. A farmer may be a very large dealer in seed, practically a wholesale dealer, yet you are throwing the onus on the buyer no matter how small a quantity he may buy. The very fact that the seller is entitled to obtain from the buyer an acknowledgment that he is selling the seed under the provisions of this Bill implies a knowledge on the part of the seller that he understands its provisions.

Mr. FISHER. The seller here is protected only under certain circumstances and conditions, which are so different from these to which the rest of the Bill applies, that I think a change should be made. If the purchaser thinks he is running any risk, he can bring the transaction under the law or it cannot be completed.

Mr. OSLER. The seller can do that. But the seller is the one likely to have the knowledge, rather than the farmer who buys.

Mr. FISHER. That might be so where the raising of the seed was as described by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). But this clause seeks to permit the ordinary small transactions that go on between farmers. If we put it in the form the hon. gentleman suggests, there is danger of great hardship. A farmer might even entice one against whom he had a grudge, or whom he wished to get into trouble, to violate the law inadvertently. As it is now, the buyer is protected if he wishes to protect himself; but if he thinks he has enough knowledge of the transaction, he takes the responsibility. I would not like to change the clause.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister give the committee any statement as to the proportion of total seed transactions that take place between farmer and farmer as against those that take place between the farmer and the seed merchant? I have a letter that makes the statement that nine-tenths of the seed sold in Canada is sold by one farmer to another directly or through the medium of the local seedsman. I think it would be valuable information and would help us in this discussion, if the minister would tell us whether this estimate is correct.

Mr. FISHER. I have no information on that point. The transactions that this clause provides for are so varied and so local that there is no possibility, so far as I know, of getting that information. One man, for instance, happens to have a crop of better looking oats than his neighbour. His neighbour asks him to sell a few bushels, thinking that the seed will be better. That kind of transaction is provided for in this section. But I have no information on which to base a statement as to the proportion of such transactions as compared with those that take place between the farmer and the seedsman.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The minister states that the farmer who buys from another farmer buys with his eyes open. But a man even with his eyes open cannot know what is in the seed. Even with a pair of ordinary glasses one cannot discern exactly the character of the seed—a powerful magnifying glass is often necessary. The statement that a man buys with his eyes open, therefore, does not affect the case, because he cannot know what is in the goods. Now, as to the remark of my hon. friend from Dufferin (Mr. Barr), whom I respect very highly, I would like to say a word. And, by the way, I was glad to see that hon. gentlemen opposite took note of my hon. friend's remark. It must be plain to hon. gentlemen opposite that we allow great liberty of opinion on this side. I trust that hon. gentlemen opposite will show equal independence and will freely speak their minds. If they do, I know, as a matter of fact, that a number of them will support me, for they do not believe in the features of this Bill. I do not think the minister has stated all the points concerning the deputation that waited upon him.

Mr. FISHER. I did not refer to anything except points relating to the clause under consideration. Other matters I left for future discussion.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. But I think the minister has not stated even all that relates to the clause under consideration. I have it from one of the largest dealers in Canada, who was a member of the deputation, that the minister gave him to understand that he would reverse the order of procedure in the clause to which I refer. That gentleman went home with the belief that the clause would be reversed. I can give the minister the name of this gentleman if he wishes, but I do not care to mention it in public. So far as that is concerned, the seedsmen asked that it should be reversed if it cannot be withdrawn. It is in the interest of all concerned that it should not be there. I submit that, and I will not take it back for anything we have heard yet. I will deal with the point of my hon. friend from Dufferin. I think he has only grasped the outside of the question, when he endorses this part of the Bill. Nine-tenths of the seed grown in Ontario is grown for export. My hon. friend (Mr. Barr) says he wants the farmers to sell to one another. But they cannot sell more than one-tenth of what they grow. What is to become of the nine-tenths? Is the farmer going to export it? Is he in a position to export it, or even to send it to Manitoba and the Northwest? It must, of necessity, go through the hands of the dealers. The dealer knows the transportation situation, he knows how to insure and how to handle the business generally. He has his agents all over the country. The dealer must handle the crop, or Ontario must cease growing it. If this clause remains it will prevent the dealers buying as much as they have been buying, and many farmers will be left with their seed on their hands. The farmer cannot sell to his neighbour, because there is no land upon which the seed can be planted. If my hon. friend from Dufferin will consider that point, I am sure that he will see that it is in the interest of dealer and grower alike that this seed should be handled. Therefore, I contend that the procedure provided by this clause should be reversed. It would not be considered neighbourly of a farmer to ask another to give him a writing; but unless the farmer specially asks for a writing he does not get it. If the minister will reverse the order, and provide that the farmer is obliged to give a writing unless he specially negotiates that a writing shall not be given, the clause will be better than it is now. Under this clause it is all in the buyer's hands. The buyer, if he wants a certificate, is compelled to ask the seller to give him one. The farmer will not do that —he cannot do it. I wish to read a clause of the report of the British Committee of Agriculture that examined witnesses and discussed this whole subject. Dealing with this particular question, they say:

> A considerable amount of seed is also sold by farmers to each other. Farmers not having the appliances used by reguler seed merchants are unable to properly clean and winnow their seeds, but it is admitted that the price at which these seeds are sold not infrequently corresponds fairly accurately to their value.

That is, the seed is sold more cheaply because the farmer cannot clean it as the dealer does. That goes to show that the

seed is best passed through the hands of the dealer. In regard to the cleaning of the seed I stated—and perhaps some hon. gentlemen were not present and not aware of the facts which were brought out more fully by the deputation—that there are many weed seeds that no machinery will entirely remove. I gave only one or two the other day, but experts, in the presence of the minister, stated that there were twelve or thirteen weed seeds that no machinery so far invented would entirely remove. The minister gave us to understand that a complete cleaning outfit could be obtained for $800, and that some fifteen concerns in the Dominion had such outfits. But one of the dealers stated in the presence of the minister that two years ago, after he had provided a complete outfit, he had to spend $2,500 in improving that outfit. And another dealer stated that he had a cleaning plant that cost him $8,000. There is a vast difference between $800 and $8,000. Therefore, I contend there is the difficulty that no grower can afford to put in that expensive machinery to clean it in the same way the dealer can. Furthermore, the minister did not deal with another important point. I pointed out that there is no safeguard there that a grower will handle his own seed only, but he may also handle his neighbours' seed. It is a fact that farmers often handle seed that they do not grow themselves. I know one or two notable instances in my own county.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend will remark that if they do that, they will not come under the provision of this exemption at all.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The minister did not explain that, and it does not appear to me that that thing is safeguarded. It says here 'seed that is grown on his own premises.' But who is to tell whether that farmer has sold only his own seed ? There is no one there who can tell, he may have bought it from his neighbour's field.

Mr. FISHER. He may know that to be a fact, and then he would not come under the operation of this exemption clause.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Whether that is the case or not, it is down in black and white here that he may sell only seed that is grown on his own premises for seeding purposes. There is no safeguard in the Act to show that there is any other seed in that barn than the seed the man grew himself. Further, the minister failed to take up another point. I asked him this question, if I, as a dealer, also became a grower, can I sell from my barn seed that I cannot sell from my warehouse ? I might become a grower, many seedsmen are growers, and I want to know from the minister now whether a seedsman, who is generally a seed grower as well—because nearly every prominent seedsmen has a seed farm—if that seedsman grows seed on his farm can he sell from his barn what he is forbidden by the Act to sell from his warehouse ? It may appear that he could. He becomes a farmer, and he can sell from his barn in the one case seed that he knows is less pure than the seed he sells from his warehouse, simply because under the Act he is classified as a farmer and as a grower. That is a very important point which the minister does not deal with, and it may be necessary for some dealers to handle the product from their barn instead of from their warehouse.

Now, I wish to refer again to the matter of labelling. I say that under this clause the minister is compelling a man to label the receptacle with all the imperfections that his seed contains—I think that is not right —with every weed seed that is in it, or that is named in that clause. Now he cannot take any chances, therefore he will be obliged to placard it in this way : This seed is clover seed, or timothy seed, or alsike, and it may contain the twenty-five named weeds—he would only be safe in naming them all, because he is not sure what is in it himself. You may examine every package and find it good on top, and you may put your hand a few inches lower down and you may strike ten weed seeds that you did not strike on the first handling. Every article you may mention may vary, because we know that the shifting of a sieve will throw certain lighter seeds to the top, and they congregate. Now, you may take one handling and say that is perfectly pure, and the next handling might have ten weed seeds in it. That may occur, and does occur to my own knowledge of the seed trade.

Now the placarding is a great hardship. The minister says you must placard everything but No. 1 seed. No. 1 seed, according to the Act, can be produced only in very limited quantities ; therefore every dealer and grower that comes under the operation of this Act is obliged to label that with all the impurities that it contains. I say you cannot sell goods under those conditions. Is it a fair thing ? A seller usually places all the good qualities in front. The dry goods man sells a piece of dress-goods, the lady makes it up, and she puts a lot of work into it, and says it will wash. But it does not wash, the colours do run. But the dress is made up, and there is an incidental damage against the dry goods man, in the same way that there is expected to be here incidental damages against the seedsman. Damages can be recovered now, damages are recovered now at law without this Seeds Act. I say it is unfair to ask any one to label all the imperfections in his goods on the outside. How can these seeds be sold in that way ? Still the minister obliges every one who has seed that comes under No. 1 grade to label it with all the imperfections it contains. I

submit that is not a fair proposition. I did not say the minister was a horse jockey, but I said that if he were obliged to label all the imperfections on a horse he knew of, he probably might not be able to sell it for what it was worth. So I say that if you label all the imperfections that bag contains you are not likely to get anything like its value.

Mr. BARR. I took the trouble to send this Bill, as many of them as I could find, to the seed dealers and also to the farmers in my riding. I have received several letters from farmers, and they say that they think they can get along very well without the Bill, though they think the object of the Bill is good. But they wish that their privilege be carefully guarded to sell to their neighbours if they wish to do so. I would like to ask if there is a member in this House who has received from any farmer in Canada a single intimation that this clause is not to their interest. In my opinion we should carefully guard their interest. I do not take much stock in that extract that was read by my hon. friend; we can find those views almost any where. Nor do I take much stock in the statement that so large a number of seed dealers are farmers. If they are, then they have the provisions of this Bill to fall back upon, they have all the advantages that the farmers have. Therefore I do not think this is class legislation, and I submit again that we are only doing our duty in looking after the farmers' interests.

Mr. SPROULE. Like my hon. friend from Dufferin (Mr. Barr) I submitted this Bill to three seedsmen in my locality, men who sell 20,000 or 30,000 bushels a year; and after looking it over carefully they did not think it was possible to continue their business and keep within the provisions of the law. Most of them admitted that if the Bill could be worked out it would be valuable, that it was desirable to have seed as clean as possible. One gentleman said that so far as he was concerned he would have to go out of the business. Now if these three seedsmen go out of the business, men who are shipping carload after carload of seeds from that locality, all of which is bought from the farmers, it must come back to the farmers, and if the farmer cannot get a market for his seed, he is put to a great disadvantage. Farmers in my locality realize year after year anywhere from $100 to $800 or $900 for seed raised on their farms. If that seed is not purchased by the dealers in the villages and towns in their neighbourhood, they will find it much more difficult to get purchasers from outside.

Then, there is some of the seed bought in this way and I mention this in answer to the statement of the hon. Minister of Agriculture: Men drive forty, fifty and sixty miles to buy seed. I have seen three, four or five teams in one day from the immediate vicinity of Guelph coming up to buy seed. These men go out amongst the farmers and buy seed. They can buy two or three loads from some individual farmers. They make inquiries, it is true, about the farms and where they are likely to get the seed they want, but they know nothing or very little about the seed that is raised on the farm nor does the buyer in the village, so that they cannot know much more than if they were buying it from the seedsman. Therefore, the statement the hon. minister made that when one farmer buys from another he does it with his eyes open and therefore is not going it blindly, is not a statement which is supported by the facts. That is the dilemma that I have in regard to the Bill. But, I rose more particularly to support the suggestion of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) because I think it is a good one though it seems rather late to make it. That is that the Bill should be sent to the Agricultural Committee and that parties should be brought here so that they might give their evidence upon it, if you like, both farmers and seedsmen. While I think it is a good thing and I would like to see it carried out if it can be made workable, I have no evidence before me that it is a workable measure and you can naturally understand the dilemma one is confronted with who is anxious that after we have spent our time and labour on the Bill it shall be a workable measure. If we can make it a workable measure it seems to me that it would not be labour in vain.

Mr. OSLER. I would like to ask the hon. minister if in England or the United States the same conditions or something similar have prevailed?

Mr. FISHER. There is no legislation of this kind in England. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) referred to a report of a committee that was appointed to deal with this question in England. That report is five years old and the subject of seed analysis, laboratory work and seed legislation has advanced very much indeed since that time. That report was based largely on the idea in England that they should introduce a law upon the guaranteeing of seeds and the report wound up by saying that they could not see their way clear to recommending a law introducing the guarantee system. We are not attempting to introduce the guarantee system. The guarantee system obtains in several countries on the continent of Europe and works fairly well there, but the observation of it and its working there led us to believe that it would not be suited to the conditions of business in this country or to our people's genius and apparently the committee decided the same thing.

Mr. OSLER. Is there any precedent in the United States?

Mr. FISHER. There is a law in the state of Maine which is similar to this. I think in the United States also they have been discussing the question of the guarantee system but they have not adopted it yet and they have not proceeded yet in the direction of this Bill. Seed laboratory work and analysis have been carried on for a number of years in the United States and I think it has now reached a point where it can be made of practical use for the protection of farmers. A Bill of this kind would not be practicable unless there was a pretty well established system of laboratory analysis of seeds and until I was prepared to say that we had that here, and I do think that we have a pretty well equipped system, I would not insist upon the passage of a Bill of this kind. But, having reached the point which that science has reached to-day, I do not think there is any doubt of the possibility of satisfactorily working a Bill of this kind. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says that he is quite willing to admit the principle of the Bill, but that the only question with him is the difficulty of working it, apparently basing this doubt upon the testimony submitted by the seed dealers that they would have to go out of business if this Bill is passed. A deputation of seed dealers came here to see me the other day. They made that statement and they brought with them a lot of samples. One gentleman brought a lot of samples of cereals which, under this Bill, he said he could not sell. Then the gentleman went down to the laboratory and he submitted to the laboratory the samples which he said he could not sell if this Bill were passed. Some of the samples he himself said he would not risk his reputation in proposing to sell. He submitted these samples to the laboratory and there was not one of them that he could not sell under the Bill.

Mr. OSLER. Then, the Bill is no good.

Mr. FISHER. If you want it stronger I will be very glad. I am perfectly willing to make it stronger. I have made it less strong in deference to the wishes of the seedsmen because they have raised such a row and put forward their pleas so vigorously. If the House will sustain me I will make the Bill more stringent at once.

Mr. BARR. No, we will not do that.

Mr. FISHER. No. Well, I think I have struck the happy medium and that the Bill is about as good as it can be made at this day. I hope that after we have had some experience of this law, if it becomes law, we will be able to make it more stringent from time to time. I have said already, and I say again, that in the interest of the farmers and in the interest of clean agriculture in Canada, this Bill ought to be made more stringent. But this is a first step in that direction. In view of the fact that we have not had a Bill of this kind before, I am willing to adopt it as it stands, try it for a year or two and then make it more stringent as the condition of affairs in Canada improves under this legislation. Now, I want to continue what I was saying. These gentlemen are more afraid than they need be that they will be hurt by the passage of this Bill. These same gentlemen brought a lot of samples of grass and clover seeds. They were afraid that none of them could be sold under this law. They were avowedly not very good samples. They brought them to show that they were not good enough samples; yet, I think, one half of these samples could be sold under this law as No. 1 and all of them could be sold. There was one sample that was avowedly a sample of screenings. The statements and representations which have been made on behalf of the seedsmen are not based upon proof of the condition of affairs.

Mr. SPROULE. If they can sell everything but screenings under the Bill, what is the use of the Bill?

Mr. FISHER. Even if that were the case I would be glad to stop the sale of screenings in this country, and if to-day our farmers are being tempted to buy screenings and seedsmen are selling screenings, I say we ought to pass a law to stop it and I am prepared to appeal to the House and the country on that question. The Bill, although it does not go so far as I would like, goes as far as the conditions of the trade to-day will permit without an undue and harsh interference with the trade. In consideration of the large body of respectable and honest seedsmen who do a legitimate, honest business and who are prepared to try and live up, as they can succeed in living up to the provisions of this Act when it is passed, I am prepared to pass the Act in its present lenient form, and to then trust to the future to make it more stringent. But, Sir, I confess that I am not ready to emasculate the Act and to make it absolutely worthless and then pretend that we are going to do any good by it in the direction of creating a clean agriculture in this country. If I should adopt the suggestions of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) and the frightened statements of certain statesmen, I would be emasculating the Act and I am not prepared, as the responsible minister who has to introduce legislation of this kind and put it through the House, to go further in the modification of this Bill than the amendments that I have suggested and which I intend to make to it. So far as I am concerned, I think with my hon. friend from Dufferin (Mr. Barr) that it is essential in the interests of the farmers of the country that the section should pass as it is and I must ask the committee to make no amendment.

Mr. W. D. STAPLES (Macdonald). As a new member of the House I did not intend to speak upon this Bill. I have listened

with great interest to the discussion of the Bill and to the criticisms that have been levelled against it, and I have come to the conclusion that as a farmer, since it has been called to my attention that the farmers of the House are not taking the interest in this Bill that they should take, it is possibly my duty to speak upon it. I have noticed during the discussion that in this House as in smaller gatherings we have two classes of farmers, the theoretical and the practical. If the hon. the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) is the practical farmer that the Liberal party have always claimed him to be, especially during the last election campaign, I am sure he will agree with me when I say that it is an easy matter to farm theoretically but that it is a different proposition to put those theories into practice. I am speaking only as a practical, or if you will allow the expression, an ordinary, common farmer. I have the honour of representing in this House one of the largest and most prosperous agricultural districts in the province of Manitoba; I think it is the largest and most prosperous constituency.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, no.

Mr. STAPLES. My hon. friend says 'no,' but of course he represents another constituency in the province of Manitoba. Not only have I the honour of representing that great constituency, but I am sent here by the largest majority of any hon. member from that province, save and except, as I must, the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Clifford Sifton). As to how he rolled up his great majority, I am not going to say at the present moment, but I will go this far and say that if it had not been for the mean contemptible, shameless practices perpetrated upon the electors of the constituency of Macdonald, by simply taking a red pen and disfrancising them, I would be here to-day with a larger majority than the Minister of the Interior.

If this Bill becomes law, are we putting anything on the statute-book that we have not at the present time? I will state to the Minister of Agriculture that so far at least, as Manitoba is concerned, we are not. We have on the statute-book of Manitoba what is known as the Noxious Weed Act, which is more drastic—that is a nice term of the hon. minister—than the Bill presented here to-day and in order to prove that, I shall call attention to a couple of clauses in that Act. It appears to me that, so far as Manitoba is concerned, we are to-day wasting time. Sections 22 and 23 of the Noxious Weed Act of Manitoba are as follows:

Any such inspector may, during the day time, enter any store, shop, warehouse, mill, elevator or other premises occupied by any person who vends grain, grass or other seed for feed or seeding purposes, and may inspect such seeds or grain to ascertain if they contain any seeds of noxious weeds, and may take away a sample of such grain, grass or other seeds if he considers it necessary for the purpose of establishing the fact that seeds of noxious weeds are contained among such grain, grass or other seeds.

Section 23 reads thus:

Any person who vends for seed or feed purposes any grain, grass or other seed, among which there is any seed of noxious weeds, shall be liable to a fine of not less than ten dollars nor more than one hundred dollars, and the magistrate may order that any grain, grass or other seed sold contrary to the provisions of this section shall be destroyed.

Now, Sir, I claim that so far as Manitoba is concerned we have all the protection not only as seedsmen but as farmers, that this Act purports to give, and I do not see that we can make any better law than that which exists in Manitoba. I will admit of course that all through his arguments the province of Manitoba has been dealt with as though it were a back number and was not worthy of consideration. In so far as the work of the Department of Agriculture and the gathering of statistics is concerned, I would say that Manitoba is well up to the mark, and in so far as the Noxious Weed Act is concerned, I think that these two clauses which I have just read will fully establish the fact that that province is quite up to the mark to-day. Notwithstanding that Act the farmers of Manitoba have not by any means the protection that we deserve from the Department of Agriculture of the Dominion of Canada. We require some means whereby we will be able to furnish not only the seedsmen, but the farmers of this country with the means of acquiring good, sound, clean seed. As to the method which will best bring this about, I agree with the suggestion of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) who has proposed that this question should be referred to an agricultural committee. I think that is the proper place for this discussion, where we farmers can get together—and it will not take a very large room to hold the farmers in this House for there are only 24—notwithstanding the fact that three-fourths of the population of Canada are farmers and paying three-fourths of the taxes of this country. Not quite a fair representation, and I am sure that if the farmers and the seedsmen meet together we can make some progress. Let us get to work and see if we cannot, together with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) succeed in laying down a fundamental basis whereby we can put within easy reach not only of the farmers, but also of the seedsmen, good clean seed. This can be done, there is no doubt about it, if we would follow out the lines suggested by an hon. member of this government during the last election who thought that it would be to the interests of his party to go to the west and give us one or two addresses, I refer to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). While I do not agree

with all the remarks he made, still I always try to be fair, and he did make some suggestions which if applied to the seed question so that we can get good clean seed, would, I think be of great benefit. He said that he thought the time had come when there should be established throughout Canada, small model farms. If these model farms were established and brought under the supervision of the Minister of Agriculture, I do not see why we could not equip them in such a manner—and I do not know that it would be a very expensive operation; after all—that we would be able to accomplish the object which I hope the hon. Minister has in view in submitting this Bill. I do not know that there is any serious objection to the Bill, from the farmers' point of view, so far as it goes; but it does not go far enough, and it does not put the responsibility upon the proper persons. It is the Department of Agriculture that should be responsible for the supply of clean seed. I believe that if we got together, we could succeed, with the good judgment of the hon. minister, in mapping out and putting into operation the requisite facilities for placing within easy reach of the farmers and seedsmen of this country the good, clean seed which we as farmers are deserving of, and the seedsmen as well.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL (South Oxford). As a practical farmer, who lives on a farm and is interested in farming operations, I have taken a deep interest in the discussion of this question, when it was before the House a few days ago, when it was discussed by the deputation of seedsmen who waited upon the minister, and as it has been presented before us to-day by the various speakers who have addressed the House. In the discussion that has taken place there has been very little real criticism against the Bill. Some points have been touched upon slightly—for instance, the provision in regard to the fines that may possibly be imposed; but I believe the minister proposes to amend the clause respecting the fines. So far as the object of the Bill is concerned, I am confident that the more carefully we consider its provisions, the more convinced we shall be that they are not at all too stringent. The first thought was that it was probably too complicated for the legal points in regard to its enforcement to be readily determined; but I presume that it has been made as clear and as easy of interpretation as the lawyers who have had it in hand could make it. The provisions of the Bill, I am sure, are not at all too stringent. Our country is too much overrun with foul weeds, and anything that is done with the view of curtailing their dissemination is in the interest of agriculture in this Dominion. I listened the other day to the deputation of seedsmen who presented the arguments from their standpoint in the strongest possible way; and yet, when they considered the situation carefully and candidly, I think that they themselves realized that the Bill was a pretty fair measure, and not one that would operate seriously against their business. Their fear that the Bill would hurt their business seemed to be greater at the introduction of their case than it was at the conclusion of the interview; and I believe that if the Bill is passed as now proposed, the seedsmen will not have much reason to complain. The objection has been raised against allowing farmers to sell seed to their neighbours, that such seed would not be fit to be sown; but we know that neighbouring farmers are thoroughly conversant with the nature of the soil and the foul weeds liable to be grown on each other's farms. The farmers themselves are desirous of getting the best possible seed, and are usually as capable as any other class of the community of guarding their own interest; and, while it may seem to be giving a farmer somewhat of a privilege to sell seeds to his neighbour in this way, I do not think that as a rule he is going to abuse the privilege. It has been stated that ninety per cent of the seed grown in Canada is exported. If so, it is important that we should have some regulation of that seed as well as of the ten per cent which is sold at home. Of the members on the opposition side who have spoken on this Bill, I notice that those who have been longest in the House have said but little. I believe that they recognize the reasonableness of the Bill, and I believe that the House as a whole regard it not only as a Bill that should be passed, but as one that has been framed moderately and in such a way as will conduce to the protection of the farmers of this country, conserve the interests of the seed trade, and, while not perhaps as stringent as it should be, will in a large measure help the agricultural industry, especially this particular branch of it.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) has alluded to the local law of the province of Manitoba. I know that Act, and I hope that it is doing good work there. I hope that the government of Manitoba is enforcing it.

Mr. STAPLES. They cannot enforce it.

Mr. FISHER. If that is the case, I think we had better have a Dominion Act that we can enforce. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman says that his government cannot enforce their Act; I am sorry that he confesses their weakness in that respect. But I was going to ask him, in his strength as a member from Manitoba, to be merciful to us who do not belong to that province, and allow us to pass an Act which will apply to other parts of the Dominion, and to Manitoba as well; because the farmers of Manitoba are equally interested in this matter with the farmers of the other parts of the Dominion. This Act does not undertake

to do what cannot be done or what we cannot enforce in a reasonable, moderate and judicious way; and I am satisfied that if this Bill becomes law, it will be enforced. I appreciate what my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Schell) has said. I believe he has expressed the judgment of the House in general, the desire of the farmers, and the feeling of the seedsmen. The deputation of seedsmen came here a good deal frightened, and determined, I think, to get all they could in the way of modifications; but after the explanations which were given at the meeting and afterwards in the seed laboratory, in regard to the way in which the Act would work out, the statement was made to me by one of the most important of those who spoke on the question, that although he would have liked this particular clause to have been modified in the way suggested, he believed that if the Act were passed they would be able to carry on their business and would go on with their business. I must ask the committee to adopt this third clause and then go on to the consideration of those amendments which, as the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Schell) has indicated, I am quite prepared to make, in the general interests, after considering the representations of the seedsmen.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Speaking from a farmer's standpoint and as one always anxious to promote the interests of the farmers, I think that the suggestion thrown out by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) should be adopted and this Bill referred to the Agricultural Committee. When it was first introduced, I sent copies to every district, and nearly every reply I have received from both sides indicates that the Bill is wholly unworkable. That is my opinion also. I should regret very much to have to vote against the Bill if I thought it was in the interests of the farmers and would be only too glad to support any measures in their interests, I care not who might bring it in. But as the measure, I believe, is neither in the interests of the farmers not the seedsmen, I think we are losing very much valuable time discussing it, and that it should be rather sent to the Agricultural Committee where it could be more satisfactorily dealt with.

Mr. STAPLES. We have a law at present in Manitoba on this same subject, but it has not proved adequate to prevent the spreading of noxious weeds, simply because we have not the proper facilities for growing and for cleaning the seeds, and until we get these facilities within easy reach of the farmers we are bound to suffer from this evil. You are going, if this measure passes, to inflict upon the people of Manitoba the cost of enforcing a law similar to the provincial one now in existence, and I do not believe that the staff of officers to be provided under this Bill will prove any more efficient than those we have at present in Manitoba.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I would like to be informed by the hon. minister whether the Act passed by the legislature of Manitoba was outside the jurisdiction of that province ? If so, has this parliament the right to pass the Bill now before us, which is dealing with a similar object ? It may be that this Bill is ultra vires and that all we have the power to do is to appoint inspectors as is done with regard to our fisheries.

Mr. FISHER. I cannot pretend to be an authority on legal questions, but I know that this Act affects a matter of commerce and consequently is within the powers of this parliament, and I have the opinion of the Department of Justice to that effect. It was introduced by a resolution because it deals with trade and commerce.

Mr. T. MARTIN. As I represent a constituency of farmers and have had something to do with the buying and selling of seed, I feel it my duty to give some expression to my views on this important measure. There is nothing to-day which gives our farmers more trouble and costs them more, without any return, than weeds, and if we can do something to eradicate this nuisance, we certainly ought to do it. As the hon. member for Brantford has told us, the deputation the other day which waited on the minister consisted of practical men, but they were practical men on one side and one side only. The opposition to this Bill has been all from that side. The object of the Bill is to afford relief to the farmers, not the seedsmen. I do not believe that we should do anything in this House to injure any man. But, if we refuse to give the farmers protection against the spread of weeds, and have no reason for it except that the dealers have not cleaners or something of that kind, we are of very little use here. The deputation that waited on the minister were very anxious to have this Bill laid over. I have no doubt that from the standpoint of their business that was all right. But this is an excellent Bill, in my opinion. If there is anything wrong with it, it is that it does not go far enough. We should not delay an hour in passing it. I wonder that such a measure as this was not placed on the statute-book many years ago. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), judging from his remarks, I should say, has not had much to do with farming. And hon. members, as, for instance, the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. MacLaren) in asking that this Bill be laid over, speak from the seedsman's point of view. I claim as a representative of the farmers that we ought to pass a law of this kind.

Mr. MACLAREN. I rise to a point of order. I did not make the statement that I spoke on behalf of the seedsmen, but I

said that I had a letter from a seedsman on this subject. I advocated sending the Bill to the Committee on Agriculture, that it might be discussed and that all those who are interested might be heard.

Mr. T. MARTIN. I sent copies of this Bill to fifteen or twenty farmers in the constituency I have the honour to represent, asking their opinion upon it. I have had a good number of answers, and, without exception those answers have been favourable to the Bill. These farmers are my friends on both sides of politics and fairly represent the general run of farmers of this country. The hon. member for Brantford does not give the farmers credit for any intelligence; but I can tell the hon. gentleman that the farmers are just as intelligent and just as alert in promoting their own business as are the representatives of any other business interest of the country. If the hon. gentleman believes that a farmer would buy seed from his neighbour without inquiring or without knowing what that seed was like, the only conclusion I can come to is that the hon. gentleman has not mixed enough with farmers to know how careful they are in guarding their own interests. If the Bill is to be changed at all, I would suggest to the Minister of Agriculture that it should be changed so as to provide that these packages or bags shall be labelled with red ink and with letters so large that he that runs may read. If the seedsmen are scattering through this country seed upon which they are afraid to put on the name of the weeds contained therein, the sooner that seed is burned the better for the Dominion of Canada. I am sure the hon. member for Brantford has never figured up what weeds cost this country. The spread of weeds means millions of dollars ; and we are throwing this money away because a few seedsmen believe they cannot clean their seed. I understand that the seed which has been tested, 65 per cent of it will grade No. 1. I would also call the attention of the committee to the fact that the Bill, as I read it, has not a word in it to prevent seedsmen going on in the business of exporting seed as they have been doing. The hon. gentleman tells of a horse that could not be sold because he was branded. Well, if his horse was so foul, I would put him in the same place as I would put the seed.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I desire to say a word or two in regard to the debate so far as it has gone. The minister rather cast an imputation on the report of the British Committee on Agriculture from which I read, giving members to understand that it was obsolete. Well, it bears the date 1901, the date of the minister's census, all the volumes of which have not yet been published. It seems to me that the minister at least should regard it as comparatively new ; and I think that members of the House generally will be inclined to accept it. If the minister has the confidence in his Bill that he claims, he has nothing to fear in sending it to the Committee on Agriculture. I am anxious for a full and open discussion ; I want the thing to be considered from the standpoint of all concerned. Let all come forward and state their views. If the committee report favourably on the Bill, if any committee that professing to know the needs of the farmer and the dealer approve this measure, I am prepared to withdraw my opposition. Now, a word to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. T. Martin). I am sorry to see that the hon. gentleman has escaped from the chamber. He advocated painting these packages red. Well, I think the hon. gentleman left us no room to doubt his party proclivities ; I think he is entitled to the very first place as a party man. As a party man, I would paint him red. He has accepted the whole Bill without regard to criticism. He suggests that I know nothing about farming. I think I know at least as much about farming as the hon. gentleman does. I was brought up largely on a farm, and have spent at least twenty summers on a farm. I am pretty well known to the farmers, and would have no fear in going before the farmers and saying exactly what I have said in this House. I have discussed this matter with farmers, and I speak the opinions of many farmers in my district. If the Bill goes through it will hit the farmer harder than anybody else. If I did not believe that so strongly, you may be sure I would not stand up here so often to declare it. The Bill will take away the big business the farmer has in seed growing. I do not know whether my hon. friend (Mr. T. Martin) who professes to know so much about farming has looked into that matter or not, but seed-growing is a great source of revenue to the farmers of Ontario. The hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. M. S. Schell) showed a disposition to swallow his own opinions as a party man. He would regulate not only the selling of the ten per cent of seed that is sold in this country but of the ninety per cent that is sold in foreign countries. Why cannot he trust the foreign countries to look after themselves ? If we are sending seed abroad that won't pass the test in this clause, it will not be received. I mentioned in this House the other day that the seedsmen, when they came down on that deputation, stated that the seeds raised in the province of Ontario are the best in the world. Now what better can you have under the Bill than that ? Are you going to destroy that trade that has been built up with great difficulty ? It is going to take away from the farmers of Ontario alone a revenue of probably $2,000,000 per annum, because Ontario is the seed grower, none

of the other provinces, scarcely, grow seed at all. I am speaking now of grass and clover seeds. There are other gentlemen here prepared to deal with the cereal question better than I am.

I do not profess to be an expert in the grain trade, but I am able to say that this is going to raise the price of seed grain. One gentleman, before the committee the other day devoted his attention to that question, but it has not appeared in this discussion at all. He said that many farms in this country would remain unseeded if the Bill was carried in its present shape, because seed grain of a certain quality cannot be obtained at all times. Are you going to risk having land remain unseeded because the quality cannot be obtained that the hon. gentleman requires ? In the Northwest alone it will cause grave injury. Many of these men live in remote districts, hundreds of miles from the Northwest seedsmen, and are you going to make it impossible for them to get seed in their own neighbourhood ? Because you are going to knock that man out of business that has been supplying him with seed. How is that man in the Northwest, or New Ontario, hundreds of miles removed from seedsmen, going to get his seed ? It is impossible. The minister makes provision that these samples shall be sent to a laboratory. This Bill says that seeds shall be tested during a period of from one to four weeks before they can tell all the seeds that will germinate. I prefer to accept the expert testimony of the best agriculturists in Great Britain, headed by Lord Onslow as chairman, to the testimony of hon. gentlemen opposite. Hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to swallow this Bill without knowing what it means. They say, don't discuss it. I say if this Bill is what the minister claims it to be, it will stand full discussion at the hands of this committee. Let the hon. gentleman name, if he can, any country in the world that has as drastic legislation as is proposed here. I asked him to do that, and he has not answered my question. I want him to name any country on the face of the earth that has the same drastic legislation. We all want to get rid of weeds, all kinds of weeds ; but are you going to lay the whole onus of the weed question on the seed dealer or the seed grower ? Look at your waysides, every road way in the whole country is marred with weeds. There is a law against it, but the neighbour who takes the trouble to cut weeds on his own side of the roadway and in the fence corners, is obliged to stand the flood of weed seeds that come to him by every wind that blows from the farm of his neighbour, who is less careful. There is a law already on the statute book against nuisances of that kind. Still, the hon. gentleman comes against the seedsmen and the grower. This is going to hit the grower. The farmer who grows seed is going to be the hardest hit of any. It is going to hit every one who plants seed, because you are hedging around his source of supply a measure that will enhance the price of seed to such an extent that he will not be able to pay for it. It will put up the price of clover seed $1 or $2 per bushel, because no man can afford to sell on the margin he is selling for at present and take the risk of the fines imposed by this Bill. Is it in the interest of agriculture that clover seed should be made a dear article ? There is no seed so necessary to the agriculturist as clover seed, it is the best manure that can be furnished to his fields, and it is the easiest provided, and if he cannot get that seed cheaply, he will be unable to keep his land in that state of fertility that it should be kept.

Now, I contend that if the minister has the confidence in his Bill that he says he has, he should submit it to a committee, who can hear the farmers and others interested. Let them examine expert evidence from all sides. I am willing to have the farmers represented, I represent a large number of farmers myself, and I trust I am doing that quite as well as the hon. gentleman from Wellington (Mr. T. Martin). I have spoken to several farmers in my county about it, and they said : 'We have the utmost confidence in your judgment on that question, go ahead and say what you like about the Bill.' I told them that I had put myself on record against that exemption clause, and not one of them objected. I have sent this Bill to some farmers and some dealers, and I have yet to hear from any one a single objection against what I said. A statement was printed in the 'Globe,' and it was a gross misrepresentation, that I had endeavoured to put it on the farmers of my neighbourhood, and still I have not had a single protest from the farmers I represent. If that is the case, I think I am justified in saying that I have endeavoured to speak on this Bill in the interest of all concerned. If, I say, the hon. gentleman has that confidence in his Bill that he claims to have, if it is as good as he says it is, and he thinks it will stand the test, let him submit it to a committee, and if that committee says the Bill is right my mouth will be sealed for evermore as far as opposing it is concerned. But in the meantime I am here to tell the minister that he has got a most imperfect Bill, a most drastic Bill, a Bill without a parallel in any civilized country in the world, so far as we know, and that if he makes it law, it will be a great injury to the farmers whom he professes to be catering to, and indirectly to the dealers, of whom I am one, and whom I am endeavouring to represent here as well as the growers. Now let the hon. gentleman submit his Bill to a committee of members of both parties, and if they approve of it just as it is, I am willing to let it go through just as it is.

But I tell the minister again that when that deputation went away the other day it was with the understanding that he was going to reverse that clause. I would like the minister to say whether or not he or his deputy did give that deputation to understand that he was going to do that. He said, as far as I understood him, that he would do it; and I was told by one of those who formed part of that deputation that he understood it was going to be done. I am not here to mention names, but I was told this by an hon. gentleman sitting on the other side of the House, and I believe he spoke the truth when he said he believed this particular clause was going to be reversed. But the minister now comes down and says that he will stand by it, he will die in the ditch with it rather than change it, it is going through just as it is. If he does that, he will wrong that deputation, he will wrong the gentlemen who went away with that impression, and who would be here again to-day to press upon the minister the injustice of this Bill if they supposed it was not going to be revised. I believe the Postmaster General himself knows something about this Bill, I believe he has been seen about it; why does he not speak? I know that some gentlemen waited on him, why does not the Postmaster General say what he knows about it? Where is our hon. friend from Centre York (Mr. Campbell)? He knows something about the objections to this Bill. Where are these gentlemen, and why don't they stand up now? Are they going to be so hide bound that they will swallow a Bill that is going to do an immense injustice to the trade, to the growers, to the agriculturists of this country? Are they simply going to bolt it down because it is a party measure, instead of threshing it out and making it a credit to the country and to parliament? I trust that the minister will take into consideration all these grave objections that have been made to his Bill, and revise it along the lines that they point out.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will this Bill apply to seed that is intended for export?

Mr. FISHER. The main part of section 3 would apply except as modified by an amendment which I propose to add to section 7. The Bill as it stands now, I think, applies to all sales of seed within the boundaries of Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It applies to more than that, does it not?

Mr. FISHER. It would apply also to any seed held for sale in the Dominion of Canada, whether for export or not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to know what the hon. minister's amendment is before we leave this section.

Mr. FISHER. After section 7, which my hon. friend will see provides for certain exemptions from the provisions of the Act, I propose to add a clause 'd':

Seed marked as screenings and held or sold for export only.

By the first section of section 7, as my hon. friend will see, the provisions of the Act will not apply to this class of seed. The seedsmen say that they would like to sell abroad the refuse which they could not sell in Canada under this Bill. Any seed which is sold to the foreign markets as Canadian seed would have to live up to the provisions of this Bill, but if they can find a market abroad for this class of goods, and if it is sold as screenings, I am willing that it should be exported, and therefore I am adding this amendment; otherwise the Act would apply to seed either sold for export or held for export.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not rise to offer any opposition to the Bill; I do not claim to be a sufficient judge of what would be required; but I would like to know whether I properly understood the minister when he was speaking with reference to the deputation which waited upon him. It appears that they had certain samples of seed which they showed to the minister, and which were placed under test. The minister, as I understood, said this afternoon that all of these seeds were such as could be sold under this Act, with the exception of one sample. I simply rise to ask if I correctly understood the minister.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, except that they were not shown to me, but were taken to the laboratory and examined by the officer of the department in the laboratory. I did not myself personally see them at all.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, then, it seems to me that there is not that very great demand for this measure that I at first thought there was. That is all the opinion I have to express about it.

Mr. JOHN HERRON (Alberta). There is one feature of this Bill of which I am somewhat afraid. I believe the Bill is honestly intended to benefit the farmers of this country, but I believe that its effect will be just the opposite, owing to the creation of a monopoly. For instance, in an outlying district, say in Alberta, where I live, you will have a large settlement and a small town in which there are three or four merchants dealing in seed. You will, under present conditions, have good opposition among them, and every one consequently gets seeds at a reasonable price. Supposing that this Act comes into operation, and that there is only one merchant in the town able to put in a plant capable of cleaning

the seed and extracting the noxious weed seeds. Will that not throw the business into the hands of one man, who will have the advantage of a monopoly, while the farmers will have to pay more than they otherwise would, and will not its evil effect in this way be greater as against the interests of the farmers in general than the evils arising under the present system? There is another feature of the Bill to which I would call attention. A farmer will get a small price for his seed grain. Many farmers make considerable money by selling seed grain of a fairly good sample, but if this law takes effect they will be afraid to sell this as clean grain, and therefore they will be compelled under the law to sell it to the one merchant who has the machinery for cleaning it. In that way, the control of the whole seed trade of the district will pass into that man's hands, and this will be an injury to the farmers.

Mr. FISHER. I think the usual competition of trade would obtain there as elsewhere. I am not familiar with the conditions in the district of my hon. friend (Mr. Herron), but I think probably agencies would be established almost immediately for the sale of seeds by the larger seed merchants of Winnipeg and other places in the western country or in Ontario, who are already selling seed pretty largely all over the Dominion. I think that the demands of trade and competition would rectify such a condition.

Mr. BOYCE. How does the minister expect to enforce or carry into operation the provisions of this Act? Does he expect to appoint inspectors throughout the farming districts of Canada, or by what machinery does he propose to render effective the so-called drastic provisions of this Act?

Mr. FISHER. I suppose my hon. friend was not in the House when I explained that before?

Mr. BOYCE. I was not.

Mr. FISHER. In the first place, any one who is aggrieved can take out an action; the Bill provides a penalty, &c. In the second place, I have a certain staff who are engaged in the seed laboratory in the investigation of the seed conditions all over the country. This staff to-day is composed of the chief of the division and, I think, five men under him. During the winter season, and I think most of the time, these officials work in the laboratory, some of them would all the time. But during the summer I have had one of them in the Northwest, one in Ontario, one in Quebec and one in the maritime provinces, investigating the conditions of the seed trade. If any circumstances arose which indicated a violation of the law, and it appeared that there was no action taken by individuals, I would consider it the duty of these men to try and enforce it; but I have no desire or intention to appoint a corps or staff of inspectors over the country, and I do not think it is at all necessary. I am satisfied that the passage of this Act, and the knowledge of the fact in the minds of the people engaged in this trade, will bring about the results which the Act is intended to secure.

Mr. BOYCE. Do I understand the minister to say that beyond the staff he now has, he will not require to appoint any officers for the enforcement of the provisions of this Act, nor will he ask for any appropriation for that purpose?

Mr. FISHER. I do not expect to do so. I cannot of course tell what developments may take place, and cannot bind myself with regard to the future; but so far as the appointment of inspectors under the Act is concerned, I do not intend to ask for any appropriation for that purpose this session.

Mr. CARVELL. I have listened to the discussion this afternoon on this question, and, while not a practical farmer, I represent a farming constituency, and I have observed that the discussion has been nearly altogether from the standpoint of the seed merchant and to some extent from the standpoint of the province of Ontario. I have heard two or three speeches from gentlemen from the west, but not a word as yet from the maritime provinces. I would therefore like to discuss this measure for a few moments from the standpoint of a maritime member, and one of the representatives of the maritime farmers. I can assure you that there is no question of so much importance to the maritime farmers to-day as the seed question. We have attempted for some years to improve the quality of the seeds we have to use. We cannot tell why, but it is a fact that we do not raise our own grass seeds to any great extent in the maritime provinces. We are compelled to purchase them mostly from the province of Ontario, and it seems almost impossible for a farmer to get a good quality of grass seeds. He can prepare his land for a crop of wheat or any other grain, and the crop will be fairly free from weeds; but the next year after he uses Ontario grass seed, he will probably have more sorrel in his crop than timothy or clover. Our farmers have taken various courses in their efforts to overcome this difficulty. They have banded themselves together in societies and have imported the seed direct; our merchants have tried to get good seed for them; but no matter what we do, it seems impossible to get good results. Now, it seems to me that this Bill is exactly in the right direction. It has been described here this afternoon, I think by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), as a drastic measure; I think he almost went so far as to say it was vicious legislation, and he did say that it was

legislation unprecedented in the annals of any civilized country. Well, Sir, if this Bill will be the means of overcoming some of the difficulties under which the farmers of this country are suffering in connection with the purchase of their grass seed, then Canada will have the distinction of being the first civilized country which has tried to grapple with this question. I cannot see any difficulty in the way of working it out. It seems to me that it would be nonsense to appoint a staff of inspectors to enforce the Act. If it is going to be useful to the farmers, they will find the means of working it out. If it become law, we in the province of New Brunswick will do so, whether they will in the province of Ontario or not. We will simply get some farmer to take a sample of the grass seed which he has purchased from his local merchant, and have it tested, and if it does not come up to the requirements, we will lay an information against the local merchant and see where the trouble is. You may say that this will be a hardship on an innocent merchant. By no means, because by subsection 2 of section 8, if the merchant be able to show that the package has not been broken, and that he has purchased it in good faith, and gives the name of the merchant in Montreal or Toronto from whom he has bought the seed, the onus will fall back upon the latter.

Mr. BOYCE. But the farmer is mulcted in the costs of the transaction.

Mr. CARVELL. What would the costs amount to? Perhaps a couple of dollars in the police court.

Mr. GANONG. And the cost of hiring a ten-dollar lawyer.

Mr. BOYCE. Whatever they are, he has to pay them.

Mr. CARVELL. I appreciate the solicitude which my hon. friends have for the poor farmer, especially the solicitude of my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) for the farmer who gets into the hands of the lawyers. When the farmer gets into trouble, he is the first man who goes to a lawyer for protection. If the merchant who sells the seed has violated the Act, then he is the man who should pay the penalty. Now, the trend of opinion seems to be that this Bill does not go far enough, because it does not make the farmer liable. That would be a hardship, because he cannot supply himself with the plant necessary to separate the seeds, which costs from $800 to $1,000. But he can go to a seed merchant, who is in a position to supply the plant and have the seeds properly examined; and if the seed merchant will not take the trouble to have the seeds properly examined, and palms them off on the country as pure seed, then he is the man who should pay the costs. It seems to me that no injustice will be done to anybody, but that great benefit will be done to the farmer who purchases seed, and in the end we shall have better seed and better agriculture. Therefore in my humble opinion this legislation is in the proper direction and should pass this House.

Mr. WALSH. Before this section passes, I would like to ask for a little information. I am not going to say that I am a farmer, like some hon. gentlemen who have spoken, and who remind me of a man who, at a meeting, said that he was a farmer. The man who spoke after him said that that was not necessary, as one only required to look at him to see that he was a farmer. He said it reminded him of a story of a man who boasted of having been brought up on the farm. 'In fact,' he said, 'I have been nurtured between two hills of corn;' and an old gentleman in the front seat spoke up and said, 'A pumpkin, begosh.' Before I discuss the Bill, I want to bring to the attention of the hon. minister a remark which he made, and which I am sure I only need to bring to his attention to have him withdraw. One speaker made a comparison between selling a horse and selling seed, and the minister said that the man who sold seed was an honourable man, thereby implying that the man who sold a horse was not. In my constituency we deal largely in horses, and I believe the farmers there are thoroughly honest. They make as much money out of selling horses as they do out of selling grass seed, because they do not deal in grass seed. The minister told us that the Bill does not require the farmer to give a certificate of the seed he sells, because he is not in a position to say whether the seed is pure or not; but, on the other hand, he tells us that the farmer who buys from his neighbour is protected because he knows the kind of seed his neighbour is growing. If the man who owns the farm does not know whether his seed is pure or not, how can his neighbour? The discussion has hinged principally on grass and clover seed. That does not apply to the farmers in my section, because they do not grow it. We are more interested in cereals. We have flat land surrounding the river, which grows grain and, back of that rising ground which is good for pasture; but they do not gow sufficient grain to feed the stock which the dairy industry requires. I give the minister credit for being a great help in the way of introducing silos and other improvements, but I am not quite sure about the effect of this Bill. If a man from the highlands comes down to the level to buy seed grain, I understand the minister to say that the farmer from whom he buys is not bound to give a certificate that that grain is pure unless he is asked to do so. But if he is asked to do so and is not in a position to give such a certificate, then he loses the sale of his seed. I am not making any factious oppo-

sition, but would be glad to join hands with the hon. minister in doing anything which would curtail the sale of impure seeds, but I would like to be in a position to know whether this measure is workable.

Mr. FISHER. This section relieves the farmer from responsibility if he sells seed on his own premises, which he raised himself, to another farmer who intends using it himself and does not intend selling it again. The buyer will have to use his own judgment, and if he has any doubt about the seed, he can ask that it be sold to him subject to the provisions of this Bill.

On section 8—penalties; liability of purchaser in good faith; report by magistrate.

Mr. FISHER. I beg to move, in amendment to this clause, that it read: 'Shall be liable, for the first offence, not exceeding $1, and each subsequent offence not exceeding $5, together with the cost of prosecution, for each receptacle, package, sack or bag, but the total amount of the fine in the case of a first offence shall not exceed $5 and, in the case of a second, $25.' I am making these modifications to meet the representations of the seedsmen, who complain that in certain circumstances a very heavy penalty might be imposed, altogether out of proportion to the offence, if the clause were not modified. The infliction of a penalty is not so much what is desired as a deterrent, as the exposure of bad seed and conduct contrary to law.

Mr. BOYCE. I would suggest to the hon. minister the insertion in the second line of section 8, after the word 'person' the word 'knowingly.' That would considerably minimize the harshness of this penal clause. It would also carry out the idea of the minister, who has expressed the desire that this measure might, while being made effective, bear as lightly as possible in the way of penalties. A reading of the penal sections will show that it is quite within the range of probability that some farmer, unacquainted with the working of the law, might have his ignorance taken advantage of by those anxious to avail themselves of a literal construction of the Act. Therefore, I think it would be only just that the penalties should be enforced only in clear cases of a wilful infraction of the law.

Mr. FISHER. I think the introduction of that word would make the prosecution for violation of the Act altogether too difficult. The second part of this clause provides machinery by which a person who has been selling impure seeds may throw the responsibility back on the person who supplied him, if he has been acting innocently or through inadvertence. But, if we were obliged to prove that the Act was wilful and with knowledge in all instances, we would leave the door open to carelessness; and I think that one of the most important effects of this Act will be to make those who are dealing in seeds careful of what they do. It is true that such a case as my hon. friend mentions might arise, but I think the magistrate has sufficient latitude in his judgment and the fines and penalties are so low that it would not work any practical hardship at all.

Mr. BOYCE. I would point out that this is peculiarly a case where a guilty knowledge should be made essential to a successful prosecution. We have many offences in our code in which the word 'knowingly' is the very essence of the offence. Surely in this case, having regard to the peculiar wording of sections 3, 4 and 6 this would be an important word to insert. Take the case to which the minister refers. Under subsection 2 of section 8, if the accused proves to the magistrate that the package was purchased directly from a seed merchant domiciled in Canada and not opened, and the state of the seed not altered while in his possession, and that he had no reason to believe—that is, was without a guilty knowledge—that the seed did not comply with the provisions of the Act, he throws the responsibility back upon the person from which he purchased it. But though we find his innocence may protect this man to a certain extent, it does not make him free from having the conviction recorded against him and being mulcted in the costs of prosecution. If the word 'knowingly' or the word 'wilfully' be inserted, it would render it difficult—justly difficult—to obtain a conviction.

Mr. SPROULE. In what position would a clerk in a seedsman's store be who sold impure seed while innocently acting as the agent of another?

Mr. FISHER. Section 9 provides for that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the minister had under consideration the advisability of making provision for different fines in proportion to the quantity of seed involved. As has been pointed out, the word 'receptacle' is very comprehensive. The receptacle may contain bushels of seed. To impose a fine of $1 for having that quantity of foul seed on hand, and a similar fine for having in possession the smallest package that did not come up to the requirements of the statute seems hardly reasonable. It may be difficult to cover this point; I think perhaps it would be; but the legislation as it stands seems somewhat incongruous.

Mr. FISHER. The fine is not fixed; it is only provided that it shall not exceed one dollar. The case my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) has in mind I suppose, is where an inspector, entering a premises, finds seed not up to the requirements of the law held for sale. I think it is not usual for a seedsman to sell a bin full of seed. The seed is generally put up in bags or

receptacles of some kind. I should think 'receptacles' means a bin or barrel or whatever it may be in which the seed is held in the store. The prosecution for holding seed for sale contrary to the Act would not be very common, I take it. I think it would hardly be well to provide a multiplicity of penalties.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is desirable to have it as simple as possible in the first instance. There is one other point. The man who has purchased and who sells in good faith may be put to the costs of a prosecution, although absolutely innocent. He escapes in part by throwing the responsibility back on the party from whom he purchased. But how are you going to work that out and get at the guilty party? The name of the person who sold him the seed is sent forward with the date of the sale. But I do not understand how the minister intends to deal with the question of punishing the original seller. Does he intend to have prosecutions originated by the department?

Mr. FISHER. I think that would be a proper case for the department to take up. And that is why subsection 3 requires that a report of every case be sent to the department. Still, that does not affect in any way the person who is attacked. Supposing he is a country dealer who has been attacked under the law by a farmer. The dealer proves that he is not guilty. He can himself proceed against the person who sold the seed, and the proof he submitted in his own defence would help in proving that the person who sold him the seed was guilty. His reputation would suffer unless he defended himself. My idea is that in cases of that kind the department would take up the case, and I provide machinery giving more time in such cases than is provided under the Summary Convictions Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is not likely the dealer could be re-imbursed himself. The man who sold the seed might be liable civilly——

Mr. FISHER. That would be outside of this Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The original seller might live a thousand miles away and in another province, and it would hardly be worth while, for the small costs to which the dealer would be subjected to enter an action. What I intended to suggest was that the Act will fall altogether short of its object if you simply permit the innocent dealer to be subject to some punishment in the shape of the costs of prosecution, and let go free the man who is absolutely responsible in the first instance.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. Will that apply to garden seeds ?

Mr. FISHER. No. The hon. gentleman will see that by this section it applies to seeds of cereals, grasses, clover or forage plant.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. I have listened with a good deal of interest to this discussion, and I must confess that I am considerably at sea with regard to the probable outcome of the Act. I know there are a number of practical farmers in this House, gentlemen who probably have a practical knowledge of this subject, and I do not see any good reason why the minister should be unwilling to refer this Bill to the Committee on Agriculture of which they form a part. The very case which is now before the House is one which that committee is well fitted to deal with, and if they are not competent to deal with questions of this kind, they might as well be disbanded. Now we have a number of practical farmers on the floor of the House who have given their views on this subject, and we also have what are called gentleman farmers, farmers that have probably never done any farm work at all except a little milking in the very early part of their lives.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. Now, Sir, there are many difficulties in the way of this legislation. Of course I am in favour of anything that will be of general assistance to the farmers, but on principle, I am opposed to class legislation. I have watched its effect with regard to many other things, and I do not know that I have ever seen any good come out of it. If it could be shown that some good would come out of this legislation, I would be glad to support it, and to do all in my power to make it workable. But I am a little doubtful about it. I have tried to think out what its probable results would be, and from what practical knowledge of farming I have, having been raised on a farm, and having also some knowledge of the grain and seed business, I see many difficulties in the way. There will be many cases where men will be mulcted in costs, if not in fines, without any intention or knowledge of doing anything wrong, even though they are the most careful men in the world. It seems to me it is placing the burden of proof on the seedsmen. You tell them to keep a record of sales they have made of seeds at any time to farmers. That is one of the difficulties I foresee. You know how difficult it is to keep track of seeds which you have in a store. Suppose you have bags of various kinds of seeds sitting in a row, and a person comes along and puts his hand into the bag and takes a handful and looks at it, and then he goes along and does the same in another bag. How easy it would be for him to transfer seeds from one bag into another. I have seen that done, and if this Bill passes men

can be fined for having this seed in possession. I believe that inside of five years, if this legislation passes, it will become obsolete, it will become a dead letter on the statute-book, deader than that old horse, thirty-two years old, that was in Queen's Park, Toronto.

Mr. BOYCE. I would again call upon the minister to consider with that leniency which he desires to show towards men prosecuted under the main clause of section 8 and the concluding words of subsection 2, some amendment; I would urge him to take into consideration an amendment striking out all the works after 'liable' in the second last line of that subsection, and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'to be convicted.' Then it would read that in the case of a local agent who innocently receives from a merchant domiciled in Canada, closed packages and retains them in his possession, and sells them in good faith, without opening them; and having no reason to believe that they did not comply with the provisions of the Act, he would not be liable to a penalty, but would be immune from prosecution. What lesser justice could be accorded to the local dealer? And why should the local dealer be held responsible under these conditions for any costs at all, or for any penalty in the shape of costs? I have in view places in my own constituency where distances are very great, where means of communication are very difficult, and where, if a prosecution was urged under this subsection against the local dealer, he would be involved in serious costs. The prosecution mentioned in subsection 2 to which he would be subjected for the reason mentioned in the closing words, would render him immune from any conviction. Then if he be held not responsible by reason of the disclosure of those facts referred to in the subsection, why should he be visited with a large amount of costs, both the costs of prosecution, the costs of the magistrate, and the costs of his own solicitor, involving also, in a country sparsely settled, travelling expenses and so forth, though he is not under the Act guilty of any offence? I fail to see why this clause is inserted if it is not meant to render the person charged under these conditions entirely immune from any penalty. I fail to see why, if he is to be mulcted in the costs of a prosecution and called to pay his own costs, he should not be guilty of some offence under the Act. It would follow as a matter of course that because he has to pay some portion of the costs there must be a record against him for infraction of the Act, at any rate to that extent, that he was guilty of some offence. But the Act declares he is not guilty of any offence, which things are an anomaly.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman has mistaken the case a little. The individual who is protected by this section is guilty.

Mr. BOYCE. Of what?

Mr. FISHER. Of selling seeds that did not conform to the provisions of the law. He has been prosecuted by a purchaser who is innocent and who has been defrauded, who has suffered a wrong. This section allows the party who has been guilty to show that he was not intentionally guilty, or that his guilt is due to the guilt of somebody else, and therefore he is only to be liable to the cost of prosecution. If he was not able to show that, he was not intentionally guilty, or that his guilt was due to the guilt of somebody else, he would be punished under the rest of section 8.

Mr. BOYCE. It would cost him a dollar more if convicted.

Mr. FISHER. Possibly, and possibly more than a dollar more, that depends upon the case. But if the hon. gentleman's amendment were adopted the innocent purchaser who has been defrauded, who has been cheated, would have to go and pay the costs of prosecution. I think the person who has been doing what is contemplated in this Act, though not intentionally perhaps, had better pay those costs than the innocent party who has been cheated by the operation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is some force in what the hon. minister has observed, but after all it comes down to the question as to whether or not in the practical selling of seeds in this country it is a reasonable thing that dealers should open every package and test it before they sell it. I would think that not to be reasonable although I do not know very much about the trade. I would consider that altogether an unreasonable requirement. If a local dealer has purchased from a firm of good repute, seed in packages and has sold the packages as he received them, should he be held to be guilty of an offence? Did not the hon. gentleman have legislation upon these lines two or three years ago in connection with apples or some other commodities and was not this very question considered then?

Mr. FISHER. There is no provision in the Fruit Marks Act which would give the protection to the local dealer which is here given.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the question was discussed.

Mr. FISHER. It may have been but there certainly is no such provision.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems to me an unreasonable thing to require the local dealer to do this.

Mr. FISHER. The view I take is this: If the local dealer were to be entirely immune in every respect and be relieved of all responsibilities he would not be tempted to take any great care as to the kind of seeds

he was dealing in. He now knows that he is subject to prosecution. He may relieve himself of the penalties by certain proof but at the same time he knows that he may suffer somewhat. One of the best safeguards we can have is that the individual shall do his best to get the right kind of goods from the wholesaler and deal in them. I do not think that this result of his doing what is contrary to the law is too great an infliction to induce him to do his very best to get the best seeds. If he does try his best to get seeds that come within the provisions of this law I think he can succeed. I cannot see how it would be fair or right that the purchaser should have to pay the cost of the prosecution. I do not know of any other alternative.

Mr. BOYCE. May I ask the hon. gentleman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BOYCE. I think hon. gentlemen might treat a young member of the House with some little courtesy. I was going to ask the hon. minister for information. How can the local dealer, under the conditions stated by him, protect himself? For instance, if a local dealer, as is often the case, receives a large number of packages, smaller packages and larger packages together, from the wholesale seed merchant, would he be compelled in order to render himself immune from the prosecution and his lawyer's costs for his defence to open every one of the packages before he sold them and if he did not open every one of the five hundred or a thousand packages would he have to take the risk of at least paying the cost of his own prosecution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Subsection 2.

Mr. TAYLOR. We want an answer from the hon. minister.

Mr. BOYCE. I would ask the hon. minister for an answer. I was merely seeking for information.

Mr. FISHER. As a matter of fact the retail dealer ought to take every precaution possible to protect himself and to see that the seeds he buys are up to the provisions of the law. He can take his sample of the seeds the moment he receives them.

Mr. BOYCE. Then he must open the package?

Mr. FISHER. No, excuse me. The hon. gentleman is not familiar with the methods of the trade. He can take a sample without opening the package.

Mr. BOYCE. I am not a farmer.

Mr. FISHER. No, the hon. gentleman is not a farmer, but he is like a good many other hon. gentlemen who talk about farming.

Mr. BOYCE. I have not been talking farming.

Mr. FISHER. No, I admit the hon. gentleman has not been posing as a friend of the farmer, but he has been acting as the friend of the dealers and seedsmen. The samples can be taken by means of a little sampler which is commonly known and which, I believe, costs 25 cents, without breaking the seal of the package. Most retail dealers buy their seeds in large sacks and sell again not in the sealed package. The sealed package trade which is just beginning, which I hope will increase and which the country dealer ought to encourage in every way will still enable the country dealer to take a sample and know what he is buying before he sells the seeds. He will have to present the proof if he is attacked. I doubt very much if he would be attacked if he showed the purchaser a sample of what he had bought.

Mr. BOYCE. Would it be an excuse ?

Mr. FISHER. What?

Mr. BOYCE. He may not be attacked, but would it render him liable to attack?

Mr. FISHER. He might be attacked under the provisions of the law.

On subsection 3, of section 8,—report by magistrate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You do not seem to have any way of enforcing that third clause which is very important.

Mr. FISHER. I think it can be enforced now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Under the general law?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, and under clause 16.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. minister did not refer to what was said by my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. William Wright) in regard to one matter. What is his objection to allowing the Bill to be considered by the Committee on Agriculture as it is a matter that affects the farmers very closely? Is there any serious oojection to it ?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think that at this stage of the Bill it is at all advisable that we should refer it to another committee. The subject has been threshed out in the House over and over again. This Bill has already been before this committee ; this is after all the Committee of the whole House and I do not see any possible object in referring it to a special committee or the committee on Agriculture. The question has been discussed and threshed out. It is being dealt with here where the opinions of everybody are on record and where they will be known and criticised and dealt with. I see no object except delay and I cannot

see any object in delay by referring it to any committee.

Mr. SPROULE. We have sent other Bills of a similar character to that committee—the Bill for marking packages of butter and cheese and I think the Fruit Marks Bill.

Mr. FISHER. Not the Fruit Marks Act.

Mr. SPROULE. Perhaps not, but we certainly do that because I remember bringing parties before the committee and taking their evidence and the committee making a report to this House. The only difficulty in dealing with the Bill in the Committee of the whole House is that no outsider can come before the committee and give evidence. These deputations may go before the minister but they cannot come before the members of this House and present their case nor can you ask such question from them as you would desire to bring out the information. We have the power to bring them before the committee to take evidence and to report to this House and it seems to me to be the proper place to bring it. The minister treats that with silent contempt.

Mr. FISHER. No I have answered my hon. friend.

Mr. SPROULE. I was in this House when the Agricultural Committee was first established and the chief argument in its favour was that you would have a committee amongst whom were the agriculturists of this House, before whom you could bring these matters and they could discuss them among themselves, bring experts before them and take such evidence as they might desire. Now we ignore the committee and say that we will not avail ourselves of the committee or allow the farmers or seedsmen to come before the committee, but force it through the House as a government measure.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend's suggestion might have some force if the matter was new, but it has been discussed and discussed and discussed, and every one has had opportunities of making representations. I was going to say that the Bill had been in the hands of those concerned for years; certainly the principle has been before them for years, and I cannot believe it is necessary to delay the passing of the Bill any longer, and can only regard the suggestion to refer it to the Committee on Agriculture as a blind to prevent the passage of the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not the design by any means, and I repeat that the minister is dishonouring the committee. He says that the case of those who are interested in the Bill is presented, but it is all presented at second hand, as they cannot come before the House or say a word.

Mr. WALSH. How would this section apply to seeds bought anywhere except in Canada?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know that it would.

Mr. WALSH. A man buying seed in good faith would be liable to penalties without any recourse.

Mr. FISHER. It would be well for him to buy his seed in Canada.

Mr. WALSH. What about free corn for seed purposes?

Mr. FISHER. Free corn is for feeding purposes.

Mr. WALSH. For seeding purposes too.

On section 10—examination of seeds; payments of samples; penalty for preventing examination.

Mr. FISHER. Objection is taken to this clause in that it is supposed that an officer might enter the premises of some party who is holding seed and not intending to sell it. I have therefore inserted the words——

In respect of which he has reason to believe that any of the provisions of this Act are being violated.

Mr. LENNOX. Where do they come in?

Mr. FISHER. After the fourth line of the section before 'are on the premises.' I submitted the matter to the Department of Justice who said that the insertion of these words would limit and restrict the officers to cases where they believed the provisions of the law were being violated.

Mr. LENNOX. So far as those words are concerned it seems to me they are the usual words and they would meet the point.

Mr. SPROULE. Is any one specially charged with the enforcement of this Act?

Mr. FISHER. A person could only be charged with the enforcement of the Act by Order in Council.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the minister to say that no person was to be appointed?

Mr. FISHER. I said that I would authorize some or all of the present officers of the department now engaged in the seed branch to be the officers to act in such cases as are contemplated under this section.

Mr. SPROULE. But there would be no inspector?

Mr. FISHER. There would not be an inspector appointed.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose that a case is reported from Manitoba, who would be responsible for the carrying on of the prosecution?

Mr. FISHER. I suppose the sample of seed would be sent down by some one in Manitoba who was complaining. He could take out the prosecution himself if he chose or the department might consider that the

circumstances of the case were such that it would be proper and right for the department to intervene. But that would be only in exceptional cases.

Mr. FOSTER. Then they would have to bring the case in Manitoba ?

Mr. FISHER. That would be covered by section 16.

Mr. SPROULE. How would you present to the court satisfactory and conclusive evidence of the analysis ?

Mr. FISHER. Section 15 would cover that.

On section 11—samples to be sent to official seed analyst.

Mr. LENNOX. I think the minister will amend this section ; it is the one to which the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) called attention. The hon. member for North Toronto pointed out that it should be changed something on the line of the alteration just made in section 10, that is to say, if the person had good ground for belief or something of that kind. That must commend itself to the minister and I think he so expressed himself the other day.

Mr. FISHER. This is only in regard to the taking of the sample and he could not enter into the premises. Section 10 empowers him to enter into the premises and that is limited by the words I have inserted there.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not think this is consistent with what the minister has done in the other section.

Mr. FOSTER. If you insert the words 'or has good reason to suspect', that will make it responsible.

Mr. FISHER. I am quite willing to accept that.

Mr. LENNOX. You use the word 'believe' in the section above and the word 'suspect' in this section. It seems to me that both sections should have the same wording.

Mr. FISHER. I think it is all right.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the minister prefer to retain the word 'suspect' ?

Mr. FISHER. I think so.

Mr. SPROULE. In this section you say that the informant or complainant shall take a sample, not purchase. By what authority shall he take it ? Suppose the party refuses to give it to him ?

Mr. FISHER. I think clause 10 covers that.

Mr. SPROULE. Clause 10 refers to any person charged with the enforcement of this Act ; but clause 11 refers to any person who may desire to purchase seed and who may suspect that it is not up to the requirements of the Act. It provides that he shall take a sample and forward it for analysis ; but there is no provision to enforce that, if the party refuses to give him a sample.

Mr. FISHER. The Act is not violated until the purchase is made ; and if the informant or complainant makes complaint, he can take a sample from what he has purchased, because it is his own. But under section 10 the inspector has the authority to enter upon the premises of the seller and take a sample on payment.

Mr. SPROULE. If the only party charged with the responsibility of enforcement resided at Ottawa, and the seed suspected were in Manitoba, then it could only be taken for analysis through a complainant. He might not want to buy the seed, but he might be satisfied that it was impure.

Mr. FISHER. If he suspected it, he could easily purchase a small quantity and from that take a sample. I do not think it would be well to give an ordinary complainant the power to go into another man's premises and take a sample or force the other man to give him a sample of the seed he is handling. Section 10 gives that power to the inspector appointed to enforce the Act, but does not extend it to anybody else.

Mr. SPROULE. You say that he shall do a thing which he has no power to do. You do not say that he shall purchase it, but you say that he shall take it, and take it in the presence of two witnesses. Now, the hon. minister admits that he cannot do that. That was the contention we made before, that the party might not be willing to give up the seed.

Mr. BARKER. The objection to clause 11 is that any busybody or meddler may go to a seed merchant and insist on taking a sample.

Mr. FISHER. He has no power to do so.

Mr. BARKER : What are the words ? 'Any inspector, informant or complainant who finds or suspects seeds to be sold,' shall take a sample. Why not adopt the words in the previous section : 'any person charged with the enforcement of this Act' ?

Mr. FISHER. There is nothing there that gives any person the power to do that. Section 10 confers that power upon the inspector alone, but section 11 does not confer it upon anybody. That means simply that they shall take a sample when they have the control over the seed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friends may laugh, but I think that is all the power that

is given there. If they have not the control over the seed, they cannot take it; but if they have control over it, this section provides that they shall take it in a certain way.

Mr. SPROULE. They would not complain of their own seed.

Mr. FISHER. Excuse me. If I buy some seed from a dealer, that is my seed. If I find that it is fraudulent, I take a sample of it and complain of it.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose you do not want to buy ?

Mr. FISHER. Then I may ask the seller to give me some. The inspector has power to go and take a sample, but other people have not.

Mr. BOYCE. But under this section they would have the power.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think so. I think they have only the power to take the sample where they have control of the seed or where the seller chooses to give them a sample.

Mr. BOYCE. The wording of the section is only capable, according to my reading of the English language, of one construction, and that is, that the inspector—who is the one who corresponds with the person charged with the enforcement of this Act under section 10—and the informant or complainant—or in other words, any person in the neighbourhood who may make himself busy enough to complain that some one has been guilty of an infraction of the Act, must take a sample from the seeds in question. He is compelled to take the sample because the word 'shall' is used and not the word 'may,' and that sample must be submitted for analysis in the manner provided by section 12.

Mr. ALCORN. It is evident that the section is not confined to the case put by the minister. The words 'or offered, exposed or had in possession' cannot mean exposed or had in possession by the intending purchaser. They must refer to the dealer. The words are 'or offered, exposed or had in possession for sale.' Therefore, the informant or complainant has to take a sample from that seed while it is in the possession of another person. It is evidently not in his own possession. Section 10 gives the inspector the right to take a sample, but section 11 extends that right to some other classes of persons. It says 'any inspector, informant or complainant.' Any one of these men has the right to take a sample if he finds or suspects that seeds are put for sale, or are offered for sale in contravention of the law, or exposed or had in possession for sale; but evidently they must be put up or offered for sale, or exposed or had in possession for sale, by some one else than the complainant. It cannot be their own seed, but the seed of somebody else of which they want a sample. It would be absurd to suppose otherwise.

Mr. FISHER. I do not propose to give an opinion as a lawyer, but this clause was submitted to the Justice Department and approved by them as carrying out the intention. Section ten gives the person charged with the enforcement of the Act the power to enter upon any premises and take samples. Section eleven deals with a case which has arisen. It supposes that action has been taken or is contemplated, and for the purpose of making out a case, it provides that the inspector or informant or complainant shall send a sample of the seed to the official seed analyst for examination. I do not see that it gives any authority to do that if the owner of the goods objects to the taking of the sample. As a rule, I think a case would arise in two ways. Either the goods were offered for sale to the complainant, informant or inspector, or the goods had been already sold and the informant or complainant believed he was cheated. In the latter case the complainant has the seeds in his possession and can send a sample to be analysed. In the other case, where an offer to sell has been made but has not been completed, the informant can say: I want to take a sample of these seeds so as to test them. But I do not think he would have any authority to do so if the seller objected. The crux of this section is that a sample shall be taken by the aggrieved party and forwarded to the government laboratory for analysis.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I suggest that the previous clause seems to give ample power to enter and take samples?

Mr. FISHER. To the inspector.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You do not want any one else to have that power ?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why would it not be sufficient for this section to read down as far as line thirty-six: 'may forward a sample from the said seed to such person as the Governor in Council may appoint ?' That would make it much clearer and remove the difficulty.

Mr. FISHER. I would not like offhand to amend the clause, as it was submitted to the Justice Department and declared by them to be in accord with the intention expressed. Section ten makes it an offence to obstruct the inspector if he chooses to take samples, but it does not give power to anybody else. My hon. friend will understand that in the case of an action which did not originate with the inspector or person charged with the enforcement of the Act, a sample would still have to be forwarded to the laboratory for analysis.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You must get a sample of the same seed, but suppose the seeds are sold, how will you do about getting a sample? There may not be another bag in the possession of the dealer.

Mr. FISHER. You must get a sample of the seed actually sold.

Mr. SPROULE. Here is a case that has been submitted to me: Suppose a man purchased seed and sowed it, but, afterwards having reason to fear that it was not up to the standard, he wished to procure a sample of the seed, what authority would he have to take it? I was innocent enough to think that under this section he could demand it in the presence of two witnesses, and that the party selling the seed would be obliged to give it.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think he could demand a sample of the seed; he would have to purchase a sample in order to get it. That is as I understand the section, and that is what I intended.

Mr. SPROULE. But suppose the dealer refused to sell, he ought to have some way of getting the sample. It is not a question of the consideration paid, but a question of making sure that he can secure the sample.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I asked the minister if that was what was intended, and I understood him to say that it was not. What is now suggested is to give the person charged with the enforcement of the Act, or the complainant, as the case may be, power to go to the dealer and compel the dealer to deliver a sample of the same class of goods, that it may be forwarded to the department for analysis. The language that I suggest would not cover that, but I did not understand that that was the object that the minister had in view.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think that would be advisable.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would agree with that.

Mr. FISHER. It would be troublesome and, I think, dangerous to allow a sample of seed other than that sold to be submitted as proof in regard to the sale of a certain seed. Suppose my hon. friend bought a bushel of grass seed in a country store and, after he had sowed it, had reason to think it might have been sold contrary to the provisions of this Act, if he got a sample of grass seed, even if it came out of the same bag, he would labour under a disadvantage, I think his lawyer would tell him, in proving that it was the same seed. The whole idea of the Act is that the sample that proves the case must be a sample of the seed actually bought or held in possession.

Mr. SPROULE. If you compel the seedsman to put a tag on his bag of seed, I think that the only proof necessary would be proof that the sample afterwards got came out of the same bag with the same tag on it as did the seed complained of.

Mr. ALCORN. I would suggest that after the word 'seeds,' in the thirty-sixth line, these words might be added, 'if such seed has been sold to him.'

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I regret that I have been absent from the chamber, and that several clauses have been railroaded through in my absence. I will have to begin my discussion where I am able to. This clause is most objectionable. I pointed out to the minister on a previous occasion that under it there is no limit to the number of samples that may be taken. The minister admits that he does not know the meaning of the clause; but one thing is as clear as the English language can make it, and that is that the inspector, not only may, but shall, take samples, the informant may take samples and the complainant may come in and demand samples. And these samples are sent to the analyst. Now, I want to read an opinion as to what the analyst may decide on the samples sent to them. I will read the testimony of this British Committee on Agriculture, which, I think, the minister will acknowledge is pretty good authority:

> In taking the opinion of two or more botanists on any particular sample, at least five per cent variation in the results may be expected.

And the minister allows only five seeds in a thousand.

> And in some cases the variation will be much more. This is especially so in the finer grasses such as the Poas, and in these an allowance of fifteen per cent for variation would not be unreasonable. In seeds of an inferior quality there is greater variation than in those of high germination. In making tests, it would seem desirable to lay down the conditions under which they should be made, and as far as possible to have the tests tried in more than one manner. Clovers kept under test for two or three weeks, and grasses for four or five weeks, though refusing to germinate in this period will sometimes do so if kept for a still longer one. There is a difference of opinion among botanists as to the proper treatment of seeds which are so hard that they do not germinate under the test. Some reject these altogether; others expecting that some at least will ultimately germinate, include a certain proportion as seeds having vitality.

And the minister proposes to take an interminable number of samples and submit them to seed analysts who will do imperfect work—who cannot do perfect work, any more than we can furnish perfect seeds. I know that grievance has already been suffered under the department of the Minister of Agriculture. I am in a position to state that seeds have been taken from dealers surreptitiously. Is the minister aware of that? This Bill leaves it open for the informant and the complainant to take the

dealer's seed whether the dealer wishes or whether he wishes not. That has been done already under the department. And it has not always been done by a man who desires to buy or to sow seed, but by a man who desires to stab in the back a political opponent.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. That is right, and I can give the minister the testimony. I have been a sufferer myself, and I know whereof I speak. Who was it that got the seeds from my firm without my knowledge or consent? If the minister does not know, he had better find out. Who was it furnished me the information that these seeds had been given not to a man who intended to purchase or to sow? My political opponent was the man who marked the analysis and sent it to me, and said: These seeds were obtained from you, and somebody has hoodwinked you. Is that the kind of legislation that the minister is going to put through this House? I ask him to reconsider this. This clause permits any man to walk into an establishment and demand these samples. It permits any man, whether a buyer or not, he may be a political opponent, but he can walk in and take those seeds in spite of you. He can buy them from one of your employees when your back is turned, and there is nothing to show that he cannot.

Any inspector, informant or complainant who finds or suspects seeds to be sold or offered.

Let the minister understand that word, 'or offered,' not bought, merely offered. It says 'to be sold or offered, exposed or had in his possession, and this man may march in—whether he wants to buy or not, whether he is an agriculturist or not, whether he understands anything about seeds or not—he can walk in and demand samples. I ask the minister in all fairness if he wants to do that. We know that to deal with political appointments is bad enough, but we do ask, if he is going to enforce this Act, that we be committed to the tender mercies of a government appointed inspector, and not be thrown upon every informer who desires to walk into that establishment. I ask the minister to confine that clause to a properly appointed inspector, who is supposed to know something about the seed trade. But if we are to be committed to the tender mercies of anybody, let us fall into the hands of our enemies rather than into the hands of an uncertain quantity like an informer, or informers by the score.

Mr. FISHER. It is a pity the hon. gentleman was absent for a while from the chamber. It is true that he accuses the committee of railroading through some sections while he was away. I do not know what the hon. gentleman's experience is in legislative bodies. But we have been now nearly two hours, and we have passed two sections, one of which was discussed for about an hour and three-quarters this afternoon while the hon. gentleman was present. If he had been here all the time, he would not have accused me of all these horrible things. The hon. gentleman, unwittingly I am sure, has been putting words into my mouth the exact opposite of what I said in my explanations a few minutes ago of this particular section. The hon. gentleman's interpretation of it may be right, he knows what the English language means, he knows all about it, and of course the rest of us will take due knowledge and record of what he tells us. At the same time, my intention, when the Act was drawn, was exactly the opposite of what the hon. gentleman has been attributing to me.

Mr. SPROULE. Several lawyers on this side of the House differ with the minister in the interpretation.

Mr. FISHER. As I said, I do not profess to give a legal opinion, I gave the opinion of the Department of Justice of Canada, which had declared that this section meant what I said. The hon. gentleman has given us the benefit of another speech this evening, as he did of several this afternoon. I remember he said this afternoon that his constituents had told him to say what he liked and as much as he liked about this Bill, and they would back him up. The hon. gentleman is taking full advantage of that permission, and he is saying a great deal about it, and I think that when he goes back to his constituents and asks them to back him up they will want some explanation of several things he has said, and perhaps the hon. gentleman will find it a little difficult to explain exactly what he has said on several occasions. I notice that he has changed his position, at all events the expressions of his views, several times in the different speeches he has made. The hon. gentleman says that this clause provides that anybody, and everybody, and innumerable people, can go in and take from a dealer as many samples as they like. I think it is about what the hon. gentleman said. Now, I pointed out that my interpretation was that, with the exception of the inspector, who had power under the clause to do that, neither an informer nor a complainant could enter into anybody's place and take any sample at all.

Mr. BARKER. Why did not the hon. gentleman say so?

Mr. FISHER. I did say so; I said clearly that I did not think this section gave authority to anybody to go and take seeds that did not belong to him. I do not know how anybody could have misunderstood what I said, because I said that more than once and very distinctly. I said that section 10 gave the inspector or person charged with the enforcement of the Act, that power, and he was paid for it; but I said clearly that

nobody else had that power, and my interpretation of clause 11 is that nobody has that power.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the hon. gentleman say what the object and intention of section 11 is? I have been trying to find it out in good faith, and I really do not understand it.

Mr. FISHER. I intended to indicate that when a case arises, and when a complainant desires to find a sample, or to have a sample of any seeds which are in question, or about which he intends to take action, he shall take a sample and forward it to the laboratory for the purpose of analysis.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How is he to get it?

Mr. FISHER. In any way he can.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Steal it.

Mr. FISHER. No, if he steals it he would be liable to the law of the land.

Mr. HENDERSON. You said any way he can.

Mr. FISHER. I take it for granted that he is a decent Canadian citizen, and would not think of stealing it.

Mr. BOYCE. Is the minister presuming that there has been a sale or transaction with these seeds, and that the inspector, or complainant, or informant, is getting them from the purchaser?

Mr. FISHER. I am not presuming that there has been a sale, because this Act covers other things besides a sale, if there has been a sale, and the complaint is about a sale, then the purchaser who owns the seeds can take as many samples of them as he likes.

Mr. BOYCE. It is not so worded, though I believe that construction may be put upon the section.

Mr. FISHER. It is a matter of drafting. This was drafted by the Department of Justice, and I think it is correct. Then the hon. gentleman asked whether there must be a sale. I was premising there had been a sale in some instances. But a person might want to get a sample when there had not been a sale; I would then only take a sample with the consent of the owner of the seed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If it is merely a matter of consent, we do not require any statute. If this provision deals with seeds which have been purchased, you do not require any statute to enable an inspector or complainant to forward a sample to the Department of Agriculture. There is no law against forwarding anything to the Department of Agriculture. Any man in the country can forward anything he likes to the department, provided it is not dangerous and not calculated to blow the department up.

Mr. FISHER.

Suppose you have the other case where the seeds remain in the possession of the dealer; as I understand, it is not intended by this section to give to the inspector, informant or complainant any power to go forcibly and take a sample against the will of the dealer. The hon. minister has made that plain. It is a matter of consent. You do not want any statute if there is consent. With that consent he could go and procure a sample, which he will be at liberty to forward to the Department of Agriculture. The informant has perfect liberty without this section to forward it to the Department of Agriculture; and further than that if it is intended to enable him to get the sample by consent he can, without this statute, procure it under the law of the land and forward it to the Department of Agriculture. I can see that it is very desirable that the samples should be forwarded, but I do not see at the present time, as far as I can gather the intention of the hon. minister, that the section really accomplishes anything. I thought at first it was intended to enable the complainant or inspector to take the samples even against the will of the dealer, because that might be necessary in some cases but the hon. minister tells me distinctly that that is not the intention at all.

Mr. FISHER. Not under this clause but under clause 10.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You have it in clause 10; therefore you do not need it in this clause.

Mr. FISHER. I would say to my hon. friend that the Act that is intended under this clause could be accomplished in many instances without the clause. I do not think this clause confers any powers. The clause is directory as to the procedure which would be, I might almost say, necessary to the prosecution. I presuppose that the evidence in a prosecution would be the analysis of the seed laboratory and this clause directs that for that purpose and for that end a sample shall be taken. All that might be done without the clause. The clause simply directs that it shall be done and shall be done for that purpose. I said a minute or two ago while the hon. gentleman was speaking that section 10 gives the inspector, or person charged with the enforcement of the law, power to take a sample under certain conditions or restrictions. This section simply directs him to do so. It may be his duty to do so. He may get an order from the department to do so and there may be no necessity for putting any such direction in the statute.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think that there would be.

Mr. FISHER. There may not be.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I suggest to my hon. friend that I think it is undesirable to

put it there if it is simply intended to be directory. You use language that is ambiguous. You say 'shall take a sample.' In construing a section of that kind a court would regard it as having been put there for some purpose and they would hardly say that this section was put there simply for the purpose of directing an officer to do that which he ordinarily would do under the instructions of the department and not by virtue of the statute. Therefore, there is some danger in leaving the clause in its present form. If you make it perfectly plain on the face of it that it is intended as a mere departmental direction to the inspector, or complainant or informant in order that there may be an analysis, there is no great objection to the section, although there is no great good in it as far as I can see, but unless you make it absolutely plain I think the section might possibly be construed in another way from that which the hon. minister states to be his intention.

Mr. FISHER. I think it goes a little farther than that in this sense ; I think it would be unfortunate if prosecutions were taken out under this Act except where a sample had been taken and sent to the laboratory for analysis. The proof in regard to the purity of the seed would be so difficult that I consider that that would be a necessary precedent to the trying of the case.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You mean by the farmer who purchases or the inspector ?

Mr. FISHER. Anybody. Put aside the inspector for the moment. There is no question that the inspector has power to take a sample under section 10. If the inspector wants to make a report, for instance, to the department that certain seeds are being exposed for sale it would be his duty to take a sample and take it in the way that section 10 authorizes him to do it. He would, of course, have to pay for it. Now, in another case where an action is being taken out I think it would be unfortunate if the action should be taken out without a sample being taken. I would like to suppose that the taking of a sample is an almost absolutely necessary precedent to the taking of the action. I would not preclude a person taking action if he chose without taking a sample but I do not think an Act of this kind would be properly enforced if there were no machinery for testing the samples. I therefore have always thought and believed that it will be almost a necessity—I would not make it by statute a necessity—but it is I think almost a necessity in the practical working out of the Act that samples should be taken and sent to the laboratory for analysis, the analysis to be used as evidence in the prosecution for the trying of the case.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are these analyses made evidence by the statute ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, by another section of the statute and that is the reason why we put in this directory or mandatory clause. I want to reiterate that I do not consider myself that the clause confers any powers or gives any control or authority to take any sample per force from the seller or owner of the seeds against that individual's will. My hon. friend, I do not think, reads the section to say so. I agree with him in that, I do not think it does, and I have no desire that it should. The words are all included here because I think it is necessary. I suppose that in legal drafting it is better to use these words : 'Any inspector or, informant or complainant.' Then, following the subject matter to the end these words are used 'who finds or suspects seeds to be sold, or offered, exposed or had in possession for sale for the purpose of seeding.' I suppose the clause would be imperfect if all these words were not included to cover the whole meaning of the Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the hon. minister would take the suggestion into consideration I would be inclined to think that the drafting had better be looked at. I thought the Bill was intended to mean what the hon. minister has suggested when I first read it and it may be so construed. I think the hon. minister's purpose would be better fulfilled by a clause drawn somewhat differently. If the hon. minister will submit to the Department of Justice what has been said in the committee in regard to it, possibly there would be no great difficulty in making it conform a little more closely to what I see now is his intention.

Mr. FISHER. I do not wish to press the matter at all. I want to accept a suggestion of such a friendly nature from the hon. leader of the opposition and I would be very glad to do so. I would be rather disappointed, however, not to get this Bill through to-night. The suggestion has been made to me that we might adopt the clause as it is and then if the Department of Justice wishes in any way to amend this clause they could do so on the third reading, referring it back to the committee if necessary.

Mr. TAYLOR. Last night before the House adjourned my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) asked the hon. the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) who was leading the House then as now, what business he would take up to-day. He promised the House that we would first dispose of the Census Bill, then the Seeds Bill, and then get into supply with the estimates of the Department of Railways. If we are to follow that programme I think it would be better for the Minister of Agriculture to accept this suggestion which has been made two or three times from this side of the House—and now that he has come to a deadlock it is all the more necessary—that the Bill be referred to the Committee of Agriculture where the farmers and law-

yers could whip the Bill into shape in the committee room and not be wasting the time of the House all day. It looks as if it would take two or three days to do it in the House. I have great respect for the Postmaster General and want to see the promise he made last night carried out, that these two Bills should be put through and that we should make some progress with the estimates. We would like to hear from the Postmaster General his opinion on the Bill and on the propriety of sending it to the committee and not discussing it in the House.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. So many opinions have been offered that I do not think I could add anything to the debate.

Mr. BOYCE. I was going to suggest to the minister that clause 11 might be passed for the present as suggested by him, but when he comes to consider the matter, in view of the somewhat ambiguous wording of section 11, all that the minister has suggested as being the meaning he engrafts on section 11 as at present framed might be added to section 10, so as to avoid the possibility of any misunderstanding. That is to add to section 10 something like this :

And such sample or samples shall be forwarded by such person charged with the enforcement of the Act to such person as the Governor General in Council appoints as official seed analyst.

And then add the operative part of section 11. That occurs to me to be in accord with the intention which the minister explained to the House ; namely, that where under section 10 the person charged with the enforcement of this Act suspects that there is a violation of the Act he may in his official capacity enter the premises and take samples and by the subsection such samples shall be forwarded to the analyst, pursuant to the provisions of the Act.

Mr. FISHER. In discussing it with the Department of Justice I shall bear that in mind.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I would suggest that the interpretation which the hon. minister puts upon this clause should accompany the clause when it is sent to the Department of Justice because that interpretation does not agree with the plain language of the Act. If this is submitted to the department they can see if they can interpret it as he does, because I cannot interpret it in that way. The hon. minister has been kind enough to say that I have said things that my constituents will not stand by.

Mr. FISHER. I do not know.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Possibly that is the case, but I was lending the best that was in me to make a good Bill for the minister, and I wish to say further that if the minister had lent himself to making as good a Bill as he could without regard to his constituents or to the electors throughout the country he would have a better Bill than he has to-night and would have thrown more light on the Bill than he has done. He has too much in view the effect upon the electors and too little in view the language of the clause. I submit that his first duty is to direct his attention to the language of the clause. That language is as straight as the English language can be. He may say that it conveys the meaning he attributes to it, and oil it over in that way ; he is giving you a sugar coated pill. Unfortunately we will not have the minister present when the case comes up in court, and his interpretation will not be the interpretation which the court will put on it. He is putting on his interpretation as a great agriculturist, but when it comes to the courts I venture to say, in the language of our learned leader, that the interpretation the court will put on the language is a very different thing from the interpretation the hon. gentleman has given to-night. The section says that the persons enumerated 'shall take a sample.' The minister says that that does not mean anything. Then in the name of all that is good leave it out ; by all means obliterate it, drop it and put it where it should be, in the waste basket. I submit that the hon. gentleman according to his own interpretation of the words should take the clause out.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course it is understood that we can go back again and discuss it in committee if we should think it advisable.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, if the Department of Justice thinks it should be amended.

On section 12.—samples to be taken in presence of seller or two witnesses ; certificate to accompany samples.

Mr. BOYCE. There is one portion of that clause that I would commend to the attention of the minister, subsection (b). It would be rather an invidious or pernicious practice to allow an informant or complainant to send an official statement of a case that would likely come before a justice of the peace for trial. It says that a statement 'shall' include, that is, it must include the name and address of the person who sold or offered the seeds and so forth ; but it may include a great deal more, and there are certain facts extraneous to the case that might be included in the statement and that might have an unfair bearing on the case when it came to trial. The minister may argue that any statement of fact submitted by an informer or complainant would not have any effect upon the quality or the adulteration of the seed, but there is this further to be spoken of, that the words 'informant or complainant' having regard to the explanation with reference to section 11, might well be left out

especially if respect be paid to the suggestion of the leader of the opposition with regard to the meaning of that section which would render it unnecessary for the words 'informant or complainant' to be introduced at all.

Mr. FISHER. I think it would be necessary for a sample to be sent, whether it is taken by an informant or complainant or an inspector, and the sample would have to be taken by the machinery herein provided. Then we want to have certain information accompanying the sample. If that information did not come with the sample, the seed laboratory would be unable to attach the data of that particular seed for the purpose of identification in any prosecution which might come before the court. The only object of this is to see that it is the sample of the seeds which might afterwards be the subject of prosecution, and it is necessary that the two should be carefully connected so as to use the analysis as evidence.

Mr. BOYCE. But the use of the words 'informant or complainant' would not enter into the prosecution at all if clause 11 were amended in the manner suggested, because the whole thing would be done by the inspector or person charged with the enforcement of the Act.

Section agreed to.

On section 15—certificate as evidence—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister will observe that under section 12 the informant or complainant is to take a sample in the presence of the person who sold or in the presence of two impartial witnesses, and he is to inclose that and send it to the department with a certain statement. It is not provided that he shall inclose it in the presence of any person. He does that by himself, as his own individual act, I suppose. Then under section 15 it is provided that the certificate of analysis shall be accepted as evidence against any person prosecuted in respect of the seeds from which the sample purports to have been taken. The result is that you might not have the sanction of the oath of any person, but merely the word of the informant or complainant as to the identity of the particular sample forwarded with that from which it purports to have been taken. Would it not be better to amend section 15, and say, 'seeds from which the sample was taken,' and thus make it necessary to prove at the trial that the sample actually came from the seeds which are the subject of prosecution ?

Mr. FISHER. Section 17 provides that the Governor in Council may make regulations to secure the enforcement of the Act, and I think that would come within these regulations.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would not think so, because you have here an explicit provision of the statute, and you could not control that by any regulation made by Order in Council.

Mr. FISHER. I shall be glad to look into that point, and if there is any doubt about it, I will on the third reading go back into committee to provide for that.

On section 7—exemptions from Act—

Mr. FISHER. I wish to amend this section for the purpose of adding a clause which will permit seeds marked as 'screenings' to be held or sold for export only. Some of the seedsmen represented that they buy seeds that are foul, and after cleaning them they have a large quantity of screenings or refuse which they do not want to sell in Canada, for which they have not a market in Canada, but for which there is a market in some foreign countries, and they wish to provide that these may be exported.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems to me that if that were done this result might follow, that if a dealer held for export seeds that contained a very slight quantity of weed seed he would be liable, but at the same time he might hold for export seeds of a very much inferior character known as screenings without being liable to any penalty. Would not that be the result?

Mr. FISHER. It would be practically the result. The seedsmen inform me that their usual trade abroad is in first-class seeds. As a matter of fact, Canada has made a reputation for clover seeds abroad and the great bulk of the export trade is in these seeds. I do not think there is any market for inferior seeds that would not comply with all the provisions of this Act, except this trade in screenings or refuse.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not acquainted with the matter practically, but it struck me as a curious provision that a dealer might have in his possession for export seeds of a very poor quality without being liable, while he would be liable if he held for export seed of a very much superior quality. It seems to me that that is a curious condition in which to leave the legislation, although there may be conditions in the trade which make it desirable or necessary, and which I do not understand. As at present advised, it seems to me perilously near nonsense.

Mr. FISHER. This Bill would not interfere with the export trade, except in this matter of screenings and the seedsmen asked to be protected with regard to the latter. I would move that the section be reconsidered and these words added to clause 'C': 'Marked as screenings held or sold for export.'

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to substitute a new provision for section 18. Section 18 provides that any prosecution may be commenced within 12 months, but not later. Under the Summary Convictions Act, prosecutions must begin within six months. In its original draft, this Bill contained the same provision, but it was pointed out that under subsection 2 of section 8 it might be impossible to begin the prosecution within the 6 months. Therefore, I propose that section 18 shall read as follows:

Any prosecution against any person under subsection three of section eight may be commenced within twelve months from the time the matter of complaint or information arose and not later.

That would allow the ordinary prosecutions to come under the provisions of the Summary Convictions Act.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. Will prosecutions first have to be pressed against the retailer and then, if he proves innocent, be pressed against the wholesaler through the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. FISHER. That is the intention, but anybody may proceed against the wholesaler at once if he chooses.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. Where the wholesaler puts up seed in packages and those packages are retailed without being broken, why not prosecute the wholesaler in the first instance?

Mr. FISHER. The purchaser may do so if he chooses, but the wholesale dealer may not be in the same district as that in which the final purchaser lives, and the last purchaser should be allowed to sue the retailer if he chooses.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. Suppose the name of the wholesale firm is on the package and the stamp has never been broken until it gets into the hands of the person who buys from the retailer. If a sample of that seed is sent to the official analyst, could not the department proceed against the wholesaler?

Mr. FISHER. I think it could.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. SPEAKER. When shall the Bill be read the third time?

Mr. FISHER. This day week.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the Bill be reprinted in the meantime?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to capital—Cornwall Canal enlargement, $7,000.

Mr. FISHER.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). At the outset I wish to make a slight amendment with respect to the caption. I move to add the words 'and other St. Lawrence Canals.'

Motion agreed to.

Mr. EMMERSON. This covers the paylist of the staff for the Cornwall and other canals amounting to $6,000, and the balance of $1,000 is to liquidate the remainder due on the regulating weir of the Cornwall canal.

Mr. LENNOX. The amount voted last year was $64,500, and this year the minister asks only $7,000. Why such a great difference?

Mr. EMMERSON. The amount last year was expended and there is a balance due of about $1,000, we hope that it will only amount to $700. The $6,000 as I have explained is to pay the staff.

Mr. LENNOX. The alteration that is proposed can be legally made I suppose?

Mr. EMMERSON. If it does not change the destination. It could be confined strictly to the Cornwall canal, but, I thought it in the interest of accuracy to explain that while this staff was engaged for the Cornwall canal they performed also certain duties and services with the other St. Lawrence canal. Instead of having a separate staff of engineers for these other works we utilized the services of these officers on the Cornwall canal.

Amendment agreed to.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to capital—Canals—Galops Canal, enlargement $135,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. Last year we asked $292,300, of which there will be expended up to the close of the fiscal year all except $69,000, so that this item includes a revote of that amount. This is an enlargement to make the canal and locks conform to the fourteen-foot scale of navigation.

Mr. LENNOX. Does this complete the work?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to pay certain claims and to complete the upper entrance and also to provide a new wharf at Cardinal.

Mr. BARKER. What is the nature of the claims?

Mr. EMMERSON. They arise in the adjustment of the contracts entered into on schedule prices. In every work of this discription, in winding up there are claims in connection with extra work perhaps not fully set forth in the specification. It is estimated that, in connection with this work there would be, on the Cardinal section $52,251 of an adjustment between the chief engineer and the contractor in winding up,

carrying out strictly the terms of the contract.

Mr. BARKER. Will the minister be good enough to say who are the claimants and the amounts ?

Mr. EMMERSON. On the Cardinal section, William Davis & Son, $52,251. Then, there is an amount we expect to spend under the contract of Murray & Cleveland of $21,968. That is to complete the work. Then there is an item of $50,000 to cover claims for extra work which the engineer has required to be done under this contract, and the fourth item is for a new wharf at Cardinal, $11,600. The contract for the wharf has not yet been let.

Mr. BARKER. What is the nature of the payment of $50,000 to Messrs. Murray & Cleveland?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is in connection with the enlargement of the canal.

Mr. BARKER. Is it for extras?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is extra work, but not extras in the sense of being extras under the contract. It was in addition to the work specified under the contract.

Mr. MACLAREN. Will the hon. minister please tell us who Mr. Robert Smith is, the man who employed the extra men on this Cornwall canal?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is under another vote. Mr. Robert Smith was a candidate in the recent election. He is supposed to be a friendly adviser.

Mr. LENNOX. Do I understand the minister aright, to say that $50,000 is for extra work that would not come under the contract?

Mr. EMMERSON. Perhaps not arising out of the contract, but extra of that specified by the contract.

Mr. LENNOX. But it is not provided for in the contract. The contract I presume is the ordinary contract we have laid on the table occasionally, and provides that no extras should be incurred except under certain conditions. It is important to know if this work was outside the contract and was not contemplated when the contract was let.

Mr. EMMERSON. These contracts are entered into at schedule prices, the engineer's estimate is made on the basis of a certain quantity of work. Now, in the course of carrying out the work it is frequently found that additional work is necessary; this additional work is ordered to be done, and it is done at schedule prices. This item of $50,000 in connection with the Murray & Cleveland contract is to cover such extra work in addition to what was contemplated originally. But the contract prices have been entered into, and the limits prescribed originally by the specifications have been enlarged.

Mr. LENNOX. It comes to this, that you can let a contract complying with the Act, after having advertised for tenders and got the tenders in, and it may be a work in which it is contemplated to spend $20,000. Then having got tenders upon that basis, and on which the contractor necessarily has to tender high up, he can enlarge the scope of his operations and may double that amount. You may then give him additional work at schedule prices to the extent of $50,000 or $100,000. It appears to me that in that way the provisions of the statute in regard to tenders are substantially violated, that although nominally the matter is let by tender after due advertisement, yet in that way the statute is in effect disregarded.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend has stated a hypothetical case; now, I will state the case as it is. Here was a contract entered into for a sum amounting altogether to about $2,000,000. This has gone on over a number of years, and in the final adjustment of the claim in consequence of extra work that was necessary in the judgment of the engineer, we require about $50,000 finally to adjust with the contractor. The percentage is not very large, and I do not think much objection can be taken to the amount.

Mr. LENNOX. Is it a fact that there is only this one item of $50,000 out of a contract of some $2,000,000?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is my information.

Mr. LENNOX. I think that is pretty satisfactory

Mr. BARKER. Does the minister assure us that this $50,000 is only to pay for work at the rate of contract prices? Is it intended to confine the payments absolutely to the rate per yard, or whatever it was, of the contract?

Mr. EMMERSON. I can give my hon. friend the assurance from what the chief engineer tells me that in every instance the prices are actual schedule prices, that is usually the case. But he cannot recollect with respect to this particular matter. But he states that there are times when that rule is departed from, and in accordance with a particular clause in the contract which provides that any extra work ordered by the chief engineer in writing need not necessarily be performed at the schedule prices. It is for the chief engineer to fix at the time he requires this extra work the price with the contractor.

Mr. BARKER. Then the hon. gentleman will see that this $50,000 is not merely for additional work, but consists of extras. That is the question I asked in the first instance. You are allowing for extras here;

we asked that question and were informed it was only additional work that was performed.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is very difficult to express it.

Mr. BARKER. Oh, no.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think my hon. friend will see that it is not extras in the sense that you are paying anything additional for work that was contracted for, but it is for the payment of extra work that was not contemplated at the time the contract was entered into.

Mr. BARKER. And at an extra price.

Mr. EMMERSON. Not necessarily at an extra price. The prices fixed in the schedule might govern, but the extra work might not be of the value fixed by the schedule and it is under the terms of the contract left to the option of the chief engineer to fix the price at which that work shall be done.

Mr. BARKER. It is an extra.

Mr. EMMERSON. Call it what you like.

Mr. LEFURGEY. If I understood the hon. minister aright a few moments ago in answer to a question from my hon. friend from Perth (Mr. MacLaren) he said that the person who recommended the extra men required during October and November on the Cornwall canal was Mr. Robert Smith, who was the government candidate for election to this House.

Mr. EMMERSON. I was asked who Mr. Robert Smith was, and I said he was a candidate at the last election. If my hon. friend wants to refer to 'Hansard' the statement that I made the other day is there reported.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am just referring to 'Hansard' and I want to remark that it is a very extraordinary circumstance that a candidate for election to this House should, during the months that active canvassing is going on amongst the electorate, have the authority to go to the superintendent of any of the public works in Canada and put on twenty-five or thirty extra men. It is certainly prostituting the elections for this House to degrading ends. I would like to know from the hon. minister if that is the regular custom followed by the government in regard to public works, if candidates are given liberty to go to superintendents of public works without any apparent cause, without any crisis arising in regard to these works, and to recommend the employment of men apparently for the purpose of obtaining votes in the election.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think that for the past twenty-five years in Canada the custom has prevailed that where men are wanted on public works the government of the day usually apply to their friends. They have applied to some one who would advise them in a friendly way and I think that custom has not been departed from. Men are not put on who are not wanted. It has been the custom year after year, whether an election was in progress or not, to have certain work done at that particular season of the year. That was done last fall, it was done the preceding fall, it has been done ever since I have had any knowledge of the department and I think it has been done from time immemorial. This is necessary work in connection with the canal. It requires men. To whom shall you apply? Of course, you will have to get some one who will advise you wisely. Under these circumstances, when we wanted some men, Mr. Smith was asked to name those who would be fit and competent to take such positions, and the department, having confidence in his advice, accepted it. There is nothing unusual in that and nothing very startling.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I think it is an outrageous principle to put before the committee, that any man who happens to be running for a constituency should have the power to override the superintendent of a public work who is a paid employee of the government and to select men to do this work, that he shall have the power to say that this or that person who may be friendly to him shall be employed and to exercise this power just at the time the election comes on.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am sorry to lacerate the sensibilities of my hon. friend.

Mr. PRINGLE. I am very glad to hear the hon. minister make the acknowledgment here that these men were wanted just before the election in November.

Mr. EMMERSON. This was in October.

Mr. PRINGLE. And in November. If the hon. gentleman will look at my question he will see that I interrogated him in regard to both months.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman is now referring to November. I am correcting him and pointing out that it was in October that these men were employed.

Mr. PRINGLE. They were employed in October and November. During the most active stage of the election canvass I paid a visit to Dickenson's Landing at the head of the canal and I found that nearly every man was employed in a ditch which was being dug out nobody knew for what purpose except that these men were being given employment in the campaign. I thought one Saturday afternoon that I would go out into a certain section of the town of Cornwall and call upon some of the voters in that district. I found that they were all working on the canal, that

they all had government positions, and I also found that these positions terminated immediately after the elections. These men were wanted very badly for the purpose of assisting Mr. Smith in his campaign. The hon. minister has, in his answer to this question, stated that there were some twenty-five or forty extra men employed, but I venture to say that during September, October and November there were at least 100 men put on outside of the staff generally employed on the Cornwall canal, and I say that I believe they were put on for one purpose and one purpose only and that was the purpose of the election which was coming on in the month of November.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. minister says that this work is done every year. Is that true?

Mr. EMMERSON. This occurs every year.

Mr. PRINGLE. I venture to say if you look back in the Auditor General's Report for past years you will find it has never occurred, that in any previous year there have been so many extra men employed on the Cornwall canal. These men were tumbling over one another. They were the laughing stock of the community. People said they were pulling weeds on the bank of the canal. I remember that at the time the registration was going on, I saw one good Conservative actively engaged in assisting at the registration. He came out from the court room and I said to him: 'What are you doing here?' He said: 'I am pulling weeds on the Cornwall canal, but I have to do some work for Mr. Smith.' I said: 'Are you getting paid for pulling weeds on the Cornwall canal while you are assisting in the registration here?' and he said 'My pay goes on just the same.' This went on during the months of October and November. I may say this is not a proper way of spending the money of the country. Nor is it proper just at that time to put it in the hands of the government candidate to say what men shall come on that work, and what men shall not come on it. It gives him a very great power in an election and a power which the government should not place in his hands. I myself am not at all sorry to see these men get work. It was a season of the year when many of them were out of employment and if the government had such a large surplus that they wanted to assist these poor men I am not sorry to see them get the money in the way they did, but I disapprove of the minister permitting the government candidate to say that twenty-five or thirty men shall go on at this place and twenty-five or thirty men at some other place on the Cornwall canal when we all know that this is done solely for the purpose of assisting in the campaign.

Mr. EMMERSON. I wish to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Pringle) that he is not stating the facts as I have stated them and that I have stated them in accordance with what transpired. Mr. Smith had no right nor did he attempt to exercise the right, to place any number of men on that canal or any portion of it, but when the department in the ordinary course of its business—for it is annually required to make certain repairs and did so last year and the preceding year, and I am informed by the chief engineer of canals that it is done every year—wants men to do that work the difficulty is to get the men. It is not always easy to secure men for such work and Mr. Smith was asked by the superintendent of canals with respect to getting a certain number of men.

Mr. PRINGLE. Would that be Mr. Stewart?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, Mr. Stewart, he is the superintendent to whom I referred, and when the men were required, Mr. Smith's advice was asked. To whom shall we refer? We have to get information from some one; the department has not the knowledge and the superintendent of canals is certainly not to run around the country looking up men.

Mr. PRINGLE. Prior to 1896 on our St. Lawrence canals we had a superintendent on each canal whose duty it was to see that the proper repairs were made. We have a permanent staff employed on each of these canals who go from end to end of the canal. They have their scows and the other articles necessary for use, and they have always done the repairs on these canals. Since 1896 in order to make a position for the organizer of the Liberal party in Glengarry, Mr. Stewart, an ex-school teacher, and I think an ex-insurance agent too, he was put in charge of all the canals. I am not saying anything personally about Mr. Stewart, I think he is a very respectable gentleman. But he knows less about a canal than I do. I think he knows little or nothing about our canals; he could not possibly know anything, he had no experience. His training was not such that he could have any knowledge of our canals. Then under Mr. Stewart, there is now the superintendent of the Cornwall canal. Why is this man overlooked? Why has he not something to say in regard to the men who are employed in connection with the work of that canal? The government evidently considered that he was a man fitted for the position when they put him in charge under Mr. Stewart, of the Cornwall canal, and yet that man is ignored and had nothing whatever to say in regard to any man employed on that canal. Instead of consulting Mr. Lally, the superintendent of the canal, the minister frankly admits that Mr.

Stewart goes to Mr. Smith the candidate and says: Mr. Smith, we want so many men put on the Cornwall canal. He entirely ignored and overlooked the man who is paid a very substantial salary for taking charge of the Cornwall canal. I do not think that is a proper way of conducting the affairs of this canal. I am told that he was never consulted in any way. Mr. Stewart goes to Mr. Smith, a lawyer and a politician, and says, we want certain repairs on the Cornwall canal; you furnish the men. Why should he not go to Mr. Lally and ask him what is required to be done in connection with the canal of which he has charge and let Mr. Lally take charge of it, and do the work with the permanent staff he has under him on that canal for this very purpose? I say again that you cannot turn to the books of previous years and show that it has been the custom to put on a staff of extra men in the fall of the year. This is the first time it ever occurred and it occurred just when we were in the heat of an election. I say now that, notwithstanding the answer, they may not be called extra men, but there was a staff of 50 to 100 men in connection with the work and they were there for one purpose, a political purpose.

Mr. EMMERSON. Communications with respect to these canals by the department are always had with the superintendents. There is no superintendent of the Cornwall canal. There is a Mr. Lally there, who is an overseer, but in so far as the transaction of the business of the canals is concerned, he has no more to do with the transaction of the business of the canal than the overseer of any of the other canals. The superintendent, Mr. Stuart, is in charge of all the canals and he receives his instructions from the department. In so far as the expenditure last year and the previous year particularly is concerned, the appropriations were not passed by parliament until a very late date and the work that might have been done earlier in the season could not be undertaken because no funds had been provided and therefore before the cold weather came on it was necessary to put on an extra crew of men. Some 40 were employed in connection with this canal and it was done at the earliest possible moment, as it was done the preceding year when there was no election. It may be a coincidence that there was an election going on but simply because there was an election is no reason why the work should not be attended to in the ordinary course of events.

Mr. PRINGLE. The minister says that Mr. Lally is overseer. What does he oversee, if he does not oversee the work that was done on the Cornwall canal? Why was Mr. Stewart going jumping about along the front like a pea on a gridiron, making himself active politically, in and out of my constituency, attending to the work on that canal, shoving to one side the man employed as overseer? The minister knows as well as I know that the overseer of the canal has not received fair treatment from Mr. Stewart, and that during the campaign Mr. Stewart came into Cornwall and devoted all his time to political work in an effort to defeat me. Mr. Lally, if he is an overseer, could have seen to the cleaning of the banks and removal of weeds in the fall; he was quite competent to do that, but Mr. Lally is overlooked entirely, a superior is brought in for this campaign. There was little use for him in Morrisburg, his headquarters at that time, because he recognized the impossibility of defeating Mr. Broder, so he devoted the most of his time and energies to the county of Stormont, and put on this extra staff of men to help him. That is the truth in regard to the work that went on there last fall.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the date when the men were employed and the date when they were dismissed?

Mr. EMMERSON. I gave the dates the other day. Some of them were dismissed in December and some in the latter end of November. Some of them were employed in September.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When they were not pulling weeds and attending to the registration of voters, what were they doing?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not aware that any of them were doing that. I am bound to accept the statement of my hon. friend; but the very great friendliness which he evinces towards Mr. Stewart, of which we had evidence last year, and of which we have some evidence to-night, would not indicate to me that he is very warm in his favour. Mr. Stewart is certainly a very excellent business man, and attends to his duties very carefully, so far as they come under my observation. Mr. Lally is a sort of overseer or foreman, whose duty it is to see that the men who are engaged attend to their work, and I am sure that he would not have these men playing or have them up town or anywhere else and drawing their pay without attending to their work. I must assume that, because I must assume that he was attending to his duty.

Mr. PRINGLE. I want to say with regard to Mr. Lally that he is a very competent man, who knows more about canals than Mr. Stewart could learn in a year. Mr. Lally is a man well fitted for his position, and he does his work well; but he was so hampered and interfered with by Mr. Stewart coming on the canal and assuming to take charge and to put on a staff of men who were not required, that he prepared his resignation with the intention of sending it in to this government. I cannot speak

too highly of Mr. Lally as a capable man for the work entrusted to him.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am surprised that he did not send in any complaint to the department.

Mr. PRINGLE. I have not the slightest doubt that he did. I understand that he made many complaints.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am informed by the chief engineer that he never made any complaint, and I never heard of any.

Mr. PRINGLE. Have complaints not been sent in in regard to Mr. Stewart's interference with the Cornwall canal by Mr. Smith himself ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The chief engineer states that he does not know of any, and I certainly do not recollect any.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand, then, from the minister that that is the policy of the department in the employment of labour? I remember the hon. gentleman stating that so far as the Intercolonial Railway was concerned, he knew no politics. Are we to understand, then, that he has one policy for the Intercolonial Railway and another for the canals ? Does he adopt that policy all along the line, of consulting the member or the defeated candidate in regard to the employment of all the men ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I can only say what my policy is in respect to that matter. If I require any advice in connection with any public work in any constituency, I am not going to be mealy-mouthed about it ; I want to say frankly that I am going to consult my friends. My hon. friend says that I stated, with respect to the railway, that I knew no politics. I do not know that my hon. friend can find on record a bald statement like that. I am not going to be hypocritical about it ; in the administration of the works under me, if it comes to be a choice between two, a Liberal and a Conservative, all other things being equal, I am going to favour the Liberal ; and I think I would not have the respect of my hon. friends opposite if I were to make any other statement. I treat those in the public service who are Conservatives justly, properly and courteously ; but in dealing with the public interest, I am not going to allow politics in any way to interfere with the works if I know it.

Mr. BLAIN. We are to understand, then, from the hon. minister that there is no danger of there ever being a conflict between the two political parties, because my hon. friend always gets his information from one source.

Mr. EMMERSON. I get it from both ; I get it from everybody.

Mr. BLAIN. I am taking the words of the hon. minister. He says he always consults his own friends—I suppose he means his political friends. We are to understand from the hon. minister that it is a political department.

Mr. EMMERSON. Oh, no.

Mr. BLAIN. I am taking the hon. gentleman's words.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will be judged by my words, not by the hon. gentleman's construction of them.

Mr. BLAIN. I will take the hon. gentleman's own words. He says he consults his own friends. He means his political friends. Do I misundertand him ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, you do not misunderstand me.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman says that when he wants any advice in a particular county, or wants men to put on works, he consults his own political friends. Therefore, we are to infer that no Conservative will be put on ; no other inference is possible. So when we have any estimates of my hon. friend, we know that no Conservative need apply.

Mr. EMMERSON. They do apply, though.

Galops Rapids—to complete channel, $26,500.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is a revote of a portion of the amount appropriated last year to complete this work.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will this complete it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am informed by the chief engineer that it will.

Mr. PRINGLE. Who has the contract for that work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Gilbert Company.

Mr. PRINGLE. The work is to be done under the same contract that was entered into six or seven years ago ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The same contract.

North channel—forming channel and building dam between Galops and Adams Island, $70,000.

Mr. LENNOX. Is this item correct ? This asks for an appropriation of $70,000 and then says that $90,200 is a revote.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is a printer's error. It is a revote of $70,000.

Improvements at Port Colborne entrance, $250,000.

Mr. PRINGLE. Who has the contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Hogan & McDonald.

Mr. PRINGLE. Were they the lowest tenders ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes. There were 14 and they were the lowest at schedule prices.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does this complete ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, it will require $150,000 more to complete.

Electric light and power plant, $100,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. That will complete.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it by contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, except a small item.

Mr. BLAIN. Who are the contractors ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There are several. Mr. Battle has the contract for the poles. The Northern Aluminum Company have the contract for wire. The Hamilton Bridge Works have the contract for steel poles. The Wire and Cable Company have the contract for copper conductors. Baker & Co. have the contract for arc lamps and regulators. In all cases the lowest tenders were accepted.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How comes it that whereas in 1903 the cost of maintenance was $72,004, in 1904 it has increased to $116,858.

Mr. EMMERSON. Do you mean on the Welland canal ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is in consequence of the repairs. There has been an increase in the wages of the men, but the greater part of the increase is caused by the additional repairs necessary.

To remove obstructions and make other improvements, Welland canal, $75,000.

Mr. PRINGLE. What is the price paid per cubic yard for the removal of earth and dredging work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Thirty-eight and a half cents.

Mr. PRINGLE. When was this contract originally entered into ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think three years ago.

Mr. PRINGLE. Is that a continuous contract to last for all time to come for any excavation required in the Welland canal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That was only within certain limits. The work was to be proceeded with year after year.

Mr. PRINGLE. Have any new tenders been called for for this work to be done since ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was all included in the original contract.

Mr. PRINGLE. Does my hon. friend say that 38½ cents is a reasonable figure for the work done ? I understand that 22 cents would be a fair price.

Mr. EMMERSON. I only know that every tenderer knew what was contemplated. Here was a certain area to be excavated. The specifications were very explicit and were understood by the other tenderers as well as by the successful ones.

Mr. PRINGLE. Was it not understood at the inception of the contract that only a small quantity was to be removed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. My chief engineer says not. The specifications clearly said a certain area.

Mr. PRINGLE. Will the hon. gentleman lay the contract on the table and let the item stand in the meantime ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am quite willing.

Item allowed to stand.

To deepen portions of summit level between Port Colborne and Thorold, $80,000.

Mr. PRINGLE. Who has that contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Magann & Finn.

Mr. PRINGLE. The same firm that had the other contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, the other was given to Weddell, Battle & Manley. Magann & Finn have this one.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does this complete the work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. PRINGLE. Is that a continuous contract as well ? They have been going on with this work the last five or six years, and every year there seems to be a larger appropriation for it.

Mr. EMMERSON. When the contract was first entered into the work was estimated to cost so much, and it was expected that it would not be completed only in a number of years. The deepening of this portion of the canal is necessary from the fact that Lake Erie is gradually lowering its level, and this level has been deepened two feet, giving 17 feet at the ordinary level of Lake Erie, and 15 feet at low water. At the time the contract was let there were three tenders. The total estimated cost at 38½ cents was $530,217. Besides this vote of $80,000, we will require $60,000 to complete the work.

Mr. PRINGLE. What has been paid to this firm up to the present time?

Mr. EMMERSON. Up to June 30, 1903, the amount paid was $139,250; from June 30, 1903, to June 30, 1904, the amount paid was $121,121, making a total up to June 30 last of $260,371; there has been expended between June 30 and December 31, 1904, $129,899, or a total to 31st of December last of $390,270. Then, as I have said, it is estimated that $140,000 will be required to complete the work, of which we are now

asking $80,000. I wish to correct a statement I made a few moments ago. I was asked as to deepening rock cut on the Welland canal and as to the contract price for the earth excavation. There was no earth excavation provided for in the contract; it was all rock cutting and the lowest tender was $2.90 per cubic yard. The earth work I had in mind at the moment was deepening portions of the summit level, the contract price for which is 38½c. per cubic yard. So, perhaps, my hon. friend (Mr. Pringle) will allow the item of $75,000 to go, that being the rock excavation.

Mr. PRINGLE. I am satisfied. The contract I would like to have brought down is the one in connection with the earth excavation. I find that the minister has expended on that work $359,000. I am informed, whether rightly or wrongly, that for the class of dredging being done there 38½c. is entirely too high a price. As to this being a continuing contract of the work. I assume, from what the minister says, that it is not, because he states that the work has been occasioned by the change in the depth of water in Lake Erie.

Mr. EMMERSON. That occurred three years ago.

Mr PRINGLE. Did it occur before the letting of this contract?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was to remedy that very defect that this contract was entered into. Let me be understood in respect to the matter. The contract of Weddell, Battle & Manley was at $2.90 per yard for rock excavation. The Magann & Finn contract for deepening portions of the summit level between Port Colborne and Thorold was at 38½c. per cubic yard for earth excavation.

Mr. PRINGLE. I quite understand that. The Auditor General's Report shows the prices that were paid last year.

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot speak as to whether this is a low or high price, but I know it is the contract price under the tender.

Mr. PRINGLE. But the minister ought to know whether the contract covers all the excavation to be done in that canal for the next few years.

Mr. EMMERSON. The contract contemplated the carrying out of a certain work, the removal of 1,377,000 cubic yards of earth on this summit level between Port Colborne and Thorold. A certain portion of that work has not been completed. It was contemplated that it would take several years to do it. The total cost of the work was estimated at $530,270, of which after December 31 last $390,270 had been expended. The balance of the excavation, 377,000 cubic yards, is yet to be done, and it is for that we are asking this vote.

Mr. PRINGLE. I would ask that this item stand until we have the contract.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The item of $75,000 is carried.

Mr. EMMERSON. And the one of $80,000 stands. All right.

Welland canal—to remove centre piers and rebuild bridges at Niagara and Queenston Streets, near Homer Road crossings, $150,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does that complete the work?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is supposed to complete the work.

Mr. BLAIN How much was expended last year?

Mr. EMMERSON. The total estimated cost of this work is $190,000. Of this item, $30,000 is a revote, and the $70,000 last year makes $190,000, the total estimated cost.

To make survey of canal, $20,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is no complete plan of this canal, and apparently no accurate survey has ever been made of it. It is represented by the department that both are much needed.

Mr. BARKER. What is the length of the canal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Twenty-seven and a half miles. An engineering survey of the whole canal is necessary to secure data from which a thorough and accurate plan can be prepared.

Mr. PRINGLE. Does the minister mean to tell us that the original plans upon which this canal was constructed are not in possession of the department ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There was, I believe, originally, a survey made, but there were no monuments placed. There have been continual encroachments upon the lands of the canal, and there are difficulties arising every year between the department and the owners along the canal ; therefore it is necessary to have a new survey. I see by a statement before me that there never was a complete plan of the canal in existence.

Mr. BARKER. Was there a plan of any portion of it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There are detached plans of certain portions.

Mr. BARKER. Of what portion of the twenty-seven miles have you plans ?

Mr. EMMERSON. From Allanburg down to Port Dalhousie, about thirteen miles.

Mr. BARKER. Then for fourteen miles of survey you want $20,000 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That has to be surveyed as well. There was the old canal which was changed, and now, in order to

put down monuments and to have a very accurate survey, marking out the line of the canal fixing the boundaries between the canal proper and the adjoining owners, it is estimated that we shall require $20,000. That is the estimate of the chief engineer.

Mr. PRINGLE. Does the minister mean to say that when the land was acquired for the purpose of constructing the Welland canal, the conveyances given to the Crown did not properly designate what the Crown was acquiring, and that that land was not marked out at the time, that the canal was not built on a regular system of plans, and that it is necessary now to expend something like $1,000 a mile to ascertain where the land belonged to the Crown lies? Is that the position?

Mr. EMMERSON. No doubt the deeds did not designate the boundaries; but it appears that monuments were not placed, certainly they were not sufficiently placed, or so insufficiently placed that there have been constant disputes arising between the owners of adjacent lands and the Department of Railways and Canals. Now in order to remedy these it is necessary to make a complete survey of the whole canal, and it is estimated by the engineer that in order to do that, and to prepare an accurate plan of the old canal, it will take $20,000.

Mr. PRINGLE. What form have these disputes taken? It is the first we have heard of any claims against the government in regard to encroachments upon the lands of private individuals along that canal.

Mr. EMMERSON. There are quite a number of cases. The engineers have attempted to fix the bounds of the canal as they understand it, and in some instances these boundaries go through the property of private owners who contend that they are not the proper boundaries. They contend that we encroach upon their property. When our men go on they send in bills or claims for trespassing on their lands. This has occurred, and has been going on for some time, and certainly it is a matter that should be settled.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is the canal fenced?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is in some places.

Mr. HENDERSON. Do I understand this $20,000 the minister is asking for, is to pay surveyors for a new survey of the canal, or is it intended to compensate the owners of property along the canal for damages? The minister says there are constant complaints about trespassing; is the money all to be expended on surveys, or is it to be used for the purpose of settling these difficulties and compensating owners of the land who claim they have been encroached upon? $20,000 seems to me a large sum for a survey of twenty-seven miles of canal.

Mr. EMMERSON. This sum does not include any item for the payment or settlement of claims. It is estimated by the engineer that it will take $20,000 to make a survey, prepare plans and place the stone monuments along the bounds of the canal.

Mr. BARKER. Will it be done by officers of the department?

Mr. EMMERSON. The chief engineer says that a land surveyor will be necessary along with the engineers of the department.

Mr. PRINGLE. I see last year that you had Mr. Davie attached to the Welland canal staff, and there is another engineer with him. What are these men doing? Are they merely laying out a route for these poles for electric lights?

Mr. EMMERSON. We have engineers at different points. The superintending engineer, Mr. Weller, is stationed at St. Catharines, he has one assistant. Mr. Davie I think is at the Port Colborne end of the canal, in connection with the construction works that are going on there. These gentlemen I have named are on the permanent staff.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then you will not want $20,000 to pay these?

Mr. EMMERSON. They are temporary in a sense.

Mr. BARKER. What is the practice when an officer on a given staff is detailed for particular work? Does he go off the pay-list on the regualr staff, and is his pay charged to the particular service?

Mr. EMMERSON. Invariably that is the case. He does not get paid from both.

Mr. BARKER. How is it that you take a vote in the estimates for these officers?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is the regular vote, it may not be expended. We cannot always anticipate that they will not be employed in connection with some other work.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Take a double vote.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is necessary in connection with this vote under the law of Ontario to employ a regularly qualified land surveyor—hon. gentlemen from Ontario will know whether that is correct or not—in fixing bounds which may be in dispute.

Mr. BARKER. But you surely have several provincial land surveyors on your staff?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not aware of one.

Mr. BARKER. Every man of that class who has been taken from Ontario is probably a provincial land surveyor.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not aware of it. If it is so it would cover the difficulty but the chief engineer tells me that he thinks that they are not.

Mr. LENNOX. There is another aspect of the case that I would like to call the hon. minister's attention to and it is this; assuming that there is a dispute between a land-owner and the government in what way does the hon. minister propose to adjust it? Ordinarily in a case of dispute between adjoining owners each party pays a portion of the costs. How does the government propose to do it? If these parties are claiming that they are entitled to land which has been and is in the possession of the government, and it seems to me that the government is now fairly in possession, it is for these parties who are claiming the land to establish their title to it, or at all events, to pay a portion of the expense. Why the government should take upon itself to make a survey of the whole line for that purpose and expend a matter of $20,000, I cannot understand. Does the hon. minister apprehend the point I am speaking of? It is that in any dispute between adjoining owners the person who is not in possession and who is claiming to obtain possession from the other is the person who enters the proceedings and it will be for the land-owner to have the limits marked out on the ground according to the provisions of the deed defining the boundaries.

Mr. EMMERSON. In a mere delimitation of bounds that may be correct, but there is other work to be done in connection with this—the preparation of the plans and the fixing of the monuments. I do not think that the parties holding the adjacent properties will be bound in any way to contribute to that. It would not be so necessary to them and I think it is more important for the government to have these bounds fixed because the present state of affairs opens the door to constant claims being pressed. The people are not so much interested in that as the government is.

Mr. LENNOX. I cannot see that the hon. minister has made it very clear yet as to the position we are in in reference to this matter. We have been in possession of the canal for years and years. We must have been using it. We are using the land. In the majority of instances I assume that the adjoining owners along the canal are using their lands. There will be fences in many instances, probably in almost all instances, and in regard to the plan that my hon. friend speaks of, the plan follows the survey; it does not precede it. You make the survey and then you prepare the plan, I presume. If the hon. minister will tell us how this $20,000 is made up, probably it will be satisfactory, but we have no information as yet on that point. There will be so much time involved, so much for the plan and so on. Will the hon. minister tell us that?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have no details of the estimate. The officers have not furnished me with them. I am acting on the estimate prepared for me by the chief engineer of canals and he concluded that this work would cost $20,000. We are asking a vote for that amount. I do not think it is an excessive amount. It cannot exceed that amount because that is the only amount provided, but if it does not cost that amount the whole of it would certainly not be expended.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not know whether I quite comprehend what the hon. minister means when he speaks of the estimate. What I understand by an estimate is that a person sits down and takes into consideration the various elements that enter into the various kinds of work and so on, and having set down the figures in detail he then finds out what the total will be. I do not understand that an estimate is a mere guess as the hon. minister says it is. It is simply that the deputy minister instructs him to put down $20,000 and down it goes. He says it may not be expended, but our experience is that when we vote money it is expended, and very often more than expended. We ought to have something more than a mere guess. We ought to have some figures to show how this amount is arrived at. If the hon. minister has such figures he ought to bring them down and if he has not he ought not to ask us to vote this amount until these figures are prepared.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like to ask the hon. minister when this work will likely be completed. Will it be done during next summer or will it extend over several years? It may be that $20,000 is only the thin end of the wedge, only a very small part of the expense necessary. We seem to have a great many of these continuous jobs running on year after year extending over two, three, four, five, or six years. There must be a great many people in this country very happy with such contracts. They seem to make their living out of them. They never seem to come to any termination. This is a policy that we will have to inquire into. Probably this survey bureau to survey the Welland canal is another of these never ending contracts. I would not be surprised if those of us who are here three or four years hence will still be voting money for the survey of the Welland canal.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not furnished with any detailed estimate. This is only the estimate of the chief engineer. This work has become urgent. The work should be done at once and as I am informed by the chief engineer it will be commenced as soon as the vote is available and will be completed certainly within the fiscal year commencing the first of July next. The reason why it is urgent that the work should be done is that in one instance, it is

claimed by the engineers, the bounds of the canal go right through the barn and house of one of the adjoining owners. It is claimed by the department that this man has encroached on the property of the canal by erecting his buildings there.

Mr. BARKER. You can ascertain that for $10.

Mr. EMMERSON. I doubt that very much. I think it will be necessary to make a complete survey of the whole line in order to ascertain with certainty where the monuments should be placed.

Mr. COCHRANE. How long have the House and barn been there, does the minister know?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, I do not know; long enough to create difficulty.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is all very well for the minister to pass it over so lightly as that, it is very nice to hand out $20,000 of the people's money and then smile.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is no use to cry over it.

Mr. COCHRANE. No, you will not cry. If it was the hon. minister's own money he would not be so happy.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am very generous.

Mr. COCHRANE. With other people's money, not with your own. I never heard of your being so generous.

Mr. EMMERSON. I never had the $20,000.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am not discussing your liberality; the question is what do you know about the subject.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY. Carried.

Mr. COCHRANE. No, it is not carried. The gentlemen opposite are very funny; I remember years ago when they were not so funny. It is absurd for intelligent men to be sitting here in parliament voting away the people's money and laughing and thinking they are so clever. I would think that the independent members would be serious. They are not tied up by any party ties and I would think that they would want to know where the money is going. I can understand hide-bound politicians but I would think the independents would show some independence. If the work is so important why does the minister not have some information? He cannot tell where the canal is. This house and barn have been there for years and they do not interfere with navigation and I would like to know why the difficulty has arisen at this time. I should think as the canal was built and deepened by the department that they would have complete plans and specifications in reference to it. I am surprised that the Minister of Customs does not instruct the Minister of Railways and Canals as to the necessity of having fuller information about his estimates. I understand that the Minister of Railways and Canals is a little new here, but the Minister of Customs knows how, when he was in opposition he used to howl about these expenditures.

Mr. LENNOX. No, not howl.

Mr. COCHRANE. No, I take that back, I made a mistake; but he used to make a great deal of noise and tell us that we were spending enormous sums of money and that the people were being bled white. Now he sits there and shakes his hands. I often wonder if he is not saying 'Lord be merciful to me a sinner.'

Lachine Canal, machinery for shops, $2,300.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is for some improvements in the workshops, the present ones are entirely inadequate.

Electrical installation, $5,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is intended to be spent in connection with the electrical apparatus for operating the lock gates and is to protect the lock gates, motors, &c., from the fenders of passing boats. The total expenditure is estimated at $15,000.

Mr. BLAIN. When will this be completed?

Mr. EMMERSON. Within this fiscal year.

Mr. BLAIN. And this will complete the work?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, this is the total cost of that particular electrical work.

Bridge over the canal at Atwater Avenue, $45,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is for the Atwater Avenue bridge over the Lachine canal in Montreal; $40,000 was voted last year, and this is to complete the work. $85,000 is the estimated cost of the bridge including the substructure and superstructure.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Possibly some of the hon. gentlemen from Montreal and vicinity might want to discuss some of these items that we have just passed. That can be done on one of the items that have been reserved. There will be no difficulty about that?

Mr. EMMERSON. There will be no difficulty.

Some resolutions reported.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is prepared to proceed with the legislation that stands in his

name, that will be taken up, and we will go into supply afterwards. If he is not ready to proceed, we will go into supply and continue with the estimates for Railways and Canals.

Mr. EMMERSON. I shall be prepared to go on with the Canals, but I had promised some hon. gentlemen that before the Railway estimates were taken up, I would give notice of that and make a statement.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Then, as soon as we finish Canals we will return to Public Works.

Motion agreed to, House adjourned at 12.15 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 17, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 60) to incorporate the Algoma Copper Range Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 61) to incorporate the Lebonk and Thunder Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Bole.

Bill (No. 62) respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Lamont—by Mr. S. J. Jackson.

Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the Brantford and Woodstock Railway Company.—Mr. M. S. Schell.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to direct the attention of the First Minister to a practice which seems to obtain a good deal this session, that of moving the House into Supply two or three hours after dinner, when neither the Prime Minister nor any of the other ministers are in their places. In the days of my parliamentary innocence it was the practice, I think, to move the House into Supply when the Prime Minister and most of his colleagues were here, and I would like to see that practice resumed. It may be fastidious on my part to vent this idea, but I would like to see it observed a little more, so that the undoubted right of every member of parliament to discuss some public question on going into Supply may be maintained, and that the ministers may be in their places to hear what is said.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that the only time when the House was moved into Committee of Supply at a later hour than eight o'clock was yesterday.

Mr. MACLEAN. No ; two or three times.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand the contrary. At all events, the House can always be moved into Committee of Supply to oblige my hon. friend or any other hon. member who wants to make a motion. Of course, the House may be moved into Committee of Supply at any moment ; but we have usually taken up Bills before going into Committee of Supply. Of course, if I knew in advance that any hon. gentleman wished to bring up any question on the motion to go into Committee of Supply, I would be only too glad to give him the opportunity.

INQUIRIES FOR REPORTS AND RETURNS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I bring to the attention of the Prime Minister, as well as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the fact that a considerable number of returns have been moved for in connection with the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and that for the most part they have not yet been brought down ? It would be desirable to have those returns brought down before the estimates of the hon. gentleman are under consideration, otherwise some delay might be necessary in order to obtain the information which is asked for in the very returns to which I refer.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The returns are being prepared as fast as possible, and they will be laid on the table of the House, I am quite sure, before the estimates of the department are taken up.

Mr. SPROULE. Yesterday I inquired when the report of the commissioner on the importation of alien labour would be brought down.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I have made inquiry, and I find that the report is in the hands of the printer, and we are promised it in time to be presented to the House next week.

Mr. GANONG. Can the Minister of Marine and Fisheries give us any idea as to when we are likely to see the report of the commission on the Atlantic fisheries ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am informed by the chairman of the commission that he will be here next week to complete his report.

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved second reading of Bill (No. 37) to amend the Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act, 1899. He said : The object is to extend about three miles further down the River St. Lawrence the pilotage limits of the Quebec

district. At present steamers have to stop at Father Point to get the mails and then they have to stop at Bic, 17 miles farther up in order to take on pilots. It is recommended by those interested in shipping that the pilotage limit be extended to Father Point and the pilots be taken on board there and thus avoid the necessity of a second stoppage.

Mr. MONK. Have all the shipping interests asked for that ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Every one.

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

On section 1,

Mr. HAGGART. What is the object of extending the jurisdiction of the Harbour Commissioners ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The limits are now 17 miles above Father Point and steamers are obliged to stop at Bic to take on pilots. They are also obliged to stop at Father Point, about 17 miles further down, to take the mails, but if the limits be extended to Father Point, the pilots can be taken on board there as well as the mail and thus only one stoppage will be necessary.

Mr. AMES. Is this the only Bill to be introduced by the government this session to amend the Quebec Harbour Commissioner's Act ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am not aware of any other nor of any demands for any other change.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there anything in the law which compels the pilots to be taken on at Bic ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The pilots of the Port of Quebec are under the jurisdiction of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners and the pilots are taken on at the extreme eastern limit of the pilotage district. The shipping federations have represented time and again that this should be remedied, and the pilots taken on at Father Point as well as the mails. But unless we extend the limits of the pilotage district, we cannot oblige a pilot to go down to Father Point, because outside the pilotage district he is outside the authority of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners.

Mr. HAGGART. I thought that the hon. minister last session intended to bring in a Bill to take the control of pilotage into the hands of the Dominion government.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The pilotage authority for the district of Montreal, extending from Montreal to Quebec was given to the Department of Marine and Fisheries last year with the consent of all public bodies interested. But as regards the Quebec district, no one would consent to this change. Even the Shipping Federation and others specially interested would not consent. I am informed however, though not officially, that they will make a request in the course of the next week that the pilotage authority for the district of Quebec be put into the hands of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. But I have not yet received any official demand.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the reason the hon. minister gives the only one for changing the law ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. What about steamers such as the 'Campana' which go to the maritime provinces ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They have no pilots.

Mr. BERGERON. They are not under the jurisdiction of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No. I wish to propose an amendment to subsection B of this section by adding at the end of the words 'the river Saguenay excepted.' Through an error in preparing the Bill these words were not inserted, and they should be there because the pilotage on the Saguenay was last year put under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—CONTROL OF TELEPHONE LINES.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I take this opportunity of calling the attention of the House to a petition with regard to telephones. This petition, which has been signed by a large number of municipal corporations all over the country prays :

That your honourable House may be pleased to pass an Act amending all charters granted to telephone companies so as to declare that the poles of such companies shall not be hereafter erected or conduits constructed on any road or street in a municipality without the consent of the council of such municipality, and upon such terms as such council may approve.

As things are now, it would appear, a telephone company incorporated under a Dominion charter can override these municipal rights and can enter upon the streets of any municipality without asking the consent of the corporation. This has been found a very substantial grievance and parliament is being petitioned to remove it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there a general statute on the subject ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. There may be some general statute in regard to it, but, so far as I can see, it does not cover the case completely. When a delegation of representatives of leading municipalities waited upon the government, the Minister of Justice asked them to draft a clause which they would like to see put in the general law, at least that is the representation that has been made to me. The municipalities all over this country feel that their rights are being encroached upon by the wide powers taken by the telephone company. And another petition is in circulation, but whether presented to the House or not I do not know. It is a petition on behalf of the Union of Canadian Municipalities. They pray the Dominion government and parliament to carry out the following legislation :

1. The purchase by the government of the long distance lines.
2. The amendment of all existing telephone charters, so as to provide that no companies shall erect poles or construct conduits on any road or street in a municipality without the consent of the council of such municipality, and upon such terms as such council may approve.

Here are two organizations, the municipalities on their own account and the Union of Canadian Municipalities praying parliament to give them jurisdiction over the erection of poles or laying of conduits by telephone companies within their limits ; and I trust the government may be able this session to introduce a general law dealing with that question and restoring to the municipalities the full control of their own streets in these matters. It may be necessary to allow these companies to go through a municipality with their long-distance service, but I contend it never was the intention of parliament to take jurisdiction over the streets of municipalities and hand it over to telephone companies. But there is a still more important question involved. It is referred to in 'The Canadian Engineer' as follows :

With regard to the government ownership and control of the long distance lines, while we endorse any movement for the public ownership of utilities, we believe it is far more essential at the present time, for the government to call upon the Bell Telephone Company to give and receive connection over the long distance lines of its existing system with the subscribers of all local telephone services, without regard to the ownership of such exchanges. In other words, every telephone user should have the right of long distance service whether he is a Bell subscriber or not. The inevitable result of this would be that the monopoly would no longer be able to keep out local competition, municipal and independent exchanges would be established in all parts of the Dominion, and in a few years the demand for increased long distance telephone facilities would be such that the government would be compelled to recognize the necessity of establishing a state-owned long distance system, either by duplicating or acquiring and extending the lines of the Bell Telephone Company.

Now, that is the most important question in connection with the telephone service. This calls for an interchange of what I might call telephone traffic. The law of Canada concerning railways provides that railway companies must interchange traffic. But at present the Bell Telephone Company or any other, can refuse to give connection to an independent company. The consequence is that the Bell Telephone Company has a monopoly throughout the country. This matter came up in the railway committee the other day. When I proposed to put in a private Bill incorporating a telephone company a clause compelling the company to allow interchange of traffic, the hon. acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) who is chairman of that committee, said that this ought to be incorporated in a general measure. I agreed with him. But I went further and said that the government should assume the responsibility and introduce such a measure. In view of the petitions that have been presented, I take it to be the duty of the government, this session to make a general law compelling an interchange of traffic between the telephone companies. It is true that a telephone company to-day will accept a measure from another company if carried across the road and handed into their office; but they will not do what railway companies are compelled to do, make connections so that the traffic can go from one line to the other. Every telephone company has been created by parliament and given powers of incorporation because it is declared to be in the public interest. That is the very basis of the reasons given for incorporating them—that they are in the general interest of Canada. That being the case, the general interest of Canada can govern them as it governs the railway companies. And the government, out of respect for that interest, should ask parliament to pass a law to compel the telephone companies to interchange traffic. Let me put it as 'The Canadian Engineer' puts it :

We would point out that the charter of the Bell Company declares the works of that corporation to be 'for the general advantage of Canada.' That being so, the Bell Company has no more right to restrict the use of its long distance system to its own subscribers, than a railway company has to refuse to haul the cars of another system over its lines. We do not, of course, suggest that the company should not be compensated for the use of its lines by outside companies. A system similar to that in operation in Great Britain for the use of the government long distance lines could be arranged without difficulty. In Great Britain a subscriber to the Glasgow Municipal Telephone exchange wishing to speak to a subscriber of the National Telephone Company in London, Manchester, Liverpool or elsewhere, would pay,

in addition to the usual toll charge for the long distance line, a terminal fee to the National Telephone Company for the privilege of connecting with its local subscriber. In the case of a National subscriber speaking to a Municipal subscriber in Glasgow or any other town, a similar terminal fee would be paid to the municipality. This is a perfectly equitable arrangement, and it would be imposing no unfair conditions upon the Bell Company, if a similar arrangement was made compulsory in Canada.

My object in calling the attention of the government to this matter is to persuade them to give, this session, a general Bill to compel the Bell Company to give that interchange of traffic that is desired—to afford the same facilities now afforded in Great Britain—and to do so on the ground that it is in the public interest. It is not right that the parliament of Canada should create a great monopoly supposed to be in the public interest and then allow it to refuse to one class or to another the service it professes to give.

At the present time the long distance service of the Bell Telephone Company is restricted to its subscribers. If an independent telephone line is erected in a rural district, and there are many in this country, and they want to have conversation over the Bell system, they cannot do it, as they should do it, by a switch connection; but some individual must convey the message from the terminal of the independent company over to the office of the Bell Telephone Company, requiring a personal act. But just as railways interchange service, so ought the Bell Company to take a terminal wire from every independent line and to make connection on its switch board, being paid as much for that service as they would if an individual came in and offered a message. This company to-day has grown to be an enormous monopoly, it has been declared to be in the public interest, it has been incorporated as such, and yet it is in a position to discriminate as to what portion of the public shall be entitled to its services.

Another thing, that Bell Telephone Company has made a contract with the two great railways of this country, that is against public policy. I have before directed attention in this House to the fact that by this contract with the great railway companies they have denied the right of every independent company in this country to have access to any railway station. Now that thing cannot continue. There are private telephone lines being erected all over the country. The people of the Northwest are going in for independent telephone lines, and they wish to have. these independent lines enter railway stations. As I have pointed out before in this House, these people are the best customers of the railway company, but by reason of this contract they cannot get any access to the railway stations except through the Bell Company, and they cannot find out, for instance, whether their goods have arrived at the station. Therefore the time has come when we ought to have a general telephone law in this country, bringing all the telephone companies under it, giving to everybody an interchange of telephone traffic, and giving that direct access between the different telephone companies which only a connection on the switchboard can give, and we ought to compel the railways to abandon that exclusive contract with the Bell Company.

Now it will be a very hard thing for myself or any other member of the Railway Committee to draft a resolution that will meet the case. In this particular private Bill that is now going through, the promoters of it have agreed to accept some kind of amendment that would compel them to do this. But I find I have to employ counsel myself to draft that law. Notwithstanding that we have a law department in this parliament, a Minister of Justice, a Solicitor General, and law clerks of all kinds in this House, still it devolves upon me to retain a drafting solicitor of my own to get an amendment of that kind. Surely I ought to have the assistance of the law officers of the Crown in devising some protection for the public, as against the companies. But at present it seems that a private member who is trying to protect the public interest, or to make an improvement in the law, must work out all these things for himself. Much better would it be for the government, working on progressive lines, and following the example in England and other progressive countries to make a general law regulating these telephone companies, and compelling them to interchange traffic, not putting upon a private member, by means of a private Bill the duty of securing the public rights that ought to be protected by a public measure. Therefore I trust that the government will pay some heed to these petitions, hundreds of which have poured into the House this session from nearly every municipality of this country, calling for a general telephone law, giving back to the municipality the right to control their streets, except for long distance lines. The law also ought to compel an interchange of traffic by connection with switchboards, at the same time protecting the interests of companies that now have a monopoly. Let them be paid for such connection, and let the connection be made in a convenient manner instead of the round-about way that takes place at present. That being the case, I hope even to-day, that in a very short time we will have an intimation from the government that they propose to remedy some of these telephone grievances this session.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I have to express to my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) the regret that he gave me no notice that he intended to bring this important subject before the

House. Had he done so, I would have been prepared——

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I had it written.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not receive any notice, had I done so I would have been glad to place in his hands for his own information the report of an interview he referred to, and which took place some time ago with a deputation from the city of Toronto, if I remember right, with regard to some of the privileges which are now held by the Bell Telephone Company. So far as I remember, the grievance which was brought to our attention by the city deputation was in consequence of a decision given by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council whereby it was held that the Bell Telephone Company could use the streets of Toronto, and put poles in the streets; they had not only the use of the streets which they had already been using, but of all the streets in the city. As I understand the charter given to the Bell Telephone Company in 1882, they had not only the right to use certain streets, they were already using, but the power to go all over the city and cover its streets with their poles. If I remember the request which was made to us by the mayor and solicitor of the city of Toronto, it was that parliament should pass a law to abridge the power thus given by parliament to the Bell Telephone Company. Well, for my part I pointed out to the mayor and to the solicitor that in my judgment that would be interfering with rights which had been given by parliament. They thought it would not be an interference, but that a clause could be framed whereby the Act would be so amended as that it would not infringe upon the vested rights they had in the city. Thereupon we asked the solicitor and the mayor to frame an amendment for our consideration so that we might have in concrete form the very thing they wanted us to do, whether we would agree to it or not. So far, however, we have not received this draft legislation. If such draft legislation were received by us, it would be our duty to consider it and see whether we could introduce it to this House. I would say to my hon. friend at once that if such an amendment could be framed, one which would not interfere with any vested rights of the Bell Telephone Company, I can see no objection why such a law should not be introduced. But if such a law cannot be introduced without infringing upon rights which have been granted to the company by this parliament, there would be a serious objection to such legislation. I pass no judgment at this moment upon the question which has been raised. I have been waiting, and am still waiting, for news from the city of Toronto upon this subject.

This brings me to another point which has been mentioned by my hon. friend. He has asked for a good deal of legislation, and one of the things he is asking for is a restoration to the municipalities of the powers which have been invaded by this parliament. I am not aware that parliament has ever, by any general law, invaded the powers of municipalities. But I am aware that in past legislation, private companies, the Bell Telephone Company for instance, have been allowed to invade municipalities, to invade Toronto and other cities, without any reference to municipal authority. Last year, or the year before, our attention was called to similar legislation which was asked for by some railway corporation; and, if I remember right, the Railway Committee here would not pass any law which would interfere with the powers of any municipality unless the consent of the municipality had first been obtained. I am pretty sure that at this moment the tendency and desire of the House would be at all times to see that the rights and privileges of the municipalities are not interfered with except with their consent. I do not know whether there will be any necessity of passing a law with this object in view. But, in regard to another matter which has been brought up by my hon. friend I confess that I, to a large extent, sympathize with him when he says that the time has come when we should have some general law regulating telephonic traffic and the interchange of traffic between telephone lines. For my part I think there is great force in the demand which has been made in this House and which has been presented to us in numerous petitions. This is a matter which ought to engage the attention of the House, but before it engages the attention of the House it ought to engage the attention of the government. I do not say what will be the course of the government this session or at any future session; all I can say is that the government is not at all oblivious to the sentiment which prevails in the country and I think some attention ought to be given to the question.

Mr. BOURASSA. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) has brought the attention of the House to this matter. I think I can supply some information from my own county upon this subject which is only an illustration of the general condition of affairs as far as private telephone companies are concerned. There have been two private companies established in my county for the last four or five years, and their purpose is to give the people living in the back townships telephonic connection with the railways. One of them especially has its terminus at a station of the Canadian Pacific Railway, an important distributing centre of trade, but by virtue of an agreement entered into between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Bell Telephone Company the Canadian Pacific Railway refuses to permit that private telephone company to place a tele-

phone box in the station. The result is that nine-tenths of the clients of the Canadian Pacific Railway at that station cannot have telephonic communication with the station through which they receive all their freight and goods. They are obliged to send their messages to the telephone office in the village and then pay a special rate for a messenger to go down the hill 400 or 500 yards to deliver them to the agent at the station. They cannot communicate directly with the agent; they can only send a messenger. And, mind you, there is no office of the Bell Telephone Company there, but simply by virtue of the monopoly they enjoy that private telephone company are not permitted to place a box in the office of the Canadian Pacific Railway notwithstanding the fact that the Bell Telephone Company have no office there. The Bell Telephone Company have no office there or at the village, but they exercise their right of monopoly even where they have no traffic at all. As far as the principle of vested rights is concerned in theory I quite agree with my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), but we must not forget this that when rights were granted for the Bell Telephone Company telephonic traffic was not then considered such as it is now a matter of general interest to the whole country. We had not then come to the point of seeing that the telephone system that does not belong to the companies who enjoy its profits but that it belongs to the people at large, and the time must come when vested rights which were at one time considered to be private property cannot longer be allowed to interfere with the rights of the public. The rights of the public must be considered and if the rights of a private company interfere with the rights of the people then parliament should rather side with the public interest than with private interest. But, it should be done with a great deal of care. We should not introduce that principle with the idea that in consideration of the public interest we should entirely disregard vested rights, but at the same time I think the government should look into the question. I hope they are going to look into it very soon and that they will not be entirely biased by the idea of protecting vested rights. They should consider vested rights, but if there is a conflict between public and private rights, public rights should have the preference over private rights.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, with a great deal of what the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said I would agree, but there is one thing with which I would not agree, that is that it is only the duty of the government to take up grievances when some one has brought in a Bill to remedy them. I have always regarded it as the duty of the government to recognize a grievance when it is brought to their notice in various ways and then to endeavour to find a remedy. This grievance has been brought to the attention of the government over and over again, for several years past and I respectfully submit that it should not be left to a private member to bring in a Bill to remedy it. The condition existing in his locality so graphically described by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) is what may be found all over this country and it has been brought to the attention of the government over and over again. If I understand it correctly a railway company, when it receives its charter, agrees, by virtue of that charter, to give to the public alike equal facilities to do business with the company. Can it be said that a railway company is carrying out that agreement if it deprives the people who live in one section of the country of the right to do business over the telephone line with its station while it gives that right to another class of people ?

Mr. BOURASSA. The case I have cited is still worse than that. The Bell Telephone Company has no office there but it prevents the private company which is the only one that has a line there from having connection with the station.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, but I was dealing with this question. It is absolutely the duty of the railway company to deal with all people who use that railway upon the same principle and to give them equal facilities. It cannot be successfully contended that a railway company is giving equal facilities to people who live alongside a private line when it denies them the right of connecting their line with the station while at the same time it gives people living upon the line of the Bell Telephone Company the right to do business with the station. I am anxious to get the ear of the right hon. Prime Minister, but if I am only talking to deaf ears I would rather avoid the trouble of talking at all. I do not say anything about the discourtesy that is displayed to a member of the House who is endeavouring to do his duty because I think every hon. minister ought to recognize that which is fairly due to another member. I say in regard to this question that in my judgment the duty of the government is, now that the grievance is brought to their attention, to provide a law to remedy and not call upon private members to perform that duty. This case has been brought to their attention over and over again. Then, another feature of this matter is that I hold that the law as it is to-day would compel the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other railway to admit any other telephone company to its office if the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) took the matter up and enforced the law. You cannot expect a private individual will undertake to fight against a railway company. This has become such an intolerable grievance to business people that the government ought to take it up and remedy it at the earliest

possible date. When we endeavour in every Bill that comes before the House and the Railway Committee to embody in it a clause providing a remedy for this grievance we are invariably met by some member of the government with the objection that this remedy should be provided by a general Act. Well, let the government introduce that Act and pass it. We will give them all the support we can and I am sure the people are desirous that it should be done. I think the government are not doing their duty by the people if they do not provide a remedy when the grievance is brought to their attention.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter in which I am very much interested.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no motion before the House. If there is to be a long discussion——

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I understood that a motion had been made to go into Supply and it was to that motion that I addressed myself.

Mr. BOYCE. This is a matter of very great moment to the country. Some time ago I placed certain questions with regard to it upon the order paper and requested an answer with regard to a particular instance, namely, the difficulty with the Bell Telephone Company which was brought to the attention of the government during the last session in reference to making connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway offices at Port Arthur and Fort William. I was told, I think, by the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Emmerson), that it was impossible to answer these questions although they were put in succinct and concrete form. For what reason he was unable to answer these questions and give the information I am unable at present to say. I regret to note that the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Conmee) is not in his place at this time. If he were here he could doubtless speak of the very great confusion that was caused to the commercial interests of Port Arthur and Fort William by this difficulty. There is in these towns the Bell Telephone system and also a municipal system. The Bell Company, armed with this public franchise granted to them by parliament and enjoying the public rights, and opportunities so granted absolutely, refused to make any connection whatever with the municipal telephone system or with the offices of the Canadian Pacific Railway, so that it was impossible for subscribers of the municipal system of Port Arthur and Fort William to have any telephone access to, or any communication with the railway stations at Port Arthur and Fort William, which were under the control of the Bell Telephone Company. A very large percentage of the people of these two towns which are large growing and prosperous towns of considerable and growing commercial importance, use the service of the Citizen Telephone Company. They prefer to use the Citizen's Company and to exercise the privilege which they have of patronizing their local municipal telephone system, but of what use was it to them when the Bell Company, enjoying these privileges granted to them, as the right hon. the Prime Minister says, by parliament, could set at naught the will of the people and prevent them from having access to these offices and to the full use and enjoyment of their franchise. It is an important question and one that should occupy the attention of the government even at this late day. It is very much to be regretted indeed that the government has not, after all these grievances have been brought to its attention, seen fit to interfere, to remedy these grievances and bring before parliament some measure which would afford some relief under the circumstances.

YUKON ELECTION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the motion is adopted I would like to refer to the correspondence which the Prime Minister has just placed on the table. As it is not very long I shall take the opportunity of reading it. The first telegram is as follows :

Ottawa, 5th Oct., 1904.

Joseph Ena Girouard,
Dawson, Y.T.

You have been appointed returning officer for the electoral district of the Yukon. Writ dated 29th September mailed to-day. Nomination Friday, 18th November, at Dawson. With this information by referring to form 'E' and clauses of Yukon Representation Act, 1902, you can select clerk and enumerator and decide on polling stations. Then prepare proclamation following directions in Act.

(Sgd.) R. W. SCOTT.

A note follows this :

On ascertaining that Girouard was a member of the Yukon Council and therefore disqualified, Ledieu was appointed.

The next telegram is dated October 8, 1904, to the gentleman just named Mr. Ledieu. It is as follows :

Ottawa, 8th October, 1904.

Pierre Ledieu,
Barrister, Dawson, Yukon Territory.

You have been appointed returning officer in place of Joseph Ena Girouard, not qualified. Get from him my telegram, October 5th, and act in accordance therewith.

R. W. SCOTT.

The next telegram reads :

Ottawa, 17th October, 1904.

Pierre Ledieu,
Returning Officer, Dawson, Yukon.

If proclamation has not been posted stay action. Represented that owing to difficulty of travelling time appointed for nomination is unsuitable. Number of polling places should not exceed forty. Consult Congdon, who is familiar

with centres of population. Advise me immediately of present position.

R. W. SCOTT.

Then there is a note following that to this effect:

Not then known that Congdon had resigned commissionership or that he was to be a candidate.

(Sgd.) R. W. S.

The next telegram is dated Dawson, Yukon, October 20, 1904:

Hon. R. W. Scott,
Secretary of State, Ottawa.

Is writ to be dated 5th October, and what is the return day?

(Sgd.) PIERRE LEDIEU,
Returning Officer.

The next telegram is dated Ottawa, October 21, 1904, and is as follows:

Ottawa, 21 October, 1904.

Pierre Ledieu,
Dawson, Yukon Territory.

No, writ dated 29th September—nomination 18th November. You were instructed to get my telegram to Mr. Girouard and act in accordance with it. I cancel the suggestion in my telegram to stay action and expect you to proceed vigorously. If not too late limit number of polls to forty. Writ returnable when your duties have been completed.

R. W. SCOTT.

The next telegram is dated Dawson, Yukon Territory, and is dated December 5, 1904. It is to the Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick (Minister of Justice), and reads:

The voters' lists compiled.

I suppose it is compiled, it reads 'complied:'

The voters' lists compiled under the Yukon Territory Representation Act, 1902, have been stolen, if posted, immediately after posted; lists for each polling division have not been posted in accordance with section 30, and access to lists in enumerators' hands under section 30 and 31 refused by enumerators to Dr. Alfred Thompson, candidate, his agents and supporting electors. Intense excitement prevails in consequence, pointing to danger of general uprising. The lists for whole enumeration district were posted in two places only in such district and were not segregated for polling subdivisions and posted in such polling divisions. Such lists as posted were so posted secretly at midnight, November 30th, and immediately removed and have never been open to be seen by Dr. Thompson or his supporters. We respectfully request that direct instructions be immediately given to all enumerators to allow Dr. Thompson, his agents and all electors access to voters' lists, final closing of the same under Act. Please advise Dr. Thompson by wire.

(Sgd.) ALFRED THOMPSON.

Candidate T. W. O'Brien, Thomas J. Kearney, N. F. Hagel, T. D. Patullo, C. W. Tobors, George Black, John Pringle, R. H. S. Cresswell, committee.

The next telegram is dated Ottawa, December 1, 1904:

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Ottawa, 7 December, 1904.

Pierre Ledieu,
Returning Officer, Dawson, Y.T.

All candidates are entitled to equal facilities in securing copies voters' lists. Representations are being made that this rule is not being observed. Any sharp or indefensible practice defeating this fair principle by officers employed under Elections Act will result in forfeiture of their remuneration and may void the election. You appointed clerks and enumerators and will be held responsible for any malfeasance. Publish this telegram immediately on receipt in local papers and send me copy of papers. Answer by wire if published.

R. W. SCOTT.

It appears by the subsequent correspondence that the returning officer did not obey the very proper instructions which the Secretary of State gave to him by publishing this telegram; in fact further on he intimates that he has declined or refused to obey these instructions so far as the publication is concerned. The telegram which follows next is:

Dawson, Y.T., Dec. 7, 1904.

Secretary State, Scott,
Ottawa.

Returning officer Pierre Ledieu refuses to make public through newspapers contents or purport of instructions known to have been received from you. People vitally interested. Please wire 'News' if the public is entitled to know.

Dawson 'Daily News,'
A. S. GEORGE, editor.

To this the following reply was sent:

Quebec, 9 Dec., 1904.

A. S. George, editor, &c.,
Dawson, Y. T.

Returning officer was substantially instructed to give all candidates equal opportunities to obtain copies of voters' lists. That as he had appointed enumerators it was in his power to see that the lists were given impartially to both candidates.

R. W. SCOTT.

The next telegram is from the Yukon to the Secretary of State.

Dawson, Y.T., Dec. 9, 1904.

Hon. R. W. Scott,
Halifax, N.S.

List as yet not furnished Dr. Thompson or his agent. Returning officer neglects to communicate with enumerators outside Dawson and some enumerators are being kept hidden. He refuses list of polling subdivisions until two days before election, too late for electors to ascertain whether names on are struck off. Other party has them. People depending on you but thoroughly aroused, have had to request police to protect enumerators and returning officer to-day. If corroboration desired communicate with Police Commissioner Wood. Instructions should be prompt and definite, and Dr. Thompson advised thereof, otherwise same will be evaded. Situation becoming more strained.

ALFRED THOMPSON, candidate,

John Pringle, T. W. O'Brien, Thos. J. Kearney, C. W. Clabor, N. W. Hagel, George Black, R. H. S. Cresswell, T D. Patullo.

The next telegram is from the returning officer:

Dawson, Y.T., Dec. 9th, 1904.

Hon. R. W. Scott,
Halifax, N.S.

I repudiate any intimation that I have facilitated one candidate more than the other in obtaining special copies of voters' lists. The law as framed does not provide for furnishing such special copies to each candidate by enumerators, whose only duty is to post the same in the different divisions. True it is that several of them were stolen after being posted. Each party accuses the other of the theft. I remain uncertain as to what was my duty, but will follow your instructions by advising the enumerators to furnish each candidate with special copies. The duties of returning officers under the Yukon Representation Act are not clear. I thank you for your opinion upon the matter. I beg, however, to submit that the publication of your telegram would be unjust towards me by putting me in an unfair light before the public. I hope you will not insist upon the execution of this order. I cannot understand how your telegram was known to have been sent before it reached me.

PIERRE LEDIEU,
Returning Officer.

The telegram of the Secretary of State reflected in no wise on the returning officer. It was a mere telegram of instructions, and it does credit to the Secretary of State in that regard. It is evident from the telegram which I have just read that it was not the intention of the returning officer to comply with those instructions, but to keep secret from the public until after the election the instructions which he had thus received. And I may say, before I go on to the further telegrams, that this returning officer points out what we pointed out to the government during the last session and the session before that if the law were not amended grave injustice would be done to candidates where there were partisan returning officers or enumerators, both in the Northwest Territories and in the Yukon. The very thing which we pointed out, which my friend Mr. Casgrain, who then represented Montmorency, predicted, in his address to the House on that occasion, has actually happened in the Yukon and has led to serious disturbances there. The other telegrams are as follows :

Dawson, Y.T., Dec. 14th, 1904.

Hon. R. W. Scott,
Secretary State, Ottawa.

If threatened wholesale removal of names from voters' lists carried out, will be bloodshed.

JOHN PRINGLE.

Ottawa, 15th Dec., 1904.

John Pringle,
Dawson, Y.T.

If election frauds such as you represent are being perpetrated, better apply afterwards to the courts to void election rather than resort to the bloodshed which you say is imminent.

R. W. SCOTT.

Ottawa, 31st Jan., 1905.

Pierre Ledieu,
Returning Officer, Dawson, Y.T.

Whom do you propose declaring as member elect ? Reports received give Thompson a large majority.

R. W. SCOTT.

Dawson, Y.T., Feb. 1, 1905.

R. W. Scott,
Ottawa, Ont.

I propose, as bound by law, to declare elected the candidate who on the 7th February, declaration day, will be found to have had the majority of votes. As it is I have only the unofficial reports of deputy returning officers, which apparently give a majority to Thompson of over 500.

PIERRE LEDIEU,
Returning Officer.

Dawson, Y.T., Feb. 8, 1905.

R. W. Scott,
Secretary State, Ottawa.

Alfred Thompson was declared elected yesterday by a **majority of 618. My report** with writ will be sent in a couple of days.

PIERRE LEDIEU,
Returning Officer.

Dawson, Y.T., Feb. 13, 1905.

R. W. Scott,
Ottawa, Ont.

Was served to-day with writ of subpoena in a case of conspiracy ordering me to produce on the 1st of March the writ of election, the voters' lists, the poll-books and all other election papers. Shall I obey the order of the court or not. Dr. Thompson is leaving for Ottawa on the 15th.

PIERRE LEDIEU,
Returning Officer.

Ottawa, 14th Feb., 1905.

Pierre Ledieu,
Returning Officer, Dawson, Y.T.

If there has not been any demand for a recount under section ninety, Dominion Elections Act, then your duty is to return this candidate and conform to all the requirements of section ninety-two of the Act.

R. W. SCOTT.

I thought it worth while to read this correspondence to the House, because it deals with a very important matter, namely, the conduct of the returning officer, who is an officer of this House ; and it concerns also the disfranchisement of the Yukon Territory for a period of perhaps two months when it should have been represented by its member sitting in this House. When this matter was mentioned earlier in the session, my hon. friend the Minister of Justice stated distinctly that an explanation was to be demanded from the returning officer as to the reason for delaying the date for opening the ballot boxes and summing up the result, to the 7th day of February, the necessity for which does not appear anywhere in this correspondence, nor, so far as I am aware, can it be demonstrated otherwise. The promise then made to the House by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice has apparently, for some reason, been overlooked or neglected.

I would suggest to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister that it is desirable that without delay that promise should be implemented and an explanation asked by telegram from the returning officer as to why he postponed to the 7th day of February the opening of the ballot boxes, when so far as we know a more proper date would have been one towards the end of December or certainly many weeks prior to the date he has fixed. I would respectfully ask the Prime Minister to have that matter dealt with at the earliest possible moment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say that I do not know much of the circumstances which have attended this election. In fact, I knew nothing of them until a day or two ago, when, after my hon. friend the leader of the opposition had brought the matter to the attention of the House, I made some inquiry as to the reason for the delay in returning the elected member. All the information that I can give at this moment to my hon. friend is this, that according to the law and the practice of the Yukon, the delay has not been extraordinary. If I am correctly informed, there must be according to the law of the Yukon a full month between nomination day and polling day, and a very long delay between polling day and declaration day. The reason is that at that season especially, on account of the long distances and the severity of the weather and the bad roads, it would not be possible to have any less delay. If I am correctly informed, the returning officer on this occasion acted exactly in accordance with the precedent of the previous election in the Yukon. There have been two elections in the Yukon so far, first, the election of Mr. Ross and then the election of Dr. Thompson. As I am informed, the delays in each were exactly the same, and those delays had been fixed by the returning officer before the two candidates were put in nomination. The impression seems to prevail that they were extended by the present returning officer after the election of Dr. Thompson, because Dr. Thompson was supposed not to be of his own political party; but if I am correctly informed, all such imputations are absolutely unfounded. The delays were exactly the same as before and were fixed at the time the returning officer issued his proclamation fixing the polling days and the day for declaration. As my hon. friend has read, the last telegram sent by the Secretary of State to the returning officer was that he should declare elected the candidate having the majority and that his duty was to send his return here, and as soon as we have his return we will be in a position to see how the matter stands.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There was no delay so far as the former member of the Yukon is concerned, but that may have been due to the fact that the House met at a later date in the year. But I would be slow to believe, without very cogent evidence, that a delay of fifty-three days is necessary for the return of the ballot boxes. That is the delay which has taken place in this instance from the 16th December until the 7th February.

MILITIA ORDERS.

Mr. G. H. PERLEY. I notice in the public prints, within the last day or two, copies of orders which the Militia Council proposes to put in force regarding those clerks in the Militia Department who are in the militia of Canada. I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Militia to one of the clauses in these orders. It is a clause which, it seems to me, cannot fail to create a wrong impression, and an impression which, I feel sure, the hon. minister had no intention of producing. The clause says that—

> —similar considerations govern the grant of leave of absence for the purpose of attending annual training or performing other military duty. Leave of absence, other than the annual leave to which the applicant is entitled under the Civil Service Act, can only be given for this purpose upon the condition that no detriment is caused to the public service.

That is the clause to which I call attention. We all know well that no employer in this country can have any of his men belong to the militia without suffering some detriment to his business. This clause refers to times of peace, and the other parts of the order, which refer to times of war, provide that the members of the civil service in the Militia Department shall not go out in time of war. That is probably all right. But in times of peace, I feel quite certain that even if these orders are put in force as they read, the minister will never prevent any of the clerks in his department from going to annual drill, simply because that might cause the department some inconvenience. I am sure that the hon. minister wishes to make the militia as efficient as possible, and I simply wish to suggest that the clause to which I have referred, and which provides that the clerks in the Militia Department cannot attend annual drill in time of peace if it causes any detriment to the public service, is one which will produce an impression among other employers of labour that will do our militia a lot of harm. No employer of labour can allow his men to belong to the militia without some detriment to his business; and I am quite sure that the Minister of Militia is willing that his department should, in time of peace, be put to the ordinary inconvenience or detriment which other people are willing to suffer when their men belong to the force. I would suggest that before these orders are put in force the hon. minister should consider whether he should not alter the wording of this clause in order to remove from the minds of ordinary em-

ployers of labour the impression that the Department of Militia is not willing to be put to any detriment or inconvenience in order to allow its clerks to attend annual drill and the other ordinary duties of militiamen in times of peace.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am sorry I was not in the House when the motion was made, and still more that my hon. friend did not intimate to me that he intended to bring this matter up. That is the usual course pursued and the usual courtesy extended to a minister. I was near the chamber in my own room attending to some work, and would have been here if I had known the intention of my hon. friend. Besides it would have been much more convenient to give the minister the opportunity of being prepared to meet a matter of this kind. Speaking off-hand, I may say that the reason for the order is that it would be manifestly inconvenient, in time of stress, or difficulty, or war, if you like, for officers of the Militia Department, who, at such a time, are more required in their offices than at any other, to be compelled to go into the field. It would be absolutely impossible to carry on important militia work if men holding important positions in the department were permitted to take posts in the militia which would necessitate their leaving their duties in the department at the very moment when they were most needed there, and when they could do best service for their country in the department itself. That is the whole object of the order. It was discussed in the Militia Council, and very strongly recommended by the four military experts, and was not passed without being most carefully considered. With all deference to my hon. friend, I do think that these gentlemen, possibly, are better informed than he as to the best requirements in the public interest on the part of these officials in the Militia Department; and I am sure that no one can have a stronger desire than they to serve the public interest. Later on, perhaps, in the session I shall be very glad to return to a discussion of this matter, but I think that this is rather an inopportune moment to consider it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It is my purpose to take this matter up on the minister's estimates. No doubt the theory is that these men are all members of a permanent corps, so to speak, and to take them from one branch of the service to another in time of stress might be detrimental to the public interest. The point I specially object to is that it names certain commissions that no officer in the department may hold, such as adjutant, and, I believe, commanding officer. If an official is allowed to enlist as a private in a militia corps, I do not see why he should not be allowed to rise to be Lieutenant-Colonel of his regiment. Either these officials should not be allowed to join a militia corps or they should be free to rise to the highest positions in the new service they are capable of taking. I give the minister intimation that I will take up this matter when the estimates are under consideration.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think it would be well to have this order placed upon 'Hansard,' and therefore with the permission of the House, I will read it:

The question of to what extent it is desirable that employees of the Department of Militia and Defence, both at headquarters and elsewhere, should serve in the militia has been under the consideration of the minister in Militia Council.

It is obvious that in the event of an outbreak of war, the position of the Department of Militia and Defence must be entirely different from that of other departments of the public service. Upon its efficient working depends the efficiency of the military forces in the field. It is, therefore, of paramount importance for the success of the campaign that it should not suffer detriment by being liable to have members of its civil staff withdrawn at such a moment in order to serve with troops in the field.

At the same time, the Minister in Council desires to encourage employees of the department to serve in time of peace and so familiarize themselves with military requirements.

He trusts, however, that they will understand that, although they are members of the militia force of Canada, their duty to the State is primarily that of civil servants in the department to which they belong, and that in time of emergency they render more valuable service to their country by continuing to serve in the Militia Department than by accompanying their units as soldiers.

This being the case, it follows that no employee of the Militia Department can be safely reckoned on to accompany his militia unit when it is called out for service, and further, that he ought not to hold any position in that unit of such a nature that his absence would seriously prejudice its military efficiency.

The Minister in Council has, therefore, decided that no civil employee of the Militia Department shall, in future, accept the position of either adjutant or commanding officer of any unit of the active militia, and that permission to join any corps can only be granted subject to this proviso.

Similar considerations govern the grant of leave of absence for the purpose of attending annual training or performing other military duty. Leave of absence, other than the annual leave to which the applicant is entitled under the Civil Service Act, can only be given for this purpose upon the condition that no detriment is caused to the public service.

All officers and other persons in the employment of the department will guide themselves accordingly.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Some time ago the minister, if I understood him aright, promised that he would supply each member of the House with a copy of the new regulations. May I jog his memory on that subject?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will see to that.

Motion agreed to and House went into Committee of Supply.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to capital—Welland canal—to deepen portions of summit level between Port Colborne and Thorold, $80,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. As I explained last evening, $140,000 is required to complete this work. We ask here for $80,000, which will cover the work that, in the ordinary course, will be done within the fiscal year which will leave a balance of $60,000 to be asked for later on.

Mr. HAGGART. Last year $150,000 was voted for this purpose, which, with the $140,000 yet to be spent would make a total of $290,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. The total estimated cost of this work is $530,000, of which $390,000 has been expended up to December 31 last.

Mr. HAGGART. Will this $140,000 complete the work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, so I am informed by the chief engineer. The work is the excavation of 1,377,000 cubic yards. The lowest tender was 38½ cents, making $530,000.

Mr. HAGGART. What depth of water will there be when the work is finished ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This will give 17 feet of water at the ordinary level of Lake Erie, and 15 feet at low water. The deepening of the canal is made necessary by reason of the lowering of the water in Lake Erie which has been going on for some years.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the object of having 17 feet when navigation in the canal is only 14 feet ?

Mr. EMMERSON. When this is completed there will be a depth of 17 feet. At certain points the boats dragged, I believe making the deepening of this level necessary.

Mr. HAGGART. Why have 17 feet when you have only 14 feet of navigation ?

Mr. GERMAN. I have some knowledge of the navigation of the Welland canal. The difficulty arises from the fact that the wind blowing from the east to the west lowers the water in the Welland canal. When the wind is blowing from the west the water in the canal will rise two feet or more ; and when it is blowing from the east up the lake the water in the canal will be lowered by two feet or more. The normal depth of the water is supposed to be 14 feet, that is the advertised depth of water in the Welland canal, the depth on the mitre sill. There being this fluctuation of two feet above or below, it is necessary that the canal from Port Colborne to Thorold, where the locks begin, should have a sufficient depth of water so that when the wind is blowing up you will still have 14 feet. Unless that is done the canal at certain times would be absolutely useless.

Mr. HAGGART. When it was first built it was well known what the effect of the wind was, blowing east or west on Lake Erie. The difference between the two extreme levels was, I think, about six feet. There would be no object in deepening the summit level if you have not dropped the mitre sills both on the lake and at the entrance. Have you done that ?

Mr. GERMAN. Yes, at Port Colborne.

Mr. HAGGART. How much ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Three feet.

Mr. HAGGART. Then you are deepening the summit level of the canal for the purpose of bringing it down to the depth on the mitre sill, and at the entrance to Port Colborne that would be 14 to 17 feet. Did not the weight of the material that was originally excavated at the summit level and piled on each side of the bank, force the bottom up a little ?

Mr. GERMAN. There is no doubt it did, and that is part of the work that it is necessary to do. This work has to a considerable degree been increased by the fact that the banks which were constructed under the supervision of the hon. gentlemen opposite in that particular way, have forced up the bottom of the canal.

Mr. EMMERSON. That would not be true with respect to that portion where there has been rock excavation.

Mr. HAGGART. None of it is rock excavation.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a fact that a portion of this work is rock excavation. If the hon. gentleman had been here last night he would have learned that fact, and that there was a contract let for that work at $2.90 per cubic yard.

Mr. HAGGART. On the summit level of the Welland canal ?

Mr. GERMAN. Yes, at Port Colborne.

Mr. HAGGART. On the summit level it must be all clay.

Mr. GERMAN. From Port Colborne for about two miles and a half down the canal to what is known as Ramey's Bend, it is all rock excavation. The whole canal is built through rock, and that has to be deepened.

Mr. HAGGART. You have 17 feet on the mitre sill of the lock, what is the depth of the excavation for Port Colborne harbour, that part which is under the control of the Canals Department.

Mr. EMMERSON. The harbour is 22 feet, we reduced it at the entrance to the lock to 17 feet.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the standard you take for 22 feet depth ? Is it the original bench mark of the canal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is the original design.

Mr. HAGGART. Are you making allowance in your 22 feet excavation for Port Colborne, for the variation caused by the lowering of Lake Erie which the hon. gentleman mentions ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Just the same as it is done in the canal.

Mr. HAGGART. Just the same as it is being done on this level of the canal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. You are taking the 22 feet navigation of Port Colborne, is that on the new depth or the new bench mark allowing for the lowering of the water in Lake Erie ?

Mr. GERMAN. The jurisdiction of the Department of Railways and Canals only extends to the outer extremity of the pier at Port Colborne. From the outer end of the pier, the beginning of the jurisdiction of the Department of Railways and Canals, the depth of the canal will be probably 15 feet on the whole summit level. Outside of that is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Works, who, I understand, are making a basin there with a depth of 22 feet under any condition of weather, so that the largest boats on the upper lakes can go into the elevator and unload no matter what the climatic conditions may be as respects the wind.

Mr. HAGGART. I understood entirely different. I understood that part of the work of deepening that was in process at Port Colborne, was under the jurisdiction of the Canals Department, that outside the locks they are deepening to the extent of 22 feet in order that vessels may come up to Port Colborne, and over this portion they have jurisdiction ; or do you only take jurisdiction to the end of the lock ?

Mr. GERMAN. To the end of the pier.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the Department of Public Works have jurisdiction to the guard lock of the canal ?

Mr. GERMAN. Not up to the guard lock.

Mr. EMMERSON. The harbour itself is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Works ; the channel which runs from the harbour into the entrance of the canal is under the control of the Department of Railway and Canals.

Mr. HAGGART. Are you deepening that channel 22 feet or only 17 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am informed by the chief engineer that they are deepening that channel to 22 feet.

Elevator at Port Colborne, including foundation, $310,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. The estimated cost of the elevator and foundations, including the machinery for operating and handling grain is $1,110,000. The capacity is 2,000,000 bushels. The foundations and superstructure were designed and planned by J. A. Jamieson, of Montreal, an acknowledged expert in this special line of engineering, and who is paid a commission of five per cent for the same, including superintendence during construction. The elevator will be fire proof, being constructed principally of steel and concrete. Mr. Jamieson has designed elevators for the Canadian Pacific Railway at Owen Sound and St. John, and for the Montreal Transportation Company at Kingston and other places. We have let the contract for the foundations, the contract price at schedule rates amounting to $95,200.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the hon. minister considered the possibility of having these elevators made of tile instead of iron? The iron ones are found to be affected more by the heat in summer and the cold in winter.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is not completely iron, but concrete and iron. It is different from the ordinary iron elevators. It is a new design of elevator in accordance with the most modern ideas and is to be one of the most up to date elevators that is to be found on this continent.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. They are all that.

Mr. EMMERSON. They may be.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. A concrete elevator erected at Duluth some years ago is more or less a failure and the iron elevators are failures.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is a combination of the two.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the policy of the government in reference to these elevators? What is the object of building them and what are you going to do with them after they are built?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is, of course, for the storage of grain. A harbour has been constructed at Port Colborne at great expense. Vast sums of public moneys have been expended there. There were quite a number of applications received by the department from time to time from transportation companies and other private corporations asking for the privilege of putting up separate elevators on the public works at that point at the entrance to the canal. It was deemed in the public interest better for Canada to furnish a large elevator which would be open to the general public in accordance with certain regulations and subject to conditions and tolls. It was deemed that it would be better that Canada should

expend the money to construct this elevator and give to all who are interested in the transportation question an opportunity of availing themselves of elevator facilities. Thus it was that it was determined to construct this elevator. It will be the largest elevator, as far as I have any knowledge, in Canada, and will certainly meet the present and even anticipated requirements of the traffic from the west to the east by the lakes.

Mr. HAGGART. Last session when the hon. gentleman was taking a vote he asked for about $40,000 for the purpose of constructing the foundations of this elevator.

Mr. EMMERSON. $400,000 was asked for last year.

Mr. HAGGART. But $40,000 for the foundations.

Mr. EMMERSON. We asked for $400,000 last year. At that time it was anticipated that we would have the foundations further advanced, but in consequence of the delay—

Mr. HAGGART. It appears in the estimates that you asked for $400,000 and I want to state what the hon. minister said last year in reference to it. He wanted $40,000 for the foundations for this elevator. He stated that in the course of the construction of the piers it would be necessary, whether the elevator was erected by private enterprise or by the government, to build the foundations. Last year the government had not decided whether it would be better for private individuals to build this elevator or whether the government should have control of it. It was a moot question with the government; they did not know whether they would expend a dollar or not in reference to this matter. What is the advantage of having this elevator built by the government and interfering with what ought to be strictly and purely a private enterprise ? What was the reason that induced the government to build this elevator?

Mr. EMMERSON. Well I would say to my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) that as far as my judgment is concerned it was to prevent one or two transportation companies getting the control of that waterway. There can only of necessity be a limited number of elevators and they would be under the control of the exclusive few. There would be a large majority of those engaged in lake transportation who would be entirely shut out, and, of course, the expenditure of public moneys there is supposed to be in the general interest. It is for the good of the greatest number, and if it were our policy to permit private parties to have the use of the works there for their particular private business it would not promote the general lake traffic. The government believe that the application of this principle must commend itself to those who are interested in getting the traffic from the west to the east and while it cannot be said to be a money making enterprise in view of the expected traffic, it need not be a money losing operation.

Mr. HAGGART. Then, you are going into what is after all an individual or private enterprise on the ground that perhaps a couple of parties might erect elevators at Port Colborne and interfere with what might not be in the interest of the general public. That is the reason stated by the hon. minister for this arrangement. He says that in the interest of the general public the control of this elevator should be in the hands of the government because it might tend to monopoly in the hands of private individuals. I suppose the hon. minister has the report which he sent to Council or at least the report of his deputy urging the reasons why the government should build this particular elevator. Within a few miles of Port Colborne there is centered a great amount of traffic requiring the greatest elevator capacity in any part of the world. Yet, I am not aware that either the state of New York or the government of the United States has interfered with what should be purely private enterprise by having an elevator erected in Buffalo or in any part or portion of the United States. It is a new venture for governments to enter the domain of private enterprise for the purpose of erecting elevators in the interest of the public, in the hope that it will accrue to the public advantage afterwards. It is true that on the Intercolonial Railway as part and portion of that railway we have erected elevators, mostly in places where grain never reaches them, like Halifax, and to a certain extent St. John, and we have, for the convenience of the Intercolonial Railway or perhaps for some reason on the lines the hon. gentleman advances, erected one in Quebec, but if the government of the country are going to furnish elevators for every part of the Dominion of Canada where it might be to the public interest and advantage that elevators should be erected they are opening up a very wide field indeed. What is the cost of this elevator going to be?

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) cannot have forgotten the proposition made to this parliament last year, that it would be in the public interest to build elevators along the railways as a public charge and under the control of the public. This proposition is a natural sequence of the action of this parliament in building the breakwater at the entrance to the Welland canal in the harbour of Port Colborne. A very large sum of money was expended in the public interest—wisely expended we must assume—in order to facilitate the lake traffic. In order to have any traffic whatever, it is necessary to have an elevator there. There are conflicting interests, competitive companies, all disputing for the

right to enjoy the major portion of that traffic, or all of it that they can get. There can only be a limited number of elevators, probably two at the most, placed upon these public works. If one or two of these companies secured these elevators, then where would be the facilities that other companies are seeking for? They would be simply shut out, and the large sums of the money of Canada which have been expended in the erection of that breakwater and the building up of that harbour would have been expended in order that one or two companies should have a monopoly of the traffic. That would be simply placing the expenditure of this large sum of money at their disposal, shutting out the larger number of transportation companies. It seems to me that these are very good reasons for the action proposed to be taken by the government with respect to this large elevator, which will be open to the public at large.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister has a curious system of ratiocination, which I am not able to follow. He says that the natural sequence of building a breakwater, if the public are going to utilize it, would be to furnish it with an elevator for the benefit of the public; in order to derive any benefit from the deepening of Port Colborne harbour and the entrance to the mouth of the Welland canal and to utilize it to the fullest extent in the interest of the public, we have to erect the largest elevator on the continent of America, and we do it probably for the reason that there is only room for two elevators there. It is news to most of us that you can only erect two elevators in that large harbour which is being constructed at Port Colborne, and that if the two were erected the public would be at the mercy of the elevator owners. It is in the interest of the public, it is the natural sequence, according to the hon. gentleman's style of argument, that when you erect a breakwater, and desire to use it to the fullest extent, you have to erect also an elevator for the benefit of the public at large. There should be an end of this kind of thing; something should be left to private enterprise in this country. The natural sequence, according to the minister's argument, of the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific by the government would be that we should erect elevators on the line of the different railways that are in operation throughout the country.

Mr. GERMAN. There is no doubt a question involved which is of very great public importance in the construction of the elevator at Port Colborne. There is a contingent on the opposite side of the House in this parliament who believe that the government should own all these utilities, not only the elevators, but all the railways, telegraph lines and telephone lines in the country. Possibly this government is starting, in a small way, in that direction by owning the elevator at Port Colborne and, perhaps, in other places. Whether it is wise for the government to own the elevator, or whether that should be left to private enterprise, is a matter for discussion; for myself, I am free to admit that I desired the government to allow a private company to construct this elevator. But the rights claimed by private companies were rather extreme. In the first place, Mr. Wolvin, of Duluth, who is the head of a large transportation company which operates between Duluth and the head of Lake Superior and Montreal and Quebec, desired to have the right to construct an elevator or elevators at Port Colborne. The government, some years ago, began, and have nearly completed, the construction of two large concrete piers at Port Colborne, which are being constructed exclusively for the purpose of erecting on them elevators and storage warehouses at considerable expense. It was thought to be in the public interest that this should be done, and I do not know that there has been any serious criticism of the government's action in the construction of these works. In order to make these works of any benefit to the country, elevators had to be built. Mr. Wolvin desired the right to construct an elevator on one of these piers, but he insisted that if he did anything he should have an exclusive right. Certain financial gentlemen in Toronto applied to parliament for a charter, and I had the honour of fathering their Bill. Hon. gentlemen can see from the Bill who the incorporators are, some of the wealthiest men in Toronto. Their idea was to get the right from this government, if possible, to construct an elevator or elevators at Port Colborne, and to put on a line of boats of canal size to carry grain on the lake route to Montreal. But these gentlemen, before they would go into the enterprise, before they would even think of constructing an elevator, insisted upon having a monopoly or an exclusive right to build elevators. They said that the matter was experimental, and that it was in the nature of a gamble, to expend large sums of money in the construction of ships and in the building of elevators at Port Colborne, terminals at Montreal and Quebec. They said that if they spent this large sum of money, they must have the exclusive right to the use of the elevators at Port Colborne. Mr. Wolvin insisted on the same thing. These two companies came into competition; they came to the government; Mr. Wolvin insisted on the exclusive right to construct the elevators, and the company of Canadian capitalists which was incorporated here also insisted on an exlusive right. The government decided—wisely or otherwise, is a question for argument—that rather than give any company the exclusive right to construct and control these elevators, the government would build an elevator itself. The government is going on to build the elevator, and I have no fear but that the

future will demonstrate conclusively that the construction of this elevator will aid very materially in the solution of the transportation question in Canada, and bring about the transportation of grain through Canadian channels instead of through American channels, where it goes at present.

Mr. OSLER. Does the minister know the amount of grain which has gone through the Welland canal during the present year as compared with previous years? Has there been any increase?

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot state off-hand, but I can furnish that later. I know there has been an increase in the tonnage of the traffic through the canals generally. I want to invite the attention of the committee to this feature. In the first place, there is a very natural and very meritorious desire on the part of Canadians to have all the possible traffic brought down through Canadian waterways and by Canadian ports. If the policy of permitting private corporations to get advantages in connection with elevators were adopted, it might mean that parties at Duluth or at Buffalo would become interested and would get control of these elevators. They could very readily do that, and that might prove to be to the disadvantage of Canada with respect to our export trade. The policy which has been adopted is largely the outcome of a thorough inquiry into the matter on the part of the government and of suggestions made by the Transportation Commission, the appointment of which I think was concurred in by this parliament. In bringing the matter to the consideration of my colleagues, I had the privilege of inviting their attention to an extract from an interim report put in by that commission. That report recommended:

> That the work of putting in a suitable foundation and the erection of an elevator at Port Colborne harbour be proceeded with at once, the capacity to be not less than one million bushels, and placed so that additional storage bins can be added when found necessary; the elevator to be of the most modern and approved type, giving the quickest despatch to vessels loading and unloading; provision also being made for loading railway cars when connection is made; the government to retain the ownership, thus avoiding any complication or deflection of traffic from the St. Lawrence route; the rates for elevation to be as low as possible, the main object being to encourage the route rather than to make a profit for the elevator.

That expresses in a nutshell the policy of the government with respect to this elevator. It is to protect Canadian interests; it is to protect the St. Lawrence route. It is to prevent such great works getting under the control of American capitalists, which might prove disadvantageous to Canadian shipping interests.

Mr. HAGGART. We have an interim report, it seems now, from the commissioners who were appointed to investigate our transportation facilities? I understood from the answer that was given in the House the other day that there were no reports.

Mr. EMMERSON. It has been stated here more than once that this commission, under the chairmanship of the late Mr. Bertram, had reported with respect to the St. John harbour, and, if I mistake not, that report was laid before parliament. It was also stated, if I mistake not, at the last session, that the matter of the Port Colborne harbour facilities was being inquired into by this commission, and that they proposed making an interim report, and they did so.

Mr. HAGGART. Are these all the reports you have from the commission?

Mr. EMMERSON. Speaking from memory, there are only two. The commission went to St. John, Halifax and Sydney, if I mistake not. At any rate, they went to St. John and they have made a report with respect to that harbour and a report with respect to Port Colborne. I do not think they have made any other suggestions—certainly not a general report.

Mr. HAGGART. It would be most interesting to the committee to have a report from that transportation commission. I had every faith in the ability of the chairman of that commission, who has died, and a report from him would be of great use to this committee. When we are considering the expenditure of two or three million dollars for the building of elevators at Port Colborne and the deepening of the harbour and that portion of the canal which reaches the harbour, we ought to have the full report of the commission on the subject. We ought to be informed how the traffic is going to be diverted, what rates are going to be charged on these elevators, and how the whole affair is going to result commercially. We know nothing about any of these matters. The minister should furnish us with a tabulated statement showing mathematically the commercial advantages of what the government propose to do.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman asks for an accurate statement showing the commercial advantages. Let me invite his attention to the situation, and if he will take a comprehensive view of it he will see that it is our duty to erect this elevator regardless whether it will pay in the matter of fees, because its erection is essential to the utilization of the enormous capital we have already expended on the Welland canal. That canal has a carrying capacity of 14 feet. I believe that the locks are able to lock through vessels carrying about 70,000 bushels. But every one knows that on the upper lakes to-day are plying a

large number of grain carrying vessels of a capacity of 200,000 bushels and more, some going as high as 300,000.

Mr. MACLEAN. Drawing what water ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Twenty feet.

Mr. HAGGART. Nineteen feet.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Those vessels are to-day doing the chief carrying trade on the lakes, carrying grain from Duluth and Fort William down chiefly to Buffalo. Why do they not bring it to Port Colborne? Those vessels carry sufficient cargo to fill at least four or five canal barges the full capacity of the lakes, and they will not come to Port Colborne if they have to be detained there. They must feel sure, when they start from Duluth or Fort William, that they will be able at once, on reaching Port Colborne, to unload either into barges or elevators. We have built a breakwater and dredged and deepened the harbour inside the breakwater. There are five hundred acres, or nearly a mile square of harbour safe for these vessels, but to-day they must give it the go-by and go to Buffalo because there are no facilities at Port Colborne to enable them to discharge their cargoes at once and immediately return. It is the very essence of the carrying trade that these vessels should utilize every moment of time during the short season of navigation instead of having to wait idly for hours or days before starting on their return trip. There are between 200 and 300 of these vessels on the upper lakes bringing the grain from the upper ports to Buffalo, and these vessels give the go-by to Port Colborne simply because we have not the facilities for unloading at the port which they require. The erection of an elevator there is therefore absolutely essential if we want to bring the traffic to that port and down the Welland canal. We have spent $60,000,000 from first to last on our canals, and they have not yet at all realized the expectations of our people or given any direct or indirect reasonable return on that expenditure. Why is this ? Simply because the key to the situation is Port Colborne, and that port has not yet been equipped in such a way as to make it possible for us to capture that traffic. If we are to enjoy the fruition of the expenditure on our canals, which has been justified by public opinion ever since confederation, we must completely equip that port. My hon. friend possibly takes exception to the government, but what is the situation ? If Port Colborne is the key to the situation, we must not imperil our chances by giving the control of the elevator at that port to any one person or company. There is not unlimited space there ; and if we were to give any set of gentlemen the building of the elevator, they would acquire a quasi monopoly and possibly deter others from investing money there in like manner. We know what wheels there are within wheels and how combines and organizations grow up. If we were to allow a set of men to build an elevator at Port Colborne, it might pay them better to shut up the elevator. They might make more money by playing into the hands of Buffalo ; and while you make agreements—my experience of agreements with great corporations——

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Be careful.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK—is that in some way or other these corporations are able largely to evade the most carefully drawn bargains.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the hon. minister mind letting us into the secret of how they do this ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am sure I could not add anything to the hon. gentleman's information on that question. In my opinion the only way for us to be safe is for the government to own this elevator. Then the grain men of Buffalo could not, as they might in case the elevator were owned by a private company, use their influence to have this elevator closed or its usefulness defeated. If a company should own the elevator, they might probably conform to the letter of the agreement and yet defeat its spirit. They might have a slow method of handling the grain. They might embarrass the boats coming and going. They might in many ways injure the trade without actually violating the agreement. On the other hand if the government should be the owner, they will have no interest except to bring the largest volume of trade through the elevator so as to make our canals useful and have the country reap the greatest advantage from the money expended. I do not think there can be any argument in favour of private ownership of an elevator at the mouth of Port Colborne as against the arguments in favour of government ownership. We should view with the greatest alarm the giving over the right to own the elevator to any corporation or set of men. The present scheme has my heartiest approval. I believe it will prove the turning point in the history of the Welland canal. That canal has not up to the present realized in any respect the expectations of the people and I shall be disappointed beyond expression if the building of this elevator will not bring to this canal as much grain as it can carry. Without this elevator how could a vessel drawing 19 feet of water come into Port Colborne and be discharged, if the weather be not favourable? If the vessel owners could be sure that when they got to Port Colborne there would be fine weather, they might come in, and a few do occasionally come in, but very few because they cannot depend upon it. True, the breakwater has to some extent got over that difficulty, but then the question of delay

comes in. I am told that when this elevator is constructed, it will give facilities for transhipment at Port Colborne that will enable vessels carrying 150,000 bushels of grain to unload and leave the harbour in six hours less than they could in Buffalo harbour. I do not know what the difficulties are in that harbour.

Mr. TAYLOR. The time taken in getting there and back.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is not only that, but there are difficulties there.

Mr. GERMAN. Congestion in the harbour.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There are other difficulties I understand. My authority is an engineer, I think it was Mr. Weller. I visited Port Colborne harbour and talked with the men in the government service there, and they gave me to understand that a vessel of the kind I speak of would be able to save six hours on each trip. That is a very material saving, I suppose, in a short season of navigation. So, if we have the elevator there, we have the chance of having between two and three hundred vessels drawing 19 feet of water or thereabouts coming to our harbour with traffic, while, to-day, we have not a chance of any of them coming. Surely, the prospect is a favourable one. How else are you going to get the trade ? If you do not put up an elevator, you get along in the same miserable way as in the past. We have had enough disappointment in the working of the canal and it is time to display such enterprise as will actually bring the traffic our way. Everything is done except the finishing of the work. We have spent $60,000,000, and surely we are not going to stop at an expense of $2,000,000 if by that expenditure we have a fair chance of securing the trade.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I asked the minister (Sir William Mulock) if he would give us light on the matter of large companies controlling the elevators. I do not know that he has thrown light on anything, but, if he has, it is certainly not on the subject before the House. He speaks of two or three hundred vessels drawing 19 feet of water coming from Port Arthur and Fort William to Port Colborne. He says he does not know anything about the grain-shipping business. I can tell him that if he is going to get two or three hundred vessels from Port Arthur and Fort William, they must be American vessels, and they could not carry freight from Fort William to Port Colborne.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Why not ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Because they are American ships and are not allowed to engage in coasting traffic. That is, they are not allowed to go from one Canadian port direct to another. They could not be Canadian boats, because there are not nearly that number of Canadian boats drawing 19 feet of water.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We will get the Duluth traffic.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. minister spoke of Port Arthur and Fort William and did not mention Duluth.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, I did.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I did not hear him. In the shipping of this grain it is not a race to reach Port Colborne or Buffalo. The question is how to send the grain most quickly and most cheaply from Duluth, Port Arthur or Fort William to its final destination. Buffalo is nearly the end of the shipping route, where the grain is taken hold of by the various railways—very little of it goes by the Erie canal and little will go by the Welland canal. The minister says we have no place to receive the grain. Why, Midland is a great deal nearer Duluth, Port Arthur and Fort William than Port Colborne is.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I did not make that statement.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not think the minister knew what statement he was making. He said we had no place to receive the grain——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, I made no such statement.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. At any rate we have Midland which is a deeper harbour and much nearer Chicago and Duluth and Port Arthur than Port Colborne is. There are elevators there and a railway connection that will take the grain to the sea-board at cheaper rates than can be given from Port Colborne. In a short time we shall have the item for the Trent canal under consideration. I hope the government will push that work through to completion. We shall then have the grain carried to the sea-board by a sheltered route all the way. I trust that in a few years we shall have the Georgian bay canal via Lake Nipissing and the French river. This will be another sheltered route for grain to the sea-board and will make it unnecessary to go round the circuitous route by way of Port Colborne. I am not finding fault with the expenditure under consideration. I believe the scheme to be all moonshine, but I have never opposed it. If there is anything in the theory that this can be made a great shipping route I am willing to try it. But, I must say, I cannot see how any shipper of grain is going to ship to Port Colborne, then place the grain in small vessels to send it by canal, or send it in cars, to Lake Ontario, then load it into boats and take it to Montreal. The barge trade on Lake Ontario cannot be made a success. I believe it would be better to enlarge the Welland canal and let the vessels go through

to Montreal, rather than waste money in building up Port Colborne.

Mr. OSLER. One fact the effect of which was not fully realized, I believe in before the enormous expenditure at Port Colborne was decided upon is that the grain shipped by the Welland canal is destined to be exported by the St. Lawrence route. This route closes comparatively early and at the very time when grain is being shipped to Buffalo in the largest quantities. The last boat from Montreal carrying grain leaves about November 10th. That is, the shipper from Port Arthur, Fort William or Duluth cannot rely upon sending out his grain by Montreal unless he gets it through the Welland canal and into the port of Montreal not later than that date. The greatest rush of grain is between the beginning of November and the middle of December, and the closing of navigation from Port Arthur is certainly not earlier than December 6th. This year vessels left Port Arthur loaded with grain and landed their cargoes at Georgian bay ports—I think I am right in saying—up to December 10th.

Mr. GERMAN. The Welland canal closes on December 15th usually.

Mr. OSLER. I am not speaking of the Welland canal, but of the destination of the grain that goes by the Welland canal—that grain is destined for export by the St. Lawrence, and, as I say, it must reach Montreal not later than November 10th. I am a little familiar with vessel trade on the lakes and am aware that the boats are being made of greater and greater capacity every year. The boat that was considered a large boat four years ago is one that would not now be built by any one going into the grain trade. The whole object that the grain men have in view, so far as I can ascertain, is to build as large boats as possible and land their grain on the eastern shore of the Georgian bay. If the enormous expenditure at Port Colborne realizes in any degree the hopes built upon it, I shall be delighted. I am quite willing that whatever amount is necessary to the carrying out of any reasonable project should be spent. But I am afraid that the conditions of our canal navigation will render the usefulness of this expenditure doubtful to say the least of it. All the railways, the Grand Trunk Pacific, Mackenzie & Mann and the Canadian Pacific Railway are looking to get increased facilities on the eastern side of the Georgian bay, so that they may as rapidly as possible get rid of their wheat from Port Arthur and Fort William. The railways do not wish to have a bushel of grain lying in the elevators on the west side of Lake Superior when navigation closes, and they want boats that will empty the elevators and transfer the grain to the eastern side of the lakes that it may be carried away even in the winter. I believe that the ministers in going into this enormous expenditure at Port Colborne have not realized the fact that the grain goes to Buffalo not so much because of superior advantages of that harbour itself—though they have superior advantages we admit—but because the grain can be distributed from Buffalo six weeks later than it can be from Port Colborne. I think that is the secret of the Buffalo grain trade. Furthermore we find that about two-thirds of the grain shipped to Buffalo is distributed through the state of New York and the New England states and is not exported. Say that 300,000,000 bushels of grain are received at Buffalo, that is quoted as grain that should have gone down from the Welland canal and through our ports. But if you trace that grain out you will find that less than 100,000,000 bushels perhaps not more than one-fourth of the whole, is for export; the balance of it is used up in New York city and in the New England states. I think when we are discussing the question of the Welland canal as against Buffalo, we are apt to omit that important consideration. I do not think we sufficiently realize that the main reason why Port Colborne and the Welland canal do not take the traffic that we think they ought to take, is because the grain traffic comes too late to be carried by that route.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is to be borne in mind that the government is not to-day originating the scheme of the Welland canal. That was determined upon a third of a century ago, or more. We find ourselves to-day confronted with a situation. The Welland canal is completed to 14 feet, that was a policy adopted by the previous government, and we have simply adhered to it, and brought the depth of the St. Lawrence locks to that depth of 14 feet. Now, because it is possible that other routes are more suitable, are we to stop and allow the Welland canal to fall into decay? Are we to say it is a failure, instead of giving it the finishing touch so that it may have a chance? That is the situation. If we had not the Welland canal to-day, and if we had the existing railways, and route, and ideas, perhaps the country would pause before embarking in a Welland canal at all. But the canal has been built. Is it wise therefore for us to decide that it is a failure and not give it a chance? It may be that climate, it may be that geography is against us, but I am not quite prepared to admit that. As time goes on we may expect that transportation rates will become cheaper, and then grain can go through the Welland canal and the St. Lawrence canals and will be able to reach the eastern market before the close of navigation. Perhaps the Minister of Railways will be able to take it by his railway to a maritime port. We have not yet learned at what cheap rates grain can be hauled by railway. But even if we had to lose a few days, even if our outport should become congested, or the vessels should leave too

soon, is that any reason why we should not try to bring the grain down as far as we can? What reason is there to suppose that during the early period of navigation, with the several hundred vessels that are now bringing grain to Buffalo, you cannot bring cargoes by the Canadian route if they can unload within the proper time? My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Osler) says that if at that late date in the season they can with greater advantage bring their grain to Buffalo, they will do it. But that does not prevent them at an earlier date in the season unloading at Port Colborne. At all events, if you do not have a harbour at Port Colborne you cannot have the trade. Is there any person in this House who would say that we should not have a harbour at Port Colborne and give that port a chance? Even if nobody contested that view, then it is only a question of detail as to what we should do in order to give the Welland canal a chance. We must have a breakwater, everybody concedes that. You have to deepen the harbour for vessels drawing 30 feet of water, and you have to have some machinery for handling the grain. It is not a question of choice. There is the necessity, you are confronted with a situation from which you cannot escape. You have either to provide facilities at Port Colborne, or you might as well close up the Welland canal. That is my view of the situation.

Mr. OSLER. I do not object to the expenditure of money, in fact I approve of it to an almost unlimited extent if it will heighten the facilities for carrying our grain to market. But I do not approve of the Postmaster General's premises, that because we have spent an enormous amount of money on a route that may be superseded, we must continue to expend it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I did not make a general remark, I was addressing myself to a particular work.

Mr. OSLER. If it can be found that by spending $500,000 or $600,000 on some other harbour which will accomplish our object, it would be much better expended than it is there, notwithstanding that a large amount of money has been spent on the Welland canal. The tendency is to get as short a run as possible from the Lake Superior side to the Georgian bay or eastern side. That is the object all vessels have, that is the reason they are building bigger vessels; and an enormous increase in the business will take place when the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Mackenzie & Mann roads are in operation. I do not think the government sufficiently weigh this matter, or give sufficient attention to this question, if they are only spending more money on the Welland canal because, as the Postmaster General says, we have already spent so much. I do not think that is a good argument at all.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK.

Mr. LEWIS. I am a firm believer in waterways, that is the proper way of carrying our grain to the sea. In considering this proposed vote of a sum of money to deepen the Welland canal, the real question is not whether it is right and proper to put an elevator there, but is this a proper amount to pay for that elevator. As I understand it, $95,000 is asked for to build the foundations for an elevator that can only carry 1,000,000 bushels of grain.

Mr. EMMERSON. 2,000,000.

Mr. LEWIS. Well, say 2,000,000. Now at Owen Sound it costs 13 cents a bushel to build an elevator, in the city of Buffalo, where the foundations are in mud, it costs 20 cents. The question is whether we should build an elevator there or not. There is no question that we should spend money on our waterways. The United States are considering the question of expending $100,000,000 on the Erie canal. We have a much shorter canal to carry grain. We should spend the money on our harbours. We should spend money on the Welland canal, so as to enable it to take care of the grain traffic. In 1902, 12,000,000 bushels of grain went through Buffalo because of the want of facilities to carry it through our own country. This government should promote the public interests by building up our waterways. We are spending too much money elsewhere. We should spend it on our great lakes and inland waterways. We have the best of facilities, if our waterways were improved, for handling the traffic through the Welland canal and by way of Montreal, and I want to say to the committee that last year and the year before, grain was carried from Duluth to Quebec at one and a half cents a bushel by the Wolvin steamers through the Welland canal. I would be glad if the government could see their way clear to deepening the Welland canal. I wish to ask the hon. minister whether this is a proper amount to be expended on the erection of an elevator and whether this work is to be let by tender. Private corporations, when doing similar work, adopt the principle of tender and contract. The Canadian Pacific Railway have built elevators at Owen Sound and at Fort William. I believe that they paid for a first-class elevator 13 cents a bushel at the outside. Canada should have a twenty-foot waterway from Fort William to Montreal.

Mr. HAGGART. If all the advantages from the expenditure at Port Colborne entailed by the erection of this elevator that my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) anticipates, were likely to be realized I am sure that the House and the country would have no objection to this vote. Let us see what the position is. In order to utilize the waterways we have at present he says that further facilities should be offered. We have constructed a harbour at Port Colborne a mile square with a

depth of 22 feet of water and there are only facilities for the erection of two elevators within that mile square. We all know about the harbour at Port Colborne, and we are aware that the difficulty of getting into the harbour was one of the objections to it. That is the reason perhaps why a good deal of the traffic was diverted to Buffalo. If you want to utilize the Welland canal without the deepening of Port Colborne harbour or the erection of an elevator why do you not send your barges to Buffalo and load them with the grain from the steamers there? Any steamer navigating the western lakes would rather go to Buffalo than to Port Colborne.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Why?

Mr. HAGGART. The facilities for getting to Buffalo are much better than, notwithstanding your breakwater, Port Colborne will ever offer.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Why are the facilities for getting to Buffalo better?

Mr. HAGGART. I will tell you why. When there is a wind blowing on Lake Erie, Port Colborne is a difficult and dangerous harbour to enter.

Mr. GERMAN. There was no harbour at that place.

Mr. HAGGART. The facilities you are providing do not remove the objections at all. They do to a certain extent but not altogether. However, if you want to utilize the Welland canal to the fullest extent why not load your barges at Buffalo where the steamers at present terminate their journey? What is the objection to it? You have a few miles more of a journey at a cost which is infinitesimal. Now, the main question to be considered is this: a party has grain at Chicago, Duluth or Fort William which he wants to send to the sea-board. He goes to the stock exchange and asks: What can I get that grain to Liverpool for? He does not care two cents whether it goes by way of New York, Baltimore, New Orleans, Montreal, or any other point. I quoted statistics here a couple of years ago to show that a fraction of a cent per bushel changes the destination of millions of bushels of grain from one port to another. Then, I ask the very pertinent question: Of what commercial advantage is the erection of an elevator at Port Colborne and the deepening of the harbour to the man sending grain from Duluth, Fort William or Chicago? I thought perhaps that question would be the first that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals would ask of his department so as to be able to tell the committee the advantages which would accrue to the people of this country from the deepening of the harbour at Port Colborne and the erection of an elevator there: It seems to me he has not considered that question. I think this is the first and most pertinent question that can be asked in connection with the expenditure which we are asked to make of nearly $3,000,000. The expenditure involved in the deepening of Port Colborne harbour is not for the advantage of the Welland canal at all. The depth of water in the Welland canal for navigation purposes is 14 feet. They have a depth of 20 feet 6 inches at the Soo canal and the standard of navigation for that section of the country in American waters is 20 feet. What do you expend $3,000,000 or nearly $4,000,000 at Port Colborne for?—to allow these vessels coming from the upper lakes to get into Port Colborne and tranship. Why could not these facilities already be given fifteen miles further down. This is a large expenditure for that purpose, an enormous expenditure and I doubt very much whether the facilities which are being provided by it will ever be utilized. The government ought to utilize what we have already paid an enormous sum of money for; that is for the purpose of enlarging our canals. As my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Osler) said, you must remember one thing when you consider the question of diverting traffic. You must know how much traffic there is to be diverted. Look at the exports of grain from Baltimore, New York, New Orleans and other American ports and find out how much really goes from these ports. You would be astonished to find that the total exports of wheat or the product of wheat from the United States to foreign ports do not amount to 100,000,000 bushels. Then, what do you intend to do? They are building canals for what? For the foreign market? They are building canals for the purpose of utilizing their own grain in their own country. As my hon. friend from Toronto says, four-fifths, yes, nineteen-twentieths of the products that pass through the Sault Ste. Marie canal and Lake Superior are consumed in the United States. What is consumed in that country cannot be diverted by any means whatever. You have to consider what would be used in this country and what portion of the traffic goes to foreign countries, or countries across the ocean that you can divert by offering facilities through your own country. You can divert the whole of the traffic from Chicago, Milwaukee and other western points if you go on to the stock exchange and quote to parties in London, Antwerp, Paris or Hamburg grain or any of the products of grain at half a cent per hundred pounds less because they do not care one cent what country it goes through.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. They will get a better rate?

Mr. HAGGART. If they get a better rate through this country, you will divert the trade. You have to offer facilities through this country, and the government, when asking for a vote for such a large

sum as this, should be prepared with a commercial proposition to show the advantages of these expenditures and what would be their effect. That is what I asked the Minister of Railways.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Does the hon. gentleman think that providing proper facilities at Port Colborne would or would not enable shippers to offer a better rate so far as that port is concerned ?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, you incur an expenditure of $4,000,000 and it may be possible to divert a portion of traffic by the expenditure of a million dollars for elevators. The reasoning and logic of the Minister of Railways was that if you make an expenditure for any facilities of that kind—you erect a breakwater and as a necessary sequence have to go on with all the other utilities, and have to erect an elevator for instance in the harbour. I do not think that the expenditure at Port Colborne for the deepening of the harbour or the erection of an elevator will be at all compensated for by the benefit derived from it. I think you are going the wrong way in reference to your transportation expenditure.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. What would the hon. gentleman's plan be ?

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. minister had listened to me I had a scheme which I explained to the fullest possible extent and I showed the advantages of it. I am not against the minister to a certain extent in his reasoning. We have these facilities at present, we might have used them and by a moderate expenditure we could probably have made them more useful, but I say that the expenditure which has been made now is an abnormal one.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

OTTAWA ELECTRIC COMPANY.

House went into Committee on Bill (No. 12) respecting the Ottawa Electric Company. —Mr. Galliher.

On section 1,

Mr. LOUIS LAVERGNE moved that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I was going to rise, before that motion was made, to point out that no one is here to-night representing the city of Ottawa. I am surprised that the members for Ottawa are not present. Perhaps they understood that the Bill was not to come up to-night. I wish to say that a number of us have been here night after night to discuss this Bill, and it has been put over from time to time. In justice to a large portion of the community who are interested in this Bill outside of the city of Ottawa, a day ought to be set for the discussion of the Bill. We ought not to be obliged to come here night after night expecting to state our views with regard to this Bill, only to find it put off. If this happens again, some of us will have to bring up the matter in the House, and have some new rule made in regard to these Bills ; because it is very unfair that a Bill of this kind, which some of us consider prejudicial to the public interest, is skipped night after night without any reason being given, and then when there is an available opportunity, or those who are opposed to the Bill are absent, an effort is made to railroad it through. The government must take the responsibility of the repeated postponements of this Bill. While I am quite willing that the committee should rise and report progress, I think some notice should be given by the promoters of the Bill of the day on which they intend to bring it up.

Mr. SPROULE. As this Bill was called to stand by the hon. Postmaster General on the last occasion when the order was called, it was thought by some that the government had decided on some course of action regarding it ; and therefore it was the more surprising to-night to find so few members present, and especially to find both of the members for Ottawa absent, who above all others are interested in the Bill. I think the committee should rise and report progress, because the Bill is too important to be proceeded with when there is such a slim House as there is to-night.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It was simply as a matter of courtesy I asked that the Bill should stand, when I looked around and saw that the promoter was not here. It was in that spirit that I did so, nothing more or less. I would not desire an act of courtesy on my part to any member of the House to be misconstrued, as it appears to be by the hon. member for East Grey. I was speaking for nobody, but simply did an act of courtesy to an absent member.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I think the minister who is leading the House to-night realizes that Bills of this kind, which concern the vital interests of the people, ought not to come up unless public notice is given. If they are the first on the order paper for a certain day, that is sufficient, if they are proceeded with on that day ; but when they are continually postponed until there is a favourable House and they can be railroaded through, there ought to be a rule that such Bill cannot be called unless some previous notice has been given.

Motion agreed to, and committee rose and reported progress.

FACER SOLID STEEL CAR COMPANY.

House went into Committee on Bill (No. 27) respecting certain patents of the Facer Solid Steel Car Company, of Perth, Limited.—Mr. Caldwell.

On section 1,

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Has the government, as representing the Department of Patents, passed upon this Bill, or is the government willing that it should go through ?

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. I wish to suggest that as there are two or three other Bills of a somewhat similar character to this one, action on all these Bills should be deferred for the present. I know that certain parties desire to be heard in regard to other Bills of a similar nature before they are disposed of. I therefore desire to ask the promoter of this Bill not to press it until we have opportunity to look into it further.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The Minister of Agriculture ought to be here when a Bill of this kind is being considered. I deprecate the continual absence of ministers. The ministers who are responsible for the matters dealt with in these private Bills ought to be present and prepared to enlighten the committee upon them. I think this Bill should stand over until the Minister of Agriculture is in his place.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Since it has been suggested by my hon. friend that consideration of the Bill should be deferred, I think the committee might accede to that view. It is quite right that ministers should as much as possible be in their seats. It is also right that private members should be in their seats. I am afraid that on many occasions the seat of the hon. member for South York is vacant.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Not when anything in which I am interested is up.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Frequently. It was only the other day that he came over to this side of the House and begged us to put off something so that he might be present when it came up. We agreed to put it off, because we always deplore his absence.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Allow me to explain what the hon. Postmaster General has referred to. I was in my place by arrangement with the Minister of Justice, but by reason of some action of a colleague of his, the matter that he had arranged to come up had to go over. The minister then said he was willing to make an arrangement with me and fix a day, so that everybody would know when the matter would come up ; and it was because he was not there that I went to one of his colleagues and stated my case. I am always here when Bills in which I am interested come up.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. But the hon. member should be here every time.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Much more so should the Minister of Agriculture and the Prime Minister and all the members of his government. This is on a line with what I brought up this afternoon. There is far too much absence of ministers.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. And members.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Can the hon. gentleman tell us where the Minister of the Interior is to-night ? Who has seen him since this session opened ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman knows that he is absent through illness.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. That has not been imparted yet. I thought he went on a hunting expedition.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The First Minister announced his illness yesterday ; but the hon. member for South York was not present.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I was here yesterday. The statement was not so much that he was ill, but that the First Minister did not know when he would be in the House.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. He announced his illness, and the hon. gentleman knows of his illness.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. In view of what has been stated and in view of the importance of this measure, I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and committee rose and reported progress.

CANADA SOUTHERN BRIDGE COMPANY.

House went into committee on Bill (No. 29) respecting the Canada Southern Bridge Company.—Mr. German.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the bridge commenced ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No ; it cannot be commenced until certain leave has been secured from the United States government. The matter was fully considered in the Railway Committee, and the Bill was unanimously concurred in.

Mr. SPROULE. We usually provide a time limit for commencing as well as for finishing a work. But in this case the limit is for finishing only.

Mr. EMMERSON. For the reason that it was dependent upon the consent of the United States government. It was thought advisable simply to provide that it should be finished within seven years.

Mr. SPROULE. It gives them five years to get authority from the United States to commence.

Mr. HAGGART. The Bill, as it has been furnished to me, gives this corporation a right to commence any time within seven years after the passing of an Act of Congress approving the construction, and they have five years from the passing of this Act in which to obtain that approval—making twelve years allowed for the commencement of the bridge.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Have the government a policy in regard to bridging the Niagara river and the Detroit river? Is it their policy to facilitate the bridging of these rivers? Apparently it is, and apparently the Minister of Railways has considered the subject. We see these Bills in regard to bridging these international rivers go through without a declaration of policy on our side; but, apparently, the American government is very reserved about giving permission to bridge these rivers, so far as their side of it is concerned. While I am in favour of improving traffic facilities and of building bridges, because they are needed for the traffic, there ought to be some policy on the part of our government in regard to the matter, and that policy ought to be announced.

Mr. HYMAN. Surely the policy of the government is plain from the position of this Bill. We give our permission to have the bridge built. The company have not been able to get the consent of the United States government. That government, I understand, owing to pressure brought to bear upon them by the shipping interests, have refused permission thus far.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. We also have a large shipping interest.

Mr. HYMAN. There has been no protest from the shipping interest.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The minister says, then, that the government have considered the matter, and they take the responsibility. That is what I wanted to know.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 24) respecting the Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Railway Company—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 31) respecting the Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Company.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 30) respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the London and Saint Clair Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Georgian Bay and Sea-board Railway Company.—Mr. Grant.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Welland canal—elevator at Port Colborne, including foundations, $310,000.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). A good deal has been said by way of making a comparison between the advantages afforded by Port Colborne and the advantages of some other ports, particularly those in the United States. Now while there may be ports which have advantages over our Canadian ports, and while there may be conditions and circumstances more favourable than those which exist in Canada, I do not think that it is in accord with the sentiment of Canadians to-day that we should remain inactive and take no action in the way of availing ourselves of every possible facility for securing at least a portion of the lake traffic. Now the action of the government in connection with the Port Colborne harbour and works has been largely guided by the report of the transportation commission. I had supposed that the report had been laid upon the table, or that its contents were within the knowledge of this committee. That not being the case, it would be fair that the committee should have a knowledge of it, and I shall avail myself of this opportunity to place before the committee the contents of that interim report.

Mr. SPROULE. Although that report has been called for twice, we were told it was not available, up to the present.

Mr. EMMERSON. I had the report in my hand and was waiting an opportunity.

Mr. SPROULE. It was called for days ago.

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not understand the hon. member to make reference to that commission.

Mr. SPROULE. It was the leader of the opposition.

Mr. EMMERSON. We cannot always hear what is said across the floor of the House, and I did not hear any reference made to this report, though no doubt, as the hon. gentleman says, it was called for. Had I heard it called for I could readily have told the hon. member that there were two interim reports, one of which has already been placed before the House of Commons, that relating to the harbour of St. John. The other report is dated at Toronto, May 6, 1904, and is addressed to His Excellency the Governor General:—

May it please your Excellency:—

We have the honour to report that in carrying out the work entrusted to us as your com-

missioners on transportation, we visited on the 3rd instant, the town of Port Colborne, Ont., at the inlet of the Welland canal on Lake Erie.

This port, situated at the eastern end of deep water navigation on the upper lakes and at the beginning of the St. Lawrence system of canals, occupies an important position on the water route from Fort William to Montreal. Passing along a level stretch of the canal from Thorold to Port Colborne, about thirteen miles in length, we were informed by the engineer in charge that between Port Dalhousie and Port Colborne the whole length of the canal had now the full depth of fourteen feet, and that only two more centre piers required to be taken out from the bridges over the canal, when there would be no obstruction to any width of vessel passing through.

Arriving at Port Colborne our attention was given to the condition of the harbour and its facilities for furthering transportation by the St. Lawrence channel.

In our examination we were favoured with the assistance and advice of Mr. J. L. Weller, superintending engineer of the Welland canal, Mr. A. J. Grant, the resident engineer at Port Colborne, and Mr. L. Coste, engineer of the Public Works Department.

Around the lake front at Port Colborne the water is shallow and the entrance to the canal has required a great deal of dredging through limestone rock.

The entrance to the canal from the new elevator piers to the guard lock is about 4,600 feet long, with a depth of 16 feet and 230 feet wide, except at the old east pier. Along the north end of this stretch, on both sides, is situated the town of Port Colborne, and on the east side, the small Grand Trunk elevator. At a distance of 4,600 feet from the guard lock, the new elevator piers have been built, the entrance is much wider and opening towards the lake, and all around the piers there is a depth of 22 feet, the rock dredging is still being continued to give ample facilities for steamers turning.

The elevator piers are built of concrete on a rock foundation, their length being 700 feet by 200 feet wide, with a connecting pier on the north side 200 feet by 100 feet connected by an old pier which needs to be repaired. To the southwest of these new piers a breakwater has been built 4,500 feet long and situated 1,650 feet out into the lake, which will, no doubt, guard the site from any southwest or south storm, but leaving it still exposed to the south-east.

To guard this the Department of Public Works have plans out for another breakwater to the southeast 2,400 feet long, and commencing 600 feet from the eastern end of the present breakwater, which when built will fully shelter the harbour. The question of how to utilize the existing canal system is important enough to merit the most careful consideration.

At the present time, with no facility for discharging cargoes at this port, the use of the route from Fort William to Montreal is confined to steamers drawing not more than fourteen feet and of a size to pass through the locks, giving a maximum capacity of 75,000 bushels of wheat, and to tow barges hauled by tugs or by steam barges of full canal size, 256 feet long by 42 feet wide, leaving entirely out of account the large steamers passing through the Sault Ste. Marie canal and carrying 200,000 bushels of wheat and upwards, able to carry grain on a 20 foot draught of water cheaper than any smaller steamer. The building of these larger steamers is a development since the Sault Ste. Marie canal was deepened ; they have cheapened freights, and if the St. Lawrence route is to have equal opportunities with the American, facilities must be provided for the discharge of cargoes from large steamers at Port Colborne, from whence it can be sent to Montreal in other vessels of canal size.

Your commissioners have, therefore, the honour to recommend :—

That the work of putting in a suitable foundation and the erection of an elevator at Port Colborne harbour be proceeded with at once, the capacity to be not less than one million bushels, and placed so that additional storage bins can be added when found necessary. The elevator to be of the most modern and approved type, giving the quickest despatch to vessels loading and unloading, provision also being made for loading railway cars when connection is made. The government to retain the ownership, thus avoiding any possible complication or deflection of traffic from the St. Lawrence route ; the rates for elevation to be as low as possible, the main object being to encourage the route rather than to make a profit for the elevator.

That the old pier stretching from the elevator lighthouse to the shore line, now in a dilapidated condition, should be rebuilt and carried to a depth of 22 feet to provide for future dredging contingencies and that the pier on the east side of the channel spoken of as the old east pier be taken out as an obstruction to navigation.

That action should be taken to have the two remaining centre piers under the railway bridges over the canal removed as soon as possible.

Although there are two piers provided on which to erect elevators, your commissioners will not think it advisable to build more than one at present, have it tested, and see what effect it has in increasing the traffic on the St. Lawrence system, which we feel assured will be so beneficial as to require additional elevator capacity at an early date.

All of which is respectfully submitted, for the commissioners,

(Sgd.) JOHN BERTRAM,
Chairman.

Now, that embodies in very few words and very pointedly the policy of the government in respect to the proposed elevator at Port Colborne, and it seems to me that no more meritorious work could be undertaken by the government in connection with this canal system. It is not a question as to the existence of the Welland canal. The policy in regard to the Welland canal was adopted years ago. We must deal with conditions and circumstances and while exception has been taken to the remarks which I made as to this being a natural sequence of the expenditure already made I think that if you deal with it from the standpoint of the circumstances and conditions that prevail there no exception can be taken to the conclusions I have arrived at. The expenditure in connection with the entrance to the canals seems to have been preliminary to some such action. There may be a question as to the policy adopted ; that is as to whether the government should build and control this elevator or whether it should be left to private enterprise. It seems to me

that having regard to the safeguarding of Canadian transportation interests the only proper policy to be pursued is the one adopted by the government in connection with this elevator and I submit that this sum should be voted by this committee at this time with the view of carrying out that policy.

Mr. HAGGART. We have some information from the reading of the report of the commissioners on transportation. If I understood the report as read by the hon. gentleman the distance between the entrance lock and Port Colborne proper, is 4,600 feet. Is that so ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Then that is the part that the authorities of the Department of Railways and Canals are deepening to a depth of 22 feet. Perhaps the hon. minister will explain why he has departed altogether from the recommendation of this commission, that he has appointed himself in reference to the erection of the elevators. If I understood the hon. minister rightly, he said that he was erecting elevators of a capacity of 2,000,000 bushels. The commission recommended that the two elevators be not constructed, that although there are foundations made for two of them only one should be constructed of 1,000,000 bushels capacity. Why has the hon. minister departed from the recommendation of the commissioners in reference to that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. On the ground of economy.

Mr. HAGGART. On the ground of economy when you are expending double the amount ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Has the hon. minister been listening? I say that the commission has recommended that only one elevator of a capacity of 1,000,000 bushels should be erected for the present, and if I understood the hon. minister rightly he is erecting two with a capacity of 2,000,000 bushels.

Mr. GERMAN. No, only one.

Mr. HAGGART. He said 2,000,000 bushels to the committee.

Mr. EMMERSON. We are erecting one elevator of a capacity of 2,000,000 bushels. That seemed to be an economical course to pursue. The commissioners recommended two elevators, or rather they recommended one elevator to be commenced with a capacity of not less than 1,000,000 bushels, but having foundations to enable additional bins to be provided so that it would have a capacity within the near future of 2,000,000 bushels, and it certainly seemed to be in the interest of economy to simply build the one set of foundations now and erect an elevator capable of meeting all the natural requirements of the traffic that may be expected within the next two or three years.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Railways states what ? I understood him to state that he is erecting an elevator of a capacity of 2,000,000 bushels, having bins provided for use in case of emergency. The fact of the matter is that the commission have recommended only one elevator of a capacity of 1,000,000 bushels.

Mr. EMMERSON. But that everything be done for an elevator of 2,000,000 bushels.

Mr. HAGGART. No, they did not do anything of the kind ; they state that foundations be prepared for two elevators, and that in the meantime only one be erected of a capacity of only 1,000,000 bushels. He is now erecting an elevator of a capacity of 2,000,000 bushels.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to know from the minister distinctly whether he is asking for an appropriation for an elevator of 1,000,000 capacity or more ? Is this for an elevator of 1,000,000 or 2,000,000 capacity ? He has been talking, and so has the Postmaster General, of an elevator of 2,000,000 capacity. I would like to know which it is that is contemplated under this estimate.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will repeat to my hon. friend that this appropriation is towards the construction of a 2,000,000-bushel elevator.

Mr. BARKER. Has that been recommended ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, it has been recommended ; and it is recommended here.

Mr. BARKER. Let us hear the words.

Mr. EMMERSON. They recommend here :

> That the work of putting in a suitable foundation and the erection of an elevator at Port Colborne Harbour to proceed with at once, the capacity to be not less than 1,000,000 bushels.

Mr. HAGGART. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. Certainly ; but the report does not say how much larger the elevator should be. It goes on and advises this :

> ——and placed so that additional storage bins can be added when found necessary.

The capacity is evidently intended by the commissioners to be greater than 1,000,000 bushels ; it must not be less than 1,000,000 bushels. It does not confine it, as he says, indeed, it rather——

Mr. BARKER. Last year, in the discussion in this House, the present Minister of Railways and Canals told us that it was uncertain whether it was desirable to construct an elevator at all. It was then a

question with the minister whether an elevator should be constructed by the government or by private parties. To-day we are told that the minister has decided upon government construction of an elevator of 2,000,000 bushels capacity. For an hour before six o'clock, we got from the minister not one word of explanation as to why there should be an elevator at all. The first explanation we heard was from the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German), who told us that some gentlemen, I think one was a Mr. Wolvin, had made application to the government for permission to construct an elevator as a private enterprise and some other gentlemen in Toronto, great capitalists, friends of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German), had proposed a rival private enterprise.

Mr. GERMAN. They were all good Conservatives.

Mr. BARKER. It does not matter in the expenditure of this money, I hope, whether they are Liberals or Conservatives.

Mr. GERMAN. Quite right.

Mr. BARKER. I hope the Liberals will be all the more pleased if Conservatives spend the money. The hon. gentleman said that certain gentlemen in Toronto were rivals of Mr. Wolvin for the building of this elevator. We never heard a word of that when the minister asked us to vote this money. We were not informed that within the last twelve months there had been a solitary application to the government by any individual or company to construct an elevator; not a word was uttered to us; we were simply asked to vote this money for one year's expenditure. We got the first intimation from the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German), but having broken the, ice we heard something further from the minister, and he told us that nobody on either side of the House had heard a word of, that the Transportation Commissioners had reported upon this very subject. I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite, who, I think, owe a duty, every man of them, to their constituents and to the country, do they think it is right to sit behind the minister and blindly vote anything that is put in these estimates without inquiry? I ask these gentlemen if they think that a million or so is nothing to this country, and that the criticism of these estimates should be left entirely to gentlemen on this side of the House? Do they owe no duty to their constituents? Have they no right to ask the minister why he asks $500,000 or $1,000,000 for a particular work? Are they to sit mum, or say 'yea' to everything that is put in these estimates? I hope not; I think that the criticism would come from these gentlemen far more effectively than from us. If one of these gentlemen should give utterance to his honest convictions on these subjects its influence would be tenfold that of a criticism from this side of the House.

But I have been in this House for a few sessions, and I have yet to see one of these hon. members stand up and ask one question of the hon. gentlemen on the front benches as to why they propose any of these expenditures. Now, I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite. There are, I know, very many of them who sincerely desire to do what is in the country's interest. I ask these hon. gentlemen, why cannot they stand up in this House and ask the hon. gentlemen on the front benches, civilly, respectfully and humbly, why these moneys are to be expended. These hon. gentlemen may think that we are asking these questions with the sole object of opposing them. Let me tell them that there are gentlemen on this side of the House just as anxious, possibly far more anxious to see public money spent on the Welland canal than half the gentlemen who sit on the government benches, so long as it is spent reasonably and in the interest of the country. Why cannot hon. gentlemen opposite criticise the government in the same spirit? When we know that a minister will listen respectfully and considerately to the representations of hon. gentlemen opposite, why cannot they use their influence reasonably and fairly, and criticise, not in a hostile spirit, but in a friendly spirit, every one of these items, and ask the government why they are spending a million when perhaps half a million would do?

Mr. GERMAN. I have listened with some degree of interest to the lecture which has been read to us on this question by the hon. member for Hamilton. I doubt very much, however, if there is a stronger political partisan in parliament to-day than the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, or one who would allow his party leaders to pass items through parliament with less criticism than he would. We are quite prepared, Sir, to criticise every act of this government. I have criticised some of the acts of this government when I thought that criticism was justified. As I said this afternoon, it was a moot question whether or not this elevator at Port Colborne should be built by a private company or by the government. For myself, I thought at the time that it would be better for a private company to build it. I am not sure that I have changed that opinion yet. The government decided that it was wiser, in the interest of the country, that it should be built by the government, in view of the fact that no company would build it—and this, in my opinion, is the only consideration that would justify the government in building the elevator—without insisting on having a monopoly of the rights in the harbour.

Mr. BARKER. Why so?

Mr. GERMAN. Simply because it was a speculative affair. I know what I am

speaking about when I say that neither the Wolvin syndicate nor the Toronto gentlemen who formed themselves into a company for the purposes of transportation would consider the building of an elevator at Port Colborne and the putting on of a line of boats without having an absolute monopoly of the rights in the harbour. I was not sure myself that it would not have been wise to have allowed the Canadian company—I would never have agreed to allow an American company—to have had the control of the situation. I do not know that the gentlemen who are interested in the company would object to my giving their names, as you can find them in the Act of incorporation : they are Frederick Nichols, William Mackenzie, I think Mr. W. R. Brock —all Canadians and men of means and enterprise who are willing to go into the work of developing the transportation facilities through our Canadian water routes ; but they would not undertake it without getting a monopoly of the rights at Port Colborne.

Mr. HAGGART. A monopoly of what rights ?

Mr. GERMAN. The rights for the construction of elevators on the two concrete piers which the government have constructed for that purpose—not an absolute monopoly of all the rights in the harbour. No other company could have built elevators except at an enormous expense. The government built, with the approbation of parliament, these two concrete piers for the purpose of constructing elevators thereon, and they also built the breakwater which forms the harbour at Port Colborne. Prior to that there was no harbour there. Each of the two companies who were interested in this matter told the government that they must have the exclusive right. The government refused to give the exclusive right to either company, and decided to build the elevator themselves.

Mr. HENDERSON. What did the piers cost ?

Mr. GERMAN. I have not got the figures. The work was put up at public tender, and it has been carried on as all government work is ; and I might say further that, much against my will, the contract was given to a good thorough Conservative.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is not the point. The point I wish to make is that the cost of constructing these concrete piers was not a difficulty in the way of a company establishing a transportation system and building piers for themselves. I understand that the piers cost only about $40,000.

Mr. GERMAN. I am not sure what the piers cost.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Are the piers on a solid foundation or on piles ?

Mr. GERMAN. They are on rock foundation. Now, the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) raised the question this afternoon, whether or not the products of the Northwest can be carried to the seaboard cheaper by rail than by water. That is a question on which different people have different opinions.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you any doubt about it ?

Mr. GERMAN. I have no doubt that they can be taken to the seaboard cheaper by water than by rail ; but hon. gentlemen who are interested in railroad companies, as the hon. member for West Toronto is, and as I understand the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) is——

Mr. BARKER. No, not a bit, and never was.

Mr. GERMAN. ——have an idea that the products of the Northwest can be taken to the sea-board more cheaply by rail than by water. That was the basis of the argument of the hon. member for West Toronto this afternoon. There is one thing which has operated against the Welland canal. The action of the Grand Trunk Railway Company for years past has made it practically impossible to bring the products of the west through our water routes, by reason of the fact that the boats coming to Port Colborne had to lighter there before they could go through the canal. The quantity of grain they had to lighter at Port Colborne was so large that the freight upon it from Port Colborne to Port Dalhousie was such as to stop the traffic.

That has been going on for years and is the reason why the grain cannot be taken through the Welland canal. Now the idea is to have an elevator at Port Colborne and tranship from the big upper lake boats, carrying 250,000 bushels of wheat, into it, and thence into canal sized boats carrying 75,000 bushels to Montreal and Quebec. That is the proposition. Our canals have been built at an enormous expense. What are we to do with them ? I heard the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) say in this House that he believed it would be an excellent thing for this country to have canals even if nothing were taken through them, because they would be a regulator of freight rates.

Mr. HAGGART. Hear, hear.

Mr. GERMAN. But we cannot regulate the freight rates by means of our canals unless we have some system of transhipping our grain at Port Colborne. It has been said that the Georgian bay route, the Ottawa canal route, is a better route. That may be. That is a matter for discussion, but we have got the Welland canal route, we have built the Welland canal and the St. Lawrence canals. Are we to utilize them

or let them fall into decay and become useless ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is the question.

Mr. GERMAN. That is the whole question. My hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) asked why not, instead of building an elevator at Port Colborne, take your boats to Buffalo and take the grain at Buffalo. But I ask him in reply, does he want to build up Buffalo at the expense of our Canadian towns and water routes ? And when the grain gets to Buffalo, it will go from there by railway or by the Erie canal to the sea-board. It will not be possible to get it back again. The only way we can get through our Canadian waterways the grain products of the Northwest at present. is to have an elevator at Port Colborne into which these large upper lake boats can unload, and from which that grain can be transhipped into canal sized boats which will carry it to the sea-board. And in this way the grain can be carried cheaper to the sea-board than by taking it to Buffalo and transhipping it from there through American routes. That is demonstrated absolutely. The hon. member for West Toronto, (Mr. Osler) said this afternoon that the season was so short, our canal system being closed up in November or early in December, that we could not compete with the American routes. But what is the United States government doing ? Notwithstanding the opportunities for transportation which they have from Buffalo to New York and Boston and the different places to which they send these products, they have made an appropriation of $100,000,000 to enlarge the Erie canal.

Mr. HAGGART. The New York state government has.

Mr. GERMAN. Yes, the New York state government has made an appropriation of $100,000,000 to enlarge the Erie canal, and the Erie canal is closed up two or three weeks earlier than the Welland canal.

Mr. BARKER. That is the local government.

Mr. GERMAN. It is the government of the state of New York. I cannot quite understand why the hon. gentleman should lay so much stress on this. I do not see how it can make any possible difference. It is the government of the wealthiest state in the United States, and the people of that state who, I suppose, have an idea of the fitness of things, believe that the expenditure of this money will be beneficial to that state and the public generally. In any case that is what they are doing. And all that this government asks is that, after having spent all the money we have done in connection with our waterways, we should now simply put the keystone in the arch and do what must necessarily be done in order to give us a complete transportation system. All the government asks is that we should build an elevator at Port Colborne, which must be done unless we intend deepening the Welland canal to 22 feet. But no one, at present at any rate, would support any such proposition. No one would think of deepening the Welland canal, at present at any rate, to 22 feet. But if you build an elevator at Port Colborne, whether it be a one million or two million bushel elevator, you must build one that will supply what is required. A two million elevator can be built for about one-third cheaper than you could build two elevators of the capacity of a million bushels each, so that the government will be saving money by building one large elevator instead of two small ones. And I firmly believe that in the near future another elevator of two million bushels capacity will be needed at Port Colborne. I am inclined to think that under private enterprise that condition of affairs might be more quickly realized ; but I am satisfied with what the government is doing, because I believe most firmly that what it proposes to do will bring about the transportation of the products of our great Northwest through our Canadian channels at the cheapest possible rates. And if that can be accomplished, surely no one can criticise severely, if at all, this proposed expenditure.

Mr. HAGGART. I am gratified at the remarks of my hon. friend because in fact they support the theory which I have always thought should guide us in the erection of elevators. He says that there were applications from two companies for the erection of elevators at this particular station, but that neither of them would undertake the work unless they were given exclusive privileges. But when questioned as to the exclusive privileges which they asked, it appears that all they wanted was the right to erect these elevators on the two foundations which the government are putting in. Was there any other exclusive rights that they asked for ? None. All the exclusive rights which these private individuals wanted was the right to use the foundations which the government are putting in for the purpose of erecting elevators at a cost of some $20,000 or $30,000 a piece. The hon. gentleman has a leaning towards the argument which I made in the former part of the evening, and I have no doubt that he is convinced from the bottom of his soul that the policy of the government is a wrong one. Application was made by these companies, not only to erect elevators, but also to build steamboats for the purpose of utilizing the facilities which the government have provided by the deepening of the harbour. They were to have no exclusive privileges beyond the right of erecting eleva-

tors on the foundations built by the government. The whole of the harbour of Port Colborne was open to any other private individuals who desired to erect elevators if they would, but on their own foundations. I need not appeal to my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German) because he is too intelligent not to know that an elevator owned by private individuals, who have their connections by boats and who could put on a line of steamers to the upper lakes, would be far more profitable than a government owned elevator. Private enterprise will succeed where a government will fail. Fancy a lot of government officials running an elevator, who do not care two cents whether a bushel of grain went into the elevator or not from one end of the year to the other. But in what a different position would be private enterprise. These people would embark their own money in the scheme, and in order to get a return from their investment, they must have transportation facilities and connections. They would build up large boats which would carry the grain most economically to Port Colborne. But, when we inquire into it, they have no exclusive privilege except, as my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German) has stated, the privilege of erecting an elevator upon foundations which the government built because they could build them more cheaply in connection with the other works. What right has the government to enter upon business which should be left to private enterprise ? What right have they to provide facilities for transporting grain, if those facilities can be provided by private enterprise ? Any person who knows anything of government undertakings of this kind, knows that they cannot successfully compete with undertakings directed by private enterprise. I need not enter upon that question now, nor need I ask the Minister of Railways whether he thinks that government railways can be managed as economically as railways that are privately owned. This domain of private business is one upon which the government has no right to enter. What right have they to go into the elevator business ? None whatever. This fostering of industries of this kind seems peculiar to this government. The hon. gentleman objects because my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) advocates the government ownership of railways and of telegraph and telephone lines. There are some public utilities that are peculiarly within the province of government. One of these is the post office and, as a legitimate part of it, the telegraph and telephone services. The question of the public ownership of railways may become a question for the people of this country to decide. But, even if the government owned the elevator, could not they lease it to a private individual to carry on business in connection with grain transportation, and impose upon the lessee conditions necessary to protect the public interest ? In the world of private enterprise the interests of the public are protected by competition, and there is no business in which competition is keener than in the transportation of grain from the upper lake ports. The government have a commission to inquire into this business of transportation. That commission reports that certain facilities should be provided. But the Minister of Railways doubles the recommendation of the commissioners.

Mr. EMMERSON. Oh, no.

Mr. HAGGART. The commission recommends an elevator of——

Mr. EMMERSON. Not less than a million bushels.

Mr. HAGGART. And the hon. gentleman draws the inference that that is justification for elevator capacity of a hundred million bushels.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Only two millions.

Mr. HAGGART. If a recommendation of a million is justification for providing two millions, why should it not be made justification for a hundred millions ? Mr. Chairman, this question of transportation is a nice question. It is too late to discuss it fully to-night. But, though the question is so great a one, and though this expenditure at Port Colborne is so large, we have nothing from the minister to show that that expenditure is justified. The expenditure of the elevator will be about $1,000,000, is it not ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I stated the amount—including the foundation, $1,100,000.

Mr. HAGGART. The deepening of the channel from the entrance locks to Port Colborne will cost $500,000 or $600,000 more

Mr. EMMERSON. That would have to be done any way.

Mr. HAGGART. The question of this elevator at Port Colborne can only be discussed in reference to the whole project. The expenditure for deepening Port Colborne and providing the second breakwater —the one additional to that already under construction—will be in the neighbourhood of $2,500,000. So you have here an expenditure of at least $4,000,000. The government must not find fault if we want the fullest information on the subject, or if we criticise that expenditure. We have been unable to get from the minister a single statement as to the commercial benefit to the Dominion to follow the development of the traffic of that port. We are simply asked to vote this money blindly. I ask him what trade he expects to develop. We cannot get any of the trade that goes to any port of the

United States, except that to New England. The only trade we can hope for is a part of that which now goes from United States ports to Europe. We ought to have some statement showing what that trade is and what part of it we may hope to secure. We have not even a statement of the rates the elevator is to charge. I understand from the recommendation of the commissioners that it will charge such a rate as will barely pay the government for the expenditures. If it comes within one-fifth of that it will do more than most of the public works of Canada are doing under the management of public officials.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am surprised at the persistent opposition of the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) to this most proper enterprise. For years he presided over the Department of Railways and Canals, and took part in framing the expenditure upon the Welland and St. Lawrence canals. For what purpose did he carry out the improvement of these canals ? Was it merely an ornamental work ? Was it merely for the purpose of spending public money ? Surely he made that expenditure in the hope that when the work was completed it would prove of benefit to the people of Canada. The work has been completed, except the mouth of the canal, from which must come the commerce which is to justify this canal construction, which is to go down to Montreal and feed ocean shipping and make Montreal the Canadian port. Up to the time we took office that mouth had been left neglected, and in such a condition that it was practically impossible for commerce to go to the Port Colborne canal and supply the traffic for which it was constructed. He says that because there is a breakwater and harbour, there is no monopoly, even if we built an elevator, that the harbour is free to all, and therefore there is no danger of a monopoly, even if we gave the privilege to a company to build an elevator on the government dock. Nobody pretends that the owners of the elevator would thereby have a monopoly of the harbour ; that is not contended ; but, from the nature of the scheme and the work, the control of the elevator by a private citizen——

Mr. HAGGART. It was stated by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) that they would have control of the harbour.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Not the harbour, no one talked about the control of the harbour, you might as well talk of controlling the lake, but that is not the point, it is the control of the traffic that would be enjoyed by the company to control the elevator. Take the Grand Trunk Railway between Toronto and Montreal ; it goes through a country where you might build scores of routes, but capital has not come in and duplicated the expenses alongside of the Grand Trunk Railway, and practically the Grand Trunk, within the distance served by it, enjoys more or less of a monopoly. True we have tried by legislation, all governments have sought by legislation to control the railways in their dealings with the public ; but up to this moment the efforts of parliament in that direction have largely been a failure. Though you might say that other companies might build railways alongside of this, owners of capital will not invest under such circumstances, and so from the very nature of the transactions they are monopolistic. Now if the government owns the elevator the policy of the government will be so worked out as to encourage traffic to go that way, and to keep down the elevator rates to the lowest possible level, and in that way to help the farmers of the Northwest to get cheaper rates to market, instead of compelling them to send their traffic by rail. We want an additional outlet for the products of the farmers of the Northwest, and if, along with that, we get the earnings from United States commerce and get the grain raised in the United States, well and good. It will come down the St. Lawrence to supply freight to the shipping coming to Canadian ports. But my hon. friend would now practically close up the Welland canal. He left it with this unprotected opening, with its mouth at Port Colborne but without shelter from the sea ; he left it in such a position that it is impossible for ships to come to that harbour with freight, ships drawing 19 or 20 feet of water ; he left the entrance to that canal with 14 feet at most. How could ships have come to the Welland canal, modern ships, bringing freight and grain, with only 14 feet of water ? The canal must have failed to meet the expectations of the people. It was an unfinished scheme. Surely no engineers who devised the canal scheme ever contemplated that it was to be left without a breakwater and other protection whereby shipping could come to the entrance of the canal and make a safe transfer of their cargoes.

But my hon. friend complains now because we have dredged the harbour so as to allow ships to come in. What was the canal for ? Was it an ornament ? Was it to be as useful as the Tay canal ? What became of that enterprise ? Does my hon. friend wish the Welland canal to have the same fate as the Tay canal ? Let me read an item from a paper that has just come under my eye, in order to show the result of the policy of the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart). That was a justifiable enterprise, a proper expenditure of public money, in the opinion of my hon. friend. He promoted the construction of this enterprise ; he who now, in opposition, is so careful about the expenditure of public money caused the construction of this canal. I think I am safe in saying that most of the ships that have passed over that canal since its construction were launches, skiffs

and canoes. If we adopted the policy of the hon. gentleman, the Welland canal would have the same fate as the Tay canal. I will read from the Daily 'Globe' of February 17. It is headed 'Dredge the Tay canal.' This is to be the prototype of the Welland canal, the fate of the Tay canal is a fit fate for the Welland canal. I recognize his policy in this item.

Smiths Falls, February 16.—A petition will be presented to the Dominion government by the residents of Perth, asking that the Tay canal be dredged. For some time the banks have been settling and sliding into the water until the channel is only about half as wide as it originally was. Navigation is now almost impossible since the canal has been allowed to fill in with mud and weeds caused by the spring freshets, but if it were dredged the matter would be remedied to a great extent.

It is not the freshets that have allowed the weeds to grow, it is because there has been no traffic to disturb the waters. A pasture has grown up in the Tay canal. My hon. friend desires such a future as that, such a return as that to the people of Canada for the expenditure of $60,000,000 on the St. Lawrence and Welland canal systems. Now the canal system that I refer to, the St. Lawrence and Welland canal systems, called the St. Lawrence canals, was the policy adopted prior to confederation. Both political parties have at all times united for the completion and improvement of that canal system, so that our products might be carried by water on the cheapest possible routes to the markets of the world. That policy has had the endorsement of all classes in Canada. Every government that has been in office since confederation has had more or less to do with prosecuting this work to completion, but whatever may have been the cause of it, a great amount of time was occupied in the completion of the canal system. I never could understand why the late government delayed the thing so long. I have my own opinion but it may not be the correct one; my own opinion is that the dilatoriness of the late government in completing the canal system and giving it those facilities which it was entitled to was largely attributed to railway influence. That may be wrong. It was either attributed to railway influence or it was attributed to the government itself not fully appreciating the importance to Canada of the early completion of the work. In that case the public interest was lost sight of and now that the canals have been deepened to 14 feet my hon. friend to-night tells us that it should be left to private enterprise to build elevators there and to build breakwaters.

An hon. MEMBER. He did not say breakwaters.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. He used the word 'breakwaters'; he may not have intended it and if so, I do not wish to make a point of it, but he used the word 'breakwaters' and he said that the construction of breakwaters and the erection of elevators should be left to private enterprise.

Mr. HAGGART. Not breakwaters.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman said so——

Mr. HAGGART. I was speaking about something else.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. But perhaps he did not intend to say so and of course I accept his explanation. I will admit without hesitation that under ordinary circumstances the erection of elevators should be left to private enterprise, but this is a unique state of affairs. There is but one Welland canal in all Canada and it is the duty of Canada to control the traffic and not leave it in the power of any set of men or corporations to prevent traffic going through the Welland canal. I do not believe, and I am sure the public will take that view of it, that it is possible to place one elevator there and to give over the whole of our piers to any set of men and at the same time be sure that these controllers of the elevator will serve the public at all times in such a way as will bring traffic through the Welland canal. As I have said before, if it were possible for any set of men to control that elevator it might be worth their while to so hamper the traffic that no grain would come this way. The government would be interested in having it come this way, and the public will get their elevator service at the lowest possible price. If the government borrows the money it will only cost the country what the government has to pay by way of interest, while if private capitalists invest their money in it they will insist on a higher dividend and accordingly they will impose higher rates. The government's interest in the traffic, its desire not being to make money, will encourage the traffic to come through at the lowest possible rate. As my hon. friend himself has said a very slight reduction in the cost of transportation will make traffic take one route or the other and therefore a fraction of a cent per bushel will divert traffic from one route to another. The very reduction that this elevator offers and the facilities for increased speed with which ships can transact their business, will necessarily have a marked effect in diverting traffic to this route, saving to us our own grain and also diverting to our water route grain grown in a foreign country. I am therefore entirely at a loss to understand why hon. gentlemen are endeavouring in every possible way to make points against this scheme, points not founded on good argument but, put forward for the moment perhaps, because they commend themselves to the hon. member for Lanark. For example, he complains because we are erecting a 2,000,000 bushel elevator instead of a 1,000,000 bushel elevator. There are

two very excellent reasons why that should be. A 1,000,000 bushel elevator will only hold four ship loads of 250,000 bushels each. In the fall of the year when there will be many ships of that capacity or greater coming down with loads, it would be felt that there is only accommodation at the most for four ship-loads and that is a limited capacity at the best, whereas a 2,000,000 bushel elevator gives us so much more capacity and therefore there is so much more confidence on the part of shippers that they will be able to get sufficient accommodation for the grain that is shipped by way of Port Colborne. It costs so much per bushel to erect a million bushel elevator; it costs less per bushel to erect a 2,000,000 bushel elevator. It will cost about fifty cents a bushel to erect a million bushel elevator, and it will cost about forty cents a bushel to erect a two million bushel elevator. You therefore save twenty per cent on the cost by having a 2,000,000 instead of 1,000,000 bushel elevator. A 2,000,000 bushel elevator at forty cents a bushel would cost $800,000. We spent nearly that much on the Tay canal alone. Would it not have been far better not to have spent that and we would have had another million bushel elevator out of that money, or if we wanted to be strictly economical, as the Tay canal cost half a million dollars and the interest would bring it up to about a million, we might have had the whole of this enterprise carried through with the money spent on the Tay canal which is now grown over with weeds.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman's calculation must be out somewhere because the minister says it will cost $1,200,000 and therefore it must be over fifty cents a bushel.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am speaking of the construction of the elevator alone. There are other works outside of the elevator.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thought you were speaking of the Tay canal.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am speaking of it too.

Mr. HAGGART. After the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Sir William Mulock) perhaps it would be proper for me to make a few remarks in reply. I was criticising very mildly the erection of an elevator at Port Colborne at the entrance to the Welland canal. I was asking for a justification of it. The hon. gentleman says that I was opposed to the building of a 2,000,000 bushel elevator. I was simply arguing from the report of the commissioners in which they recommend a 1,000,000 bushel elevator.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, they recommend not less than 1,000,000 bushel capacity.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman goes farther and says: Why is it that the hon. gentleman did not secure a greater depth of water in the Welland and other canals in order to bring the immense traffic of the Northwest to the port of Montreal? The policy of building the Welland canal was approved of first of all by the reform government, approved of by Mr. Mackenzie, the contracts were let and it was built. What is the necessity of a 14 foot canal having a 22 foot entrance? You say that it is in order to bring down the boats that navigate the upper lakes for the purposes of transhipping grain. They can go out to a point 22 feet deep exchange their cargoes and then come into the Welland canal. The hon. gentleman says that he does not understand the policy pursued by the late government, that he does not understand why we did not press to completion the Welland and St. Lawrence canals. What single contract have these hon. gentlemen entered into since they came into power for the purpose of completing these works that was not entered into when the last government was in power?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is not a question of what contract we have entered into that had not been commenced before, but a question of what we have done for the contractors. When the minister—I think it was the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) himself—one of the ministry of his day, was being pressed upon this subject, I think it was in the Public Accounts Committee, we were informed that, at the instance of the ex-Minister of Finance, the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), it was the policy of that government to delay the completion of these works and to allow the contractors to prolong the work beyond the date limits of the contracts.

Mr. HAGGART. Every contract was entered into and there were only a very few small parts of the St. Lawrence canal which required completion. The only new one on any work of any importance to be done was the contract of Mr. Davis to overcome the Galops. The Welland had been finished for years. Is there a single expenditure that they have made except the deepening of the long reach? All of the contracts were let, the whole scheme was carried out by the late government, and if it is any benefit to the country the country must thank the late government for the expenditure upon the St. Lawrence and Welland canals. It is not true, as the gentleman states, that the work was delayed on part of the canals for about six months. It was not delayed, the contracts were entered into with certain parties for the construction of the canal and the option was given them I think that they might proceed quickly or slowly for the next three months at the instance, as the hon. gentleman (Sir William Mulock) says, of the then Finance Minister, because the finances of the country were not in the prosperous condition that they are at present. As

a climax to the whole affair, comes the Minister of Railways with the desire to put these works in the same condition as the Tay canal, 'his favourite work, the work that he undertook and completed.' was in ! Does the hon. gentleman know that the Tay canal was in active operation before either he or I was born ; that an Act of parliament was passed I think in 1831 and that the Tay canal was built and run in 1834 ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Then why did the hon. gentleman spend half a million dollars on it ?

Mr. HAGGART. By the Tay canal charter the company were given the right to build the canal and the Imperial government who had built the Rideau canal had the right to take it over at any time. The work was completed and it was taken over by the government of the country without giving to the parties who had invested large sums of money in it one single cent. The government of the country went on and made an expenditure for the purpose of making that canal of the same depth and tonnage as the Rideau canal. Did the hon. gentleman or any of his friends in this House object to it ? The expenditure was made in Lanark ; I represent that county and that was the principal objection to the expenditure. You do not hear a word about expenditures in other more favoured portions of the country on public works, in some counties of 16 or 18 expenditures being voted in one year—and for what purpose ? For the public utilities necessary for carrying on the government of the country in those particular counties. The hon. gentleman must remember that I was not a member of the government when the sum was voted for the expenditure upon the Tay canal. I was a supporter of the expenditure ; so were the hon. gentleman's friends in the House then. Not one of them criticised the expenditure until the hon. gentleman who represents South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) became a member of the government and then it was quite warrantable to make any possible attack upon a member of a Tory government. This canal has done good service to the Postmaster General and his friends in different parts of the country. They instance from one end of the country to the other the extravagance the enormous expenditure and the infamous job of building the Tay canal. None of them dare make the attack before my face. The first one who has made the attack is the hon. gentleman who has done so by reading a quotation from his organ the 'Globe,' as to the petition of the town of Perth to have certain obstructions removed from the Tay canal.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The grass and the weeds.

Mr. HAGGART. If it was in the county of York or some constituencies I could name in the maritime provinces a dredge would be sent there at an expense of $1,500 or $5,000 or any sum of money that was required, especially if the work had been required about September or October or November last. There has been no expenditure upon it, the work has been a benefit to that section of the country as every man knows who resides in that section. As the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) stated, we are not to judge the results by the traffic of the canal. It places the towns on the canal in the same position as if they were on the banks of the St. Lawrence, they are able to make arrangements with railway companies for a lower freight rate than they otherwise could secure. The amount saved annually to the people of the town in which I live is greater than the interest on the money expended by the government in the completion of that undertaking. Can the hon. gentleman justify other expenditures in that way ? Does he ever expect that the expenditure he proposes to make this afternoon in the building of this elevator will directly or indirectly bring to the people of this country a return for the expenditure ? Is it possible that the people will be so blind as to expect that what belongs purely to private enterprise can be effected as well by the government of the country ? That they can enter into competition in transport, the operation of steamers by the erection of elevators or anything of that kind and to do things as economically as a private individual would do ? If they cannot, they are not justified in the expenditure. This is not one of the public utilities of the country that justifies government interference ; it does not come within that category and they are infringing on what should be left entirely to private enterprise. I have no objection to this item passing with the criticism we have made.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend still says that the construction of elevators is a matter for private investment. Elevators are as a rule associated with railways or canals. The hon. gentleman himself as a minister caused the construction of two elevators by the government, one at St. John and the other at Halifax.

Mr. HAGGART. Are you sure that I did it ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman's government did it.

Mr. HAGGART. I understood the hon. gentleman to mean that when I had charge of the Railway Department I authorized the construction of these elevators.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not care whether it was as a minister or as a supporter of the government. The government of which the hon. gentleman was a supporter, and of which for some time he was a member, erected these two elevators in connection with the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. I mentioned that in my speech.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If the elevators should only be constructed as private enterprises, why did this government erect these two elevators ? I hope that the elevator which we erect at Port Colborne will prove of greater advantage than the one erected at Halifax.

Mr. HAGGART. Or the one you erected at Quebec.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Although that elevator at Halifax has been erected for many years, I think I am right in saying that there has never been a bushel of grain pass through it yet. I am perhaps not right to the letter, but I think I am substantially right. My impression is that there never went through it an elevator of grain.

Mr. EMMERSON. Not as much as there should.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand that the elevator has been burned down, and that you are re-building it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, we are. We expect, with the improvements on the Intercolonial Railway and the diversion of the grain via the St. Lawrence route, to be able to send grain to that elevator when the St. Lawrence navigation is closed. But my hon. friend, having spent money on the erection of two elevators, now discovers that it is all wrong for the government to spend money on public elevators. It is to be regretted that his policy and his practice do not seem to fit in together.

Mr. OSLER. I think we are entitled to have the fullest discussion on this item, and that when we discuss it we are not to be accused of objecting to expenditures in the interest of transportation. I may bring to the remembrance of the House the fact that two or three sessions ago the government brought in a measure which they heralded with all the eloquence that could be produced from the government side, for the appointment of a transportation commission which was to take charge of all the great questions of transportation in Canada. This commission has passed through various stages and has had various chairmen. I think I referred last session to the fact that the commission had reported upon the silt that came down the River Don at Toronto ; that was all it accomplished up to that time. The commission is still in existence, and it has made a report upon this particular work, a very meagre report. Now, the government are making a very large expenditure upon the experimental surveys of a canal, which, if successful, will destroy the utility of the Welland canal. I refer to a canal coming in at French river and down from the north ; and I venture to say that not one member of the government will contradict my statement that if that scheme is successful, the utility of the Welland canal is gone and this expenditure is absolutely useless. We also heard from the Prime Minister last session when one of his own ministers proposed the acquisition of the Canada Atlantic Railway, that he objected to the acquisition of that road because, when he had visited a harbour on the Georgian bay, it had at once occurred to him that if the government owned that railway, they would have to build elevators, charter and look after ships, and come into competion with private enterprise in grain carrying. That was the reason given by the Prime Minister for turning down the scheme of acquiring the Canada Atlantic Railway as an extension of the Intercolonial. Now, I am not objecting to this expenditure or to any expenditure that is going to facilitate the carriage of grain from the Northwest to the sea-board ; but I do say that we have not enough information before us to warrant the expenditure of millions of dollars on elevators at this port.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We are not investing a million on an elevator.

Mr. OSLER. On elevators and other works, because the other works necessitate elevators, whether private or public, and all together they will cost this country $4,000,000, perhaps more.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Might I ask the hon. gentleman what portions of the works at Port Colborne he objects to ? They consist of the elevator, the breakwater, deepening of the harbour and the construction of the piers. Does he object to all these works ?

Mr. OSLER. When I spoke on this question last year or the year before, when the Hon. Mr. Tarte was Minister of Public Works, I objected very strongly to the enormous expenditure at Port Colborne, because there was not data enough to indicate whether or not it was going to be profitable.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Does he object to the breakwater ?

Mr. OSLER. I object to the expenditure of $4,000,000, which is now admitted to be necessary until the government have proper data to show to this House that it is going to be a warrantable expenditure. I say that the government put themselves out of court when they appointed a transportation commission and represented to this House that they would look to that commission to guide them in their expenditure for improving the facilities for transporting grain and other produce from the west to the east. That was their scheme, not the scheme of this side of the House, not the scheme of the late government. They pledged themselves to take the judgment of the commission which they themselves appointed, and from that

day to this they have ignored the existence of this commission. That being the case, we on this side have a perfect right to criticise most keenly and thoroughly every large expenditure in connection with transportation. So long as that transportation committee is in existence and is treated with absolute indifference by the government, so long as the government fail to ask that commission to report on any transportation scheme submitted to this House, it is our duty to criticise that scheme most minutely.

Mr. LENNOX. I have listened pretty attentively for several hours to the discussion of this subject in order to find whether the minister in charge can give any reasonable ground for this proposed large expenditure. But what probably induces me more than anything else to address the House at present is the attitude taken by the hon. the Postmaster General. It is rather refreshing to find that gentleman of late years advocating the extension and utilization of our water-ways. It shows that even at this late date he has come to realize to some extent that the Conservative party had advocated for years the best policy in this connection, but it would be more satisfactory to the people if the government, before submitting a proposition of this nature, would obtain upon it a report of the transportation committee which they themselves appointed for the express purpose of investigating such matters. We are told by the Postmaster General that this is a unique proposition, and no doubt it is; and it is both unique and peculiar in the way it has been brought before the House by the Minister of Railways and Canals. That hon. gentleman certainly has not been candid with the committee in the manner in which he introduced this matter and referred to the report. He led us to understand in the first instance that this was a recommendation for a two-million bushel elevator instead of, as it turns out to be, for a one-million bushel elevator only.

Mr. EMMERSON. Not less than one million.

Mr. LENNOX. It is unique in another respect, because it is a matter on which the government, through its first minister, had already distinctly pronounced itself. We all remember in what a dramatic way the right hon. gentleman, in introducing the transcontinental scheme, referred to that memorable day when he stood on the shores of Georgian bay in company with Mr. Booth, and there came to the conclusion that a scheme of government ownership was not practicable in the interests of the country, because a government could not enter, among other things, upon the construction of elevators. But a change has evidently since come over the spirit of their dream, and the Postmaster General in particular has completely taken to the water. Only a few months ago it was heralded throughout the Liberal press that the Postmaster General had virtually brought about the completion of the Trent Valley canal, and that, if he did not originate the scheme, at all events he had gone up and opened a lock, and in that way had, to a great extent, consummated that great work. Since then the Postmaster General has been engaged in other watery schemes. Just before the election he was approached by some of his old constituents in the townships of West Gwillimbury and Bradford and by some of his present constituents in North York and asked to supply them with a wharf, and if the wharf was to be constructed on the Holland river, it would naturally be on the village of Bradford side. A wharf was constructed and completed shortly before the elections, but not in time to be paid for before the elections took place. It was placed in my hon. friend's constituency, away from the village, it is true, but in his own constituency, because there had been a gerrymander by which Bradford had ceased to be in his constituency, and he placed it on his own side of the boundary, besides buying the land from one of his own supporters and giving to his supporter the building of the wharf. The wharf is there upon what was his supporter's land and has been paid for out of the public moneys. But the hon. minister has taken to the water in yet other ways. He has in fact allied himself to the water-ways most conspicuously in the last four or five months. Just about election time, when he was not too sanguine about the results in North York, he summoned together a number of the faithful in that constituency and laid before them a magnificent scheme of water-ways. He proposed, forsooth, to build what? To extend the Trent Valley canal—a scheme which those gentlemen had denounced in years gone by. And he proposed to extend it where? Into his own riding. He will have to negotiate with the Grand Trunk Railway to get it further than the Bradford bridge, but that no doubt can be done very easily, because this government are now hand and glove with that company. He proposed to extend it to the town of Newmarket and the village of Schomberg. The hon. gentleman told the House this afternoon that they were an up-to-date government which appreciated the signs of the times, and that they understood how things work. Certainly the Postmaster General showed his astuteness by inaugurating this scheme on the eve of the last general elections in his own riding. Let me read a word or two from the Bradford 'Witness,' which is a paper not altogether published in the interests of my hon. friend, but published in the riding he formerly represented. The article is dated February 9th, and is headed 'The Trent Valley Canal Extension':

Our readers will remember that a public meeting was held in Newmarket last September

to consider the advisability of steps being taken to deepen the east branch of the Holland river via Holland Landing, Newmarket and Aurora and the west branch to Schomberg, in order to make these waters available for commercial purposes in connection with the Trent Valley canal system which will shortly be continued to Lake Simcoe. Sir William Mulock, the Hon. E. J. Davis——

He is a gentleman who forgets, but who remembered very well to be present on this occasion.

——Mayor Kane, of Newmarket——

Another good supporter of my hon. friend.

——Mayor Daville, of Aurora, spoke in favour of the scheme,——

'Scheme' is the very word.

——and a large committee was appointed to promote this great undertaking.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Was the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) present at that meeting ?

Mr. LENNOX. He was the chief spokesman in favour of this scheme to promote the general interest and prosperity of Canada through his own riding and through his own supporters. The hon. gentleman (Sir William Mulock) seems to have been the chief person on that occasion, as we would naturally expect him to be.

Since that meeting government engineers have made careful survey of the territory——

It would need to be very careful if it favours the putting through of that canal.

——and, although no official report has yet been made, it is pretty well understood that the engineers will report favourably upon the matter.

It will be interesting to the people of Canada, it will be very interesting to the people who know the locality, it will be most interesting to the people of North York who after all are not perhaps to be hoodwinked exactly in this way—and interesting to the people of West Gwillimbury and Bradford whom my hon. friend used to represent—to see what that report will be. I would like the Postmaster General to tell the members of this committee, if he can, that this is anything else than what it is called here, a 'scheme,' a bribe to the electors of North York to support my hon. friend in that election—an effort to win their favour by putting into the field at the time of the election a number of surveyors, to impress the people with the idea that the work would go on. The men were there, and it was told over the riding that they were actually at work. It was heard in South Simcoe, my own riding, in the township of West Gwillimbury, that these men were coming right in ; that the work would be extended to Aurora, and Schomberg, and Holland landing, and Newmarket—every hamlet in the riding of my hon. friend was taken in. And when it was extended there, they said, they would do something for South Simcoe as well—they would make a cut from the elbow of the river to the Bradford railway station. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) knows the locality and understands the case ; and he knows that if ever there was a farce played by a member of this House, it was played by the hon. member who has the distinction of being Postmaster General when he brought in this scheme upon the eve of an election and told the people of North York that this was a great enterprise and that he was prepared to advocate its adoption in this House.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. This is hardly the occasion to discuss a scheme that is not yet before parliament. The question before us is the Port Colborne scheme. But I may tell my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) that he will have an excellent opportunity to know more about the scheme about which he has spoken than he appears to know at present. On Tuesday next, there is to be a very influential deputation from that part of the country to wait upon the government and lay the merits of this scheme and the needs of that district before them. And I here invite my hon. friend to accompany that deputation. Perhaps, when he has heard their arguments he will change his views and think that, after all, this is a very good enterprise and one that should be supported. From what I know of the country and the circumstances, the scheme has my entire approval. I believe that such a public work would be thoroughly justified and I hope that time will see it brought to completion.

Mr. BARKER. I hope the invitation of the Postmaster General will be accepted by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox)——

Mr. LENNOX. Certainly.

Mr. BARKER. I hope also that the Postmaster General will not fail to be present to advocate the scheme. The hon. gentleman knows, perhaps, more than any other member in this House, perhaps more than any one in that district the possibilities of the particular canal that was being surveyed. The hon. gentleman is a large proprietor of real estate in the immediate neighbourhood and he ought to know exactly what the situation would be. I, therefore, commend to him the advice he has given to the member for South Simcoe, to be present and give his views on the occasion to which he has referred.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not know what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) intends to insinuate by saying that I am a large landed proprietor in that vicinity. If he means to suggest that I am seeking to promote some enterprise for personal gain—

Mr. BARKER. Not at all.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK——I will say this to him, that he will not find any person in North York, even of his own political faith who will attribute to me such motives as he has done.

Mr. BARKER. I did not attribute motives.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Then, what did the hon. gentleman mean by stating that I was a large landed proprietor in that vicinity ? I happen to own a small holding, a farm of a couple hundred acres. It is not near this proposed canal. My farm is in the township of King, and this canal will have no connection with my property ; it will be a long distance away. I think that when his remarks reach the people of North York his own friends will be the first to dissent from such insinuations as he has made. If I support the scheme, I support it in the interest of the general public.

Mr. BARKER. I suppose that the Postmaster General in giving advice to the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) did not intend to insinuate anything against that hon. gentleman.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No.

Mr. BARKER. I made simply the same remark to the Postmaster General——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. BARKER——that he made to the hon. member for South Simcoe. I told the Postmaster General, as a gentleman who is immediately interested in the district, that he ought to attend with the delegation and impress his personal views upon the government. I hope he will do so. From my knowledge of this district—and I do know a good deal about the district—I should be very glad to be present and hear the remarks of the hon. gentleman in advocating a branch of the Trent canal into it. I would like it to go upon record. I think it would be a very interesting thing for members of this House to have upon record, something that we might read to the hon. gentleman when he is lecturing gentlemen upon this side of the House upon ancient history in relation to public works.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I extend to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) as well the invitation to accompany the deputation.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why not to all ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I extend it to all.

Mr. LENNOX. I wish to say a word or two in a friendly spirit to the Postmaster General. We are neighbours ; we live in adjoining ridings.

Mr. EMMERSON. Suppose we come back to the Welland canal ?

Mr. BARKER.

Mr. LENNOX. If I have the gracious indulgence of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) who has cast so great a light upon this matter, I will refer to the gentleman who introduced the subject of the Tay canal. And I may incidentally, perhaps, refer to those who sit behind him and applauded him so loudly, and not one in ten of whom, I venture to say, could tell us anything about the Tay canal.

Mr. EMMERSON. You cannot see it, it is grown up with weeds.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is not as weedy as the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Emmerson's) mind.

Mr. LENNOX. I am not discussing particularly the question whether branches of the Trent Valley canal should or should not be extended to Schomberg and Aurora. I have the habit—I wish the Postmaster General had the same habit—of not talking of a matter until I know something about it. Now I will talk of a matter that the Postmaster General cannot deny. I am sorry he does not appreciate the situation better than he appears to ; he seems to be oblivious of the fact that it is a very grave offence, a very grave indiscretion in any member of parliament, and particularly a prominent member of a government, to go into a riding, particularly in his own riding, on the eve of a general election, when votes are to be won, and ought to be won by honest means, and there to hold out a bait to the people to vote for him. It is not a question of the policy of constructing the canal. When that matter has been laid before parliament, when this large scheme that has been foreshadowed by the speech from the Throne, it is quite time enough for any member of the government to go before the people and announce that he is in favour of the scheme. I venture to say, although a young man, a young member of parliament, that it is not becoming in a member of a cabinet, without consultation with his associates, without the scheme having been officially before the cabinet council for consideration, to pledge himself in his own riding to promote a scheme, whether it is or is not supposed to be in the interest of his constituents. How stands the Postmaster General in regard to this matter? He stands as a pledged man, bound and shackled in regard to this proposition. He is not a free man to sit as a cabinet minister when that delegation comes here, and to give a judicial consideration to the question. No, he is one of the promoters, as it is stated here, he is one of those who advocated the scheme, he is one of the active men who initiated it, and therefore he cannot represent the people of Canada in this matter. He is a shackled man before this delegation comes to Ottawa to consult with the government. But the Postmaster General is not in an unique position. He talked about unique positions a little

while ago, but he is not alone in failing to grasp the niceties which surround the actions of cabinet ministers. He is on a par with the unfortunate position in which the Minister of Trade and Commerce stood a few months ago when, in discussing the Jackson transaction, he failed to see what was the real issue before the House, and ventured to condone an offence without realizing the enormity of the offence. So it is with the Postmaster General to-night. I regret it exceedingly, I regret it because of its effect on public life in Canada, I regret it as a Canadian on behalf of the people of this country, that a cabinet minister, a gentleman not new to the position, one who has been long in office, does not see the gravity of the offence he committed when he became a party to the promotion of a scheme which had never been foreshadowed even by the speech from the Throne.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I desire to say a word or two in answer to the stand the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) has taken here to-night. He has robed himself in righteousness and made broad his phylacteries like the Pharisees of old, thanking God he is not like other men. He reads a lecture to the members of this House on honesty, integrity and straightforwardness. We had the spectacle last year, on the last day of the last session of the last parliament, of this self same hon. gentleman getting up on the floor of this House and attempting to besmirch the name of a member of parliament; and to prove his statement he read a letter, and in reading that letter he purposely left out a sentence, he purposely suppressed a sentence in that letter which turned the whole force of the argument against himself, and left him with not a leg to stand on. That is the hon. gentleman who gets up now, I would like to call him my cacological friend, and attempts to read us a lesson. He should be the last man to do a thing like that. A gentleman who committed a wrong like that last session has no right to get up and read a lecture to this House on honesty. It ill becomes the hon. gentleman to make a statement like that unless he is prepared to stand by every one of his actions, let alone his words.

Mr. LENNOX. Somebody asks me to attend to this hon. gentleman. I do not think I will. There are a number of hon. gentlemen in this House who know exactly what the hon. gentleman is referring to, and it is not surprising to me that he feels sore. The hon. gentleman on that occasion had to admit—and I can furnish the 'Hansard' with the whole discussion—he had to admit that he had been guilty of making statements which did not sound well in the mouth of any hon. gentleman or any member of this House, statements that were made far away from this House, out in British Columbia, statements that I read from papers furnished to me. It is right and fitting that this hon. gentleman should come to the rescue of the Postmaster General. If not a case of birds of a feather flocking together, it is a case of returning a service where the Postmaster General came to his rescue on that occasion. I told the hon. member that as certain papers had been placed in my hands of which I knew nothing at all about——

An hon. MEMBER. Nothing at all?

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, of which I knew nothing at all—hon. gentlemen had better not shout until they are out of the bush—papers of which I knew nothing at all had been placed in my hands to bring before the House, and I took occasion to tell the hon. gentleman that I would endeavour to bring them up at a time that was convenient to him. I had waited for some time—I think he was at Montreal—for him to return. We were friendly. I could not get an opportunity when the hon. gentleman was present until the last day of the session. The Postmaster General, acting on behalf of my hon. friend, came over to me and seeing that I had a bundle of papers before me said, I hope you are not going to read all those papers because the time is short. He said the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) wanted to leave soon on the train. I said, well, there are certain portions that I will read, and I went on to show the Postmaster General what I proposed to read. Well, he says, cut it short, just give a part of it, don't take up much time; and so I promised him I would shorten it as much as I could.

I was not particularly familiar with the papers. They had been marked before they had been placed in my hands. I read such portions as I thought would be necessary, but not all that would be necessary if I had had more time at my disposal. These papers were in the hands of the hon. minister, and every one of the letters which I read was in the possession of the government, and was known to be in the possession of the government, for weeks before the discussion came on. It was not essential or reasonable that I should read the whole of the letters. Subsequently, the hon. acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman), whom I see in the House, got up and, taking some of the papers I had handed over, said that I had left out a sentence in a letter that would have qualified what I had read. I was not professing to read the whole letter. He quoted it, and I said that I had not read such a letter, and neither I had, according to the bundle in my hand and probably according to the papers in his hand. But the hon. gentleman who has just spoken says that I wilfully and deliberately suppresed a portion of a letter, that I did not make it as full as I ought to have made it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macpherson), who has interjected something irrelevant in

the discussion, will receive attention at my hands on some occasion when the House is not so busy—in the dog days, in the good old summer time to come, perhaps; but I do not intend to pay much attention to him now. I am ready to refer to 'Hansard' and to deal with the whole question, and if he goes much farther, I will be liable to ask him certain questions that he will not like to answer. But I am not going to depart from the subject we have in hand now. It is quite right that he should come to the rescue of the hon. Postmaster General, and if there is any one who should apologize, it is the hon. Postmaster General, whom I endeavoured to accommodate.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I ask no man to apologize for me, and at any time the hon. gentleman wishes to follow up that line of attack upon me, he will find me doing business at the old stand. I want to say further when the hon. gentleman says here that I was obliged to retract something I said, he cannot find on the pages of the revised or unrevised 'Hansard' anything to show that I was obliged to retract one solitary word.

Mr. LENNOX. It is not remarkable that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macpherson) should be inexact as to what occurred many months or a year ago, when he cannot remember what was said two minutes ago. I did not say that he was obliged to retract anything, but I said he was obliged to admit certain statements, which he made at Vancouver, and which were read by me, to be true. That is all. The hon. gentleman says I can commence the discussion of the matter at any time I see fit. I am not going to do anything of the kind. The time of this House is too valuable for me to waste it in dealing with the hon. gentleman who has just spoken.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. member for South Simcoe says that I am pledged, that I am shackled and bound to the scheme, and therefore I am not free to pass an opinion upon it. I just desire to say what my views are on that question. I am not shackled, I am not bound, and I am perfectly free to take any course that I think proper in the public interest. But, to give the committee my opinion and to repeat all that I have ever stated, I would say that I believe that such a work as is indicated would be of very great advantage to the locality in question. Whether or not the expenditure would make it unreasonable to embark upon it is another question. No person can form a proper opinion as to whether a work should or should not be proceeded with until a reasonable estimate of the cost is obtained, and until that cost is ascertained, however desirable in itself the public work might be, any final judgment upon it must remain in abeyance. My judgment is not in suspense as to the advantage it would be to the district to have the work proceeded with, but my judgment is in suspense as to whether the country must go into it until we know the cost. I have never otherwise expressed myself. The hon. gentleman read an extract from a paper published in Bradford. The statement was published in February last, and referred to a meeting which took place six months before, and upon that statement he makes an accusation against me. I do not think that is good evidence, and I do not think the hon. gentleman is quite doing himself justice in making such an unfounded charge against me as he has made.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman is very funny. He tries to get away from the point. Does the hon. gentleman deny, as it is stated in the paper, that he was present at the meeting and spoke in favour of the scheme? I read it, not only in this paper, but I read it in other papers, amongst them the Newmarket 'Era,' I think. While I was travelling on the train I met a gentleman who had just come from the meeting. I know it was discussed broadcast throughout the last general election, and I am calling attention to it here because I think it does not become a cabinet minister, on the eve of an election, to make promises to the electors which may influence their votes.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. An abstract declaration of principle may be a very good thing. I attended the meeting in question, I addressed myself to the meeting as other citizens did, and I was saying what I am saying now, that the district would be advantaged by the construction of such a work, but the question of its cost and the question of its feasibility were matters entirely in the future, and the determination of the work must depend upon these considerations. That is my view to-day. I hope the result of the inquiry will show that the work is feasible, and that the prices come within a reasonable figure or as reasonable as will commend itself to support at the hands of this House.

Mr. LENNOX. Is it a fact that engineers or surveyors were put on?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. When we come to discuss that question, the way it happened to come up at that time will be made quite clear. It grew out of the decision of the Railway Commission seriously affecting a great enterprise in our district. The people were seriously intending to move away because of the railway freight rates. The matter came up in that way, and the people of our district were extremely uneasy lest this large enterprise should move away on account of the rates of freight charged by the Grand Trunk Railway Company on the commodities used and exported by that enterprise.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman has not answered me, but probably he will tell me now?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. About the engineers ?

Mr. LENNOX. Yes.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The engineers have been in the field ever since, and I think they are in the field yet.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not want to prolong this matter ; if the hon. gentleman will tell me now, that is an end of it—what large enterprise was it that was about to leave ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Messrs. Kane & Sons.

Mr. LENNOX. Of Newmarket ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Of Newmarket.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, the gentleman who is named in this paper as the promoter of this scheme.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. He is one of the firm.

Mr. LENNOX. By what authority were these engineers sent into the field ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. By the authority of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals whether there has been any money spent on this work of building the elevators during the present year ? There was money voted for it, but was there any money spent, and when was the scheme undertaken by the government of building this elevator ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The matter was under consideration last May after the report of the Transportation Commission and during the summer. I asked parliament at the last session to make an appropriation of $400,000. Arrangements were then made with a view to having plans made for the foundations, and tenders were asked for. Arrangements were also made for the making of plans and specifications for the superstructure. The contract has been let for the substructure but the plans are not quite complete for the superstructure. I hope they will be ready within a week or two and then tenders will be called for.

Mr. SPROULE. As the $400,000 was in the main estimates last year, which were published before the date of the Transportation Commission's report, the government's decision must have been reached before the report was received ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The $400,000 was not in the main estimates but in the supplementaries which came down in August.

Mr. SPROULE. This seems to me to be exactly the same scheme as that which was outlined by the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) and which he pressed on the attention of the House.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know what he did.

Mr. SPROULE. His contention was that it was a scheme that should be undertaken by the government, and he urged it on the ground that the storage of grain there ought to be made as cheap as possible, and that for that reason it should be kept in the hands of the government, for on that would largely depend the possibility or the probability of a large amount of grain passing by that route. This is exactly the same scheme and therefore must have been undertaken before the Transportation Commission reported on it. Speaking of this report it seems to me that for a great commission, a commission supposed to be composed of able men, this was about the most superficial report on the transportation question, so far as that locality is concerned, that I ever saw. It does not pretend to say that another bushel of grain will be taken down the St. Lawrence on account of it or that a bushel will be diverted from the Erie canal. The commission simply seems to recommend what the government had already discussed and agreed upon so that the government might be fortified in the policy to which they had practically committed themselves over a year before. If that is all the great Transportation Commission can do we had better avoid the expense of keeping that commission going in the future.

Mr. EMMERSON. The report of the Transportation Commission is certainly brief, but it states facts ; it does not indulge in any prophetic visions or fancy flights but states facts as to the conditions which prevail there and points out why it is necessary to have an elevator built in order to utilize and develop to their full capacity the works which have been constructed at great cost to the country in connection with the canal. I do not know anything about any views which Mr. Tarte entertained ; I only know that after this report came in I brought the matter, in a report to council, to the consideration of my colleagues and that it was discussed during the summer. The item was finally put in the estimates to the extent of $400,000 with a view to carrying out the policy which is outlined in the report referred to. It has no connection beyond that with any views which might have been entertained by other gentlemen. There may have been those who entertained these views; I have no doubt there are because they seem to be wise conclusions and I trust that the good judgment of the people of this country and of the business interests of the country will concur in their conclusion and will approve of the action of parliament in making an appropriation.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) gave us to understand that there were two corporations prepared to build this elevator, and not only to do that but to build boats suitable to pass

through the canal and handle the grain. We have heard a good deal of argument with reference to the possibility of the government building an elevator. As a business proposition we would readily understand that the men who are building the elevator would be willing and ready at least to build boats to carry the grain both from Port Arthur to Port Colborne and from Port Colborne to Montreal. I would like to have the minister explain at least part of the arrangement into which these companies were willing to enter.

Mr. EMMERSON. Propositions did come to the department that were sent there by the member for Welland (Mr. German). He has very correctly stated that in view of the policy outlined by the Transportation Commission they were not entertained or taken into consideration. I think that in a general way they wished the government to construct the foundations and to give them the privilege of building elevators on the pier after it had been constructed, the company then to have the exclusive control of these elevators in connection with their transportation lines. The propositions were not taken into serious consideration for the reason that they seemed to be opposed to the best interests of the country, that it would be creating a monopoly in connection with the traffic whatever it might amount to and would not inure to the advantage either of the business interests of the country or of the canal.

Mr. SPROULE. This elevator, I understand, is to contain not less than 2,000,000 bushels. Is it believed that there will be any great advantage in having a 2,000,000 bushel elevator there for the storage of grain at the close of the year. An elevator of the capacity of 2,000,000 bushels would be much better than an elevator of the capacity of 1,000,000. What object is there in putting in a large quantity of grain when navigation has closed.

Mr. EMMERSON. In the first instance, the class of vessels that will furnish the products of the west to that elevator will be a large class, and those products will necessarily be transhipped in smaller vessels suitable to the canal navigation. It will be necessary to have an elevator of large storage capacity, because the incoming freight will be greater than the outgoing at particular times during the season of navigation. More than that, as is outlined in the report of the commissioners, railway connection should be had with the elevator, and the grain that would not be taken through the canal, by reason of the closing of navigation, could be stored at the elevator and taken out from time to time by railway transportation. The commissioners recommend an elevator of not less capacity than one million bushels; but they contemplate another elevator, because they say, prepare your foundation and have everything in readiness for even more than that. The capacity of the elevator, in their judgment, must not be less than one million bushels, but they do not confine it to that capacity. One elevator of two million bushels capacity can be constructed for almost a third less—so I am advised by a very competent engineer—than two elevators of one million bushels capacity each. Therefore, having in mind the almost certainty of requiring two one million bushel elevators within the very near future, it seemed to be the interest of economy that one of the larger capacity should be built, especially as it could also be operated at much less expense. One power of larger capacity could be utilized in connection with the two million elevator much more cheaply than could two powers for isolated plants in separate elevators of one million capacity each. There would also be a smaller number of employees and officials. These are the reasons which led me, upon whom some responsibility rested in connection with the matter, to recommend to my colleagues the construction of one elevator of two million bushels capacity.

Mr. SPROULE. It does not seem to me that the reasons given are very strong. The principal one is that the grain might be stored there, and might be moved by railway after navigation closed. Is it likely that the grain would go such a long way round to be moved by railway when it could go to Midland or Parry Sound? Not very likely. There is a reason to my mind why there might be a large elevator, that is, to store the large quantity of Manitoba wheat that is used in the Ontario mills in the winter time. With regard to the necessity of having a large elevator so that it would not get filled up during navigation, I am satisfied that if you had a million bushel elevator, there would be plenty of craft to take all the grain that reached it during the season of navigation. I would not think it likely that there would be a great blockade of grain there after navigation opened. But after navigation closed, it might be advisable to have more storage capacity, not for the purpose of having the grain taken to Montreal by rail, but for the purpose of having it there for distribution to the mills in the province of Ontario in the winter time to be mixed with Ontario wheat. That is the strongest argument that could be advanced, in my judgment, for a large elevator. But the feature of the Transportation Commission that attracted my attention was this. The great object of the large expenditure at Port Colborne, as stated by the ex-Minister of Public Works, was the desirability of diverting to the St. Lawrence route the grain which goes from Chicago and Duluth via the Erie canal to New York. That, and that alone, must be the justification of this expenditure which when completed will be over $4,000,000. But this Transportation

Commission seems to have completely ignored that in their interim report, on which the hon. minister is acting in making this large expenditure, for they are silent on that point.

Mr. BARKER. There was one observation made by the minister a few minutes ago which seems to me to emphasize the objection raised by the hon. member from South Lanark to the government entering into this business which ought to be conducted by private enterprise. The hon. gentleman says that the wheat will arrive at this elevator, will go into it, and will be subsequently forwarded, perhaps by rail, perhaps at the conclusion of the winter season by vessels. Has the hon gentleman reflected for a moment that that involves the government entering into a warehouse business ? If you receive consignments of wheat of different classes and grades and from various persons you will have to issue warehouse receipts. These will be handled by banks, large advances will be made upon them, commercial transactions will occur, and all in reliance upon documents issued by an agent of the government. I think it is a most serious question. Have the government considered it as it ought to be considered ? You are going to have perhaps two milion bushels of wheat in your elevators at the end of the season. That wheat will be held on behalf of various companies, commission merchants, railways, ships and other interests.

A certificate from the government as to any quantity held in store will be commercial paper, negotiable in the banks, upon which enormous sums of money will be advanced. The government will be responsible for the documents issued by their agents ; and one of the most difficult matters to be conducted by any commercial body will be conducted by a few government appointees who were never brought up to the business and know little or nothing about it. I have had some experience myself of the difficulty of conducting an elevator business. There is no line of business in which the persons or company responsible run more risk than in this particular business which the government are proposing to enter into. I am inclined to think that a hasty conclusion has been arrived at and that the government have not fully considered what the construction and management of this elevator will lead them to. It may be that the government are under the impression that they will build an elevator and then perhaps turn it over to somebody else, but we have not had a word to that effect from the minister. So far as we know, the government propose to become warehousemen. They propose to enter into the commercial business of issuing warehouse receipts and conducting all the enormous transactions involved in the business including the liability to banks, endorsers and tranferees. And all these various ramifications are to be conducted by some gentlemen of the civil service who have had no training in anything of the kind. The whole of this discussion from first to last shows that there has not been given to this subject the careful consideration that it ought to have received. For an hour the minister did not tell us one word as to the grounds on which he was acting. It was not until the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) told us about the proposition of a couple of private enterprises to build the elevators that we knew anything about that offer. And it was only after we got that information that the Postmaster General told us about the report from the transportation committee.

Mr. EMMERSON. I told you about that before the Postmaster General spoke at all. I read extracts from it.

Mr. BARKER. If the hon. gentleman did, it certainly escaped my observation.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Postmaster General made no reference to it whatever.

Mr. BARKER. I may perhaps be wrong in that respect, but I say it was not until after the hon. member for Welland told us about the proposition from two private companies that we knew that any such proposition had been made or that we heard a word about the report of the Transportation Commission. It was only then, for the first time, that we heard that the subject had been reported upon by that commission. We have never seen that report. It has never been laid on the table. We never heard until to-night that offers had been made by any parties to construct these elevators, and we are asked to grant millions of money without giving the matter as much consideration as a business man would give to an expenditure of $500.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the hon. minister if the erection of an elevator by the government will prevent any private company from constructing an elevator in that harbour ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The government may prevent any other elevator being built on their concrete piers. I question whether there would be room for another on these piers.

Mr. HAGGART. Would there not be room for 200 elevators in the harbour ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not merely the elevators but the slips in connection with the elevators which must be considered. There are quite a number of vessels prying over the lakes which will require to utilize the elevators and will require advantages in connection with the unloading.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman says there is only room for two elevators. I asked him what is the distance from the entrance lock to the harbour and he said 4,650 feet.

Could you not put an elevator along the whole length of the canal from the entrance and the lock of the harbour ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am speaking of the two concrete foundations. You can build elevators away down at the mouth and there is no reason why you could not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend means that you can only put two elevators on the foundations for two.

Mr. BLAIN. What I ask is that supposing private corporations wanted the privilege of erecting elevators would that be granted them or is it the policy of the government to monopolize the elevator business.

Mr. EMMERSON. That point has not been considered in the concrete form in which my hon. friend puts it, but I am satisfied that if any private corporation wanted to build a elevator, it would be open to them to do it, on such conditions as the government might see fit to impose.

Mr. OSLER. I was very sorry to find that on a question such as this a minister of the Crown or anybody else could drift away into ancient politics and go back to the expenditure on the Welland canal in generations gone by and ask who was responsible for it. What is the use, in this day and generation, of going away back to make political capital out of the expenditure on canals, which were built under conditions which the most of us to-day know nothing about. What struck me in connection with this discussion as to the relative advantage of government ownership and the building of these elevators by private enterprise, is this : If the government build the elevators and these large vessels unload into them, where are they going to get the barges into which to tranship that grain ? But if a company should build these elevators, they would do so for the purpose of making money and would no doubt build the barges required to take the grain down the canal. They would build an elevator for commercial reasons—to make money. Having built the elevator, would that company also be in a position to build vessels of proper capacity for the canal to carry the grain from the elevator down to the shipping port at Montreal, Quebec, or wherever they wished to go ? The hon. minister told us, with a great flourish of trumpets, about the number of vessels upon the upper lakes that would come down to Port Colborne. I admire his faith in the development of the country, for I am a Canadian also. But, even if there are so many vessels as he says on the upper lakes, surely three or four of these vessels would carry enough to fill his elevator, and then where would he be if barges were not provided to take the grain away ? Why, the whole traffic would be blocked. We may talk as much as we like, but we should not go beyond the bounds of common sense in dealing with this plain practical matter. It is too big and too serious a question to have our minds distracted by party politics when we are trying to deal with it. As a practical matter, I would ask how much of the grain that reaches Buffalo is ultimately exported from the United States. I have not the figures before me, and at my time of life I cannot carry these figures in my mind ; but I understand that a very small proportion of the grain that goes through the elevators at Buffalo is exported to foreign countries. If that is the fact, will the minister explain to me how he can possibly hope to divert any part of that traffic from Buffalo to Port Colborne ? To say that this could be done would be the most absurd proposition that could be made. All he can hope to secure will be a share of the grain that goes through Buffalo for export to foreign countries. The report that the minister has read is not complete for our purpose. It does not go into figures, and so does not give us the information upon which to base an intelligent judgment with regard to this vote. I hardly like to venture to give advice to the minister, but I must say, whether they like it or not, that I have found a lack of readiness on their part to give this committee information that it ought to have. The Minister of Railways has read the report of the commission, not when he introduced the resolution, but, apparently—I hope he will excuse me if I am wrong—when it was dragged out of him and he could not help himself.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) spoke of two other offers made to build an elevator at this point. It would not have been amiss for the minister to bring down information concerning these. We have an extract from the report of the Transportation Commission, but we should have the other too. It may not prove valuable information, but I think it would be better if we had it before disposing of this item finally.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am quite ready to bring down any desired information, but I feel sure hon. gentlemen opposite will not seek to have the item stand over on that account. We have discussed this matter exhaustively. No item has been passed, and I think we ought to make some progress. I would like to go on with other items. I have already agreed with some hon. gentlemen opposite to allow some of the items to stand because some gentlemen on the other side who wish to discuss them could not be present this evening. Therefore, I would like to get this item through. The report of the Transportation Commission was referred to by me and I read an extract from it that I happened to have. I did not know at the time that a copy of the full report was in the House. But again after I sat down, and the discussion proceeded, the chief engi-

neer told me he had a copy of the report here, and I brought it to the notice of the committee. I did so at the first opportunity. Hon. gentlemen opposite and on this side also wished to speak and I bided my time. It certainly would be an advantage to this vote, as hon. gentlemen opposite will admit, to have that report before the committee, and had I known that a copy of it was here, I would have read the whole report. The extract that I did read, I read at the outset of my remarks in explanation of the vote.

Mr. BLAIN. I would draw the attention of the minister to the fact that this report was in the hands of the government last year before this question was discussed in the House. The report is dated Toronto, May 6th, 1904, and the discussion on the elevator question was on August 3rd, 1904. The minister had this report in his possession, and, no doubt, the government had gone over it very carefully, and, from that report had arrived at the decision to construct the elevator.

Mr. EMMERSON. My recollection is that at that time the decision had not been reached in the matter. The subject was under discussion in May, when I brought to the notice of my colleagues by the way of report, the contents of the report of the Transportation Commission. The matter was not finally settled even at the time the House was asked for the vote.

Mr. BLAIN. But let me read to the minister his own statement to the House on the 3rd of August, 1904, as reported in 'Hansard' of that year, page 8380 :

> It occurred to me that the elevators might be free even if the canals were not. But I would naturally expect that the public who use these elevators should pay for them. It is a question of policy as to whether a private corporation should have the right to build an elevator or whether it would be better for the government to do it.
>
> The policy adopted is that the government shall do it, there being so many different shippers whose interests might clash. Therefore, the government would charge the ordinary elevator dues. That would be my idea.

Mr. EMMERSON. Then it was settled at that time. Without referring to the record, I was under the impression that it had not been settled at that time. But it is only a question of date.

Mr. BLAIN. That is the all important question before the committee, and I do not wonder at my hon. friend from Northumberland calling the attention of the government to the fact that they are unwilling at times to give us information. Here is the fact that an important transportation commission had already reported last year, the report being in the hands of the government, and still the government have allowed this matter to come up involving the expenditure of nearly $3,000,000, as stated at that time, to build a 2,000,000 bushel elevator. They allowed the committee to go on and discuss that, and all the time they withheld from the committee the report of the Transportation Commission.

Mr. EMMERSON. There was no object in withholding it. I have already stated that I was under the impression that that report had been presented to parliament, as indeed the interim report with regard to the St. John harbour had been presented to parliament. Until the question arose here tonight I certainly had no idea, but that it was within the knowledge of the House.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend does not pretend to say now that he was of the opinion that the committee had this report in their possession last year.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. I am amazed at that statement, because this question was up then. Was it printed and distributed to the members ? No more important document could be printed.

Mr. EMMERSON. I thought it had been placed before the House with the report concerning the St. John harbour.

Mr. BLAIN. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement when he says he understood the committee had it in their possession. But the fact remains that the minister allowed this discussion to take place last year, involving an enormous expenditure, and he did not give the committee the report of the Transportation Commission, nor did he give it to the House at the beginning of this session. This item was up for discussion last evening, and still there was no mention of the report.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say a word with regard to the suggestion of the minister that we allow this item to pass, because we have been discussing it for some time, and he has no objection to bring down these offers later on. There is this inconvenience about it, that after we have voted the money it cannot be of the same interest to us. It is before we vote the money that we require the information to enable us to judge whether we are going right. I have no desire to obstruct the passage of the vote, at the same time I think we ought to see those offers before we dispose of the item. We desire the information so that we may act intelligently.

Mr. EMMERSON. They cannot affect the question materially. I acknowledge that the House should have these offers, but they do not bear materially on the question of this vote. It must be borne in mind that parliament is already committed to this work. There is no departure from the policy of the government constructing the elevator, This parliament committed itself a year ago

to a policy of that kind, and authorized the government to expend $400,000.

Mr. SPROULE. And that without the information which was in the government's possession.

Mr. EMMERSON. Parliament was evidently satisfied with the information it had at that time. There was no reason why hon. members should not have had it. I could have no interest in withholding it, as it is information that entirely supports the proposition made by the government. But parliament having committed itself to the principle of constructing an elevator at that point, and placed at the disposal of the government $400,000, it seems to me that my hon. friend, in asking the matter to stand over now, is not serving the purpose that he desires to serve. Hon. gentlemen who were here last session will bear witness that whenever I promised to bring down information, that promise was fulfilled as early as possible. I can promise my hon. friend that the information he requires will be furnished on Monday.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister says that the House committed itself to this expenditure last year, and that it did so without information. But last year we were confronted with two dilemmas. We made an effort to get information and we could not, and were obliged to let many items go through without information. First there was put up a plea that the minister was a new minister and therefore was not familiar with the business, and out of charity we had to let him pass over many things without the explanations we would have exacted from an older minister. Moreover, we never knew when there was any information in the possession of a minister. I am not applying that remark to the present minister, because he is better than some of them; but we never knew whether the information was in possession of a minister and he was so obstinate that he would not give it, or whether he had not the information, and in many cases we were obliged to go blindly. Does he not see that if we did what he desires us to do, that if we should let it go without this information, we would be practically repeating the same blunder that we have committed in other instances. Suppose, for instance, that these two offers were much more favourable than we might reasonably anticipate they were, we have not that knowledge because the information has not been given to the committee. We have voted about $400,000 and we are asked to vote $310,000, because we have committed ourselves to it already, but we are just adding to it. We are increasing the degree without increasing the intelligence with which we are doing it and it is on account of the absence of that information that I speak of it at the present time.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would like to draw the attention of the committee to the statement of the hon. minister just to show how absurd his proposition is. He says that he very generously gave us the information when we asked for it. We did not know anything about this report being in his possession. Here is a commission that we were paying, and the members of which are the servants of the people, but I think the trouble arose largely from the fact that the present ministers think they are czars, and that they are not the servants of the people. Here is a commission that the people are paying, obtaining information that an humble member of the House of Commons like myself cannot obtain. If the hon. minister will consult his deputy when I conclude the few remarks which I propose to make, I will be very much obliged to him. If he were as anxious to get information when he was out of the House as he is in the House, we would not have all this trouble in getting information from him. What reason has the hon. minister for having a report in his possession that is made to him in his capacity as minister when he has not thought it necessary to have it printed and given to the public, so that the public might understand what that commission has been doing in the interest of the people who are paying for it? He tells us very blandly, and with that generous smile he puts on——

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not put on. It is natural. Do not be unkind.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is not put on? I thought it was, because it is so bland that a wayfaring man, even a fool, might read that it is deceptive. If the hon. minister upon getting that report had printed it, we would have known what it contained. I fancy the trouble is that the hon. minister —I do not blame him and I do not criticise him more than I do other ministers—fails to get any information in reference to the estimates until he comes down to the House and asks the committee to vote them. Then he has to talk to his deputy and get the information that he should have in his hands when he comes before the House, instead of having to refer to his deputy or some one else to ascertain whether the criticism made of his estimates by some hon. member is well founded or not. A minister of the Crown is the servant of the people just as I am. We are paying him for his services as a minister. We paid that commission to give us certain information which they gave to the minister, and from the fact that he neglected his duty by failing to have that report printed and put in the hands of the committee, we have had three or four hours of discussion—useless discussion, perhaps. There is the whole trouble in a nut shell, and if ministers only realized that they were delaying their own estimates by

their—I was going to say ignorance, but I will not use that word—but from the fact that they do not post themselves in connection with their estimates, thus causing the country to expend a lot of money for useless talk, I am sure they would make an effort to prepare themselves more thoroughly. If they would get that information and give it to us, it would save the country a great deal of expense and save a great deal of talk in this House and hard feelings, as well as those humiliating conversations between the hon. minister and his deputy.

Mr. HAGGART. You have a preliminary report of the Transportation Commission ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is the report in respect to the St. John harbour.

Mr. HAGGART. No, I am leaving out the St. John harbour and the special report you brought down this evening. Have you a preliminary report besides these ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. HAGGART. Well, I am taking the answer of the right hon. Prime Minister :

Before the orders of the day are called, would the right hon. first minister tell us when we are to expect the preliminary report of the Transportation Committee.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It will be brought down very shortly.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is a preliminary report, and the report in regard to St. John harbour is a preliminary report.

Mr. HAGGART. We had that a year ago. You do not call that a preliminary report of the Transportation Commission ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do.

Mr. HAGGART. Where there is a special reference to a particular portion of their work, and only giving their opinion on that —you call that a preliminary report ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do.

Mr. HAGGART. That is sufficient. It may impose upon somebody.

Rideau canal extension, $50,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is a revote of $50,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Is there any of it expended ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes ; there was expended on surveys $566.66.

Mr. COCHRANE. Are you going to take the weeds out of the Tay canal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No. There is a certain mill property belonging to certain parties—I forget the names, but I think they are Tott Brothers—for which a very large sum of money is claimed, and in order to build the locks at that place it will be necessary to have that property. The matter has not been gone on with. The surveys were not completed fully in time to go on last season, but in addition to that there is another difficulty arising in connection with this property.

Mr. HAGGART. This is for the purpose of establishing communication between the canal and a certain lake ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Mud lake, Devil's lake and Desert lake.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes ; for the purpose of developing what was represented by the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) as a large mining section.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. I hope the mines are there, that is all I can say.

Sault Ste. Marie canal—construction, $100,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What are you doing there ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is $100,000 we are asking for in addition to the $170,000 asked for last year. About $150,000 will be required to complete this work. The canal is cut through St. Mary's Island. It is 1¾ miles in length. The canal proper has a depth of 22 feet of water in the prism, with 24 feet 4 inches of water on the mitre sill of the lock. The deepening of the lower entrance to a depth of 21 feet 5 inches has been completed. The above amount is to be expended in removing shoals and deepening what is called the Vidal shoal and dredging and deepening the Upper Entrance so as to give a uniform depth of 21 feet 5 inches ; also to make a safer passage of vessels. There is, under contract, an extension of South Entrance Pier at lower entrance of canal of 800 feet. The substructure is of timber crib work with a superstructure of concrete ; at present there is only 18 feet in parts of upper entrance. Hinckler Bros. had a contract for deepening a portion of upper entrance at upper end of Vidal shoal. Their contract is completed. Tenders were advertised for; but only one was received. Rate, 80 cents per yard. Tenders were called for in September, 1894, for deepening the upper entrance from eastern end of the entrance piers to the eastern end of what is known as the Vidal shoals. Five tenders were received. The work was awarded to the lowest tenderer—C. S. Boone, Toronto, at $1.74 per yard. No work has been done yet. Work is also under way in the extension of south entrance pier at lower entrance which will be finished next summer. Tenders were called for. Seven bids were received. The lowest tenderer, W. Birmingham, of Ottawa, was awarded the work at schedule rates. There was expended up to 30th November, 1904, $37,501.

Mr. BOYCE. When was the contract awarded to Mr. Birmingham ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was sometime after the vote of parliament. It was between that time and Christmas. A contract was also entered into with Messrs. O'Boyle Bros. for extending the south entrance pier, at the upper entrance of the canal. This is an extension of 800 feet and consists of a timber substructure capped with a concrete wall. This will make a safer entrance and avoid the cross current. Three tenders were received. The work was awarded to the lowest and amounts to $59,280.

Mr. HAGGART. What sum more will be required to complete the improvements ?

Mr. EMMERSON. About $150,000 more in addition to the $50,000 I spoke of.

Mr. BOYCE. If the minister would allow this item to stand there is a great deal of information that we would like to obtain.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can give all the information now and I would like to make some progress in connection with it. I would like to get the item through.

Mr. BOYCE. The discussion might take some time and I think the work would be expedited by rising now.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Trent canal matter was to stand by arrangement. I want to make an amendment now. You will notice under the Trent canal an item.

Damage by flooding, $7,000.

That was stricken out in the original and it has been put in here by a clerical mistake. It has been transferred to the income account and I would like that stricken out. It is transferred to the supplementary estimates of 1904. I would move that that item of $7,000 be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have agreed that the item of the Trent canal should stand.

Some resolutions reported.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If we should reach government business on Monday, what will be taken up ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If government business is reached, the Minister of Agriculture will proceed with his Census Bill and after that the House will be moved into Committee of Supply. The Minister of Railways and Canals will continue his estimates.

Motion agreed to, House adjourned at 12.05 a.m., Saturday.

Mr. EMMERSON.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 20, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 64) respecting Central Counties Railway Company.—Mr. Stewart.

Bill (No. 65) respecting the James Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Talbot.

Bill (No. 66) to amend the Criminal Code of 1892, respecting appeals and summary convictions.—Mr. Porter by Mr. Sam Hughes.

CABINET CHANGES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman whether any cabinet changes have taken place since the session of 1904 ? I do not know that there are any which I have in mind, with the exception of the admission into the cabinet of the Hon. A. B. Aylesworth, a very prominent member of the Ontario bar. It was stated during the campaign in the newspapers that Mr. Aylesworth had become a member of the government, and I would like to know whether or not this statement was well founded, and whether or not Mr. Aylesworth is still a member of the administration.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Some time last fall, before the election, I approached, with the concurrence of my colleagues and the approval of His Excellency the Governor General, Mr. Aylesworth and asked him to become a member of the cabinet without portfolio. Mr. Aylesworth agreed to my proposition, and entered into the contest at once and ran for the county of Durham. But he was not sworn in as a member of the cabinet before he entered upon the campaign. He had not time to come to Ottawa before the election to be sworn in, so that he has never been a member of the cabinet and is not now. He was unsuccessful in the election, and after the election I had an interview with him and again asked him to come into the cabinet. He told me that, under the circumstances, so long as he had not stated whether or not he would run again, he was not prepared to be sworn in. I hope, however, that at an early date Mr. Aylesworth will take his position in the cabinet.

REPORTS OF RETURNING OFFICERS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will my right hon. friend bring down the special reports which I see must have been made by the returning officers for the electoral divisions of McKenzie and Dauphin. The hon. gentleman, will, no doubt, remember that under the terms of the Northwest Territories the Representation Act provision is made that, whenever, owing to unforeseen accident,

delays or otherwise, the proclamation cannot be postponed in time to leave the requisite number of days between the posting and the day of polling, the returning officer may fix another day for nomination, which day shall be the nearest possible day after allowing the number of days during which said proclamation is required to be posted before such nomination. There is a provision in the statute that in every such case, the returning officer must make a special report to the clerk of the Crown in Chancery as to the cause of the postponement. A similar provision is made in the Dominion Elections Act of 1900. I presume that special reports under these provisions must have been made with regard to the elections in the electoral divisions of Mackenzie and Dauphin. I think it would be right that, in both cases, the special report of the returning officer should be laid on the table of this House. I will send over to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfred Laurier) the memorandum I have, which, I have no doubt, will assist him in obtaining the information which I have asked for.

PAYMENT FOR BALLOT BOXES.

Mr. J. B. MORIN. I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he has a reply for Mr. Cayouette, P.M., at Sainte Claire regarding the ballot boxes of which I spoke the other day. The gentleman wants an answer, and, if the Prime Minister can give me any information I shall be glad to have it. If not, I must reply to Mr. Cayouette advising him that there is no information.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say that the reply I have to give to my hon. friend (Mr. Morin) will not be very satisfactory to Mr. Cayouette. I understood from the letter he had written to my hon. friend, that Mr. Cayouette received, in 1891, certain ballot boxes which were handed to him by a Dr. Lesage, returning officer, and that they have been there ever since. I can only say that, so far as my information goes, we have no information as to the action of Dr. Lesage, whether Dr. Lesage deposited the ballot boxes with Mr. Cayouette does not appear from anything we can find in the records of the government.

Mr. MORIN. I can tell the Prime Minister that the boxes are there. Last fall, when the returning officer for the county of Dorchester was appointed he came to me and asked me if I knew where he could get ballot boxes made, and I told him that he could get them at Mr. Cayouette's; and he went and got four, Mr. Cayouette has yet twenty-one in his possession. He wants to dispose of them and he has no way to do so. I spoke to the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) about it in 1897, and he told me that he would see to it. But I suppose he has not done so.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Speaking of the correction, I think that, under the law, Mr. Cayouette would be within his rights and obligations if he sent the boxes to the sheriff or registrar of the county.

Mr. MORIN. That is what the Postmaster General told me, and I told Mr. Cayouette of that, and he asks: Who will pay me for doing that? And the matter stands as it was.

STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) is in his place, I would like to ask him if he has any tidings of the movement of the steamers 'Stanley' and 'Minto' plying between the provinces of Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia. I understand that there has been no crossing there for three weeks.

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I understand from the report in the department that the two stemers are still unable to cope with the ice between the island and the mainland.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I would suggest to the minister that there is, as I understand a winter boat, or ice-crusher at present in Quebec, and not doing very much—the steamer 'Montcalm.' I would like to ask if there is any possibility of sending that steamer to their rescue.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I would give the same answer as to the other question. It would be impossible to send an ice-breaker down under the present circumstances, especially from Montreal, because the St. Lawrence is blocked at the present moment.

PRIVATE BILLS.

OTTAWA ELECTRIC COMPANY.

On the order:

House in Committee on Bill (No. 12) respecting the Ottawa Electric Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I am asked by the promoter of the Bill to request that it be set over until Wednesday, March 1.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 60) to incorporate the Algoma Copper Range Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 61) to incorporate the Lebonk and Thunder Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Bole.

Bill (No. 62) respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Lamont.

Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the Brantford and Woodstock Railway Company.—Mr. Schell (Oxford).

FACER SOLID STEEL CAR WHEEL CO.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 27) respecting certain patents of the Facer Solid Steel Car Wheel Company, of Perth, Limited.

On section 1,

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I may say that when this Bill came up in committee I, as the minister in charge of the administration of the Patent Act, took exception to the general provisions of the Bill as presented. It seemed to ask for a far too long an extension of time ; and in connection with one of the patents, at all events, there was no need of an extension of time at all. The Bill as originally printed asked to deal with five different patents, all of them more or less dependent on each other. One of them has still a term of nine years to go ; one of them through inadvertence made in the renewal, was dead ; the three others expire next fall. On several occasions this House has authorized an extension of the life of patents under circumstances very similar to those surrounding these patents, namely, that while the patent had existed for a length of time, nobody had been able to make use of it or really to take the matter up and utilize it for the benefit of the public. That is the case with these patents. A suggestion was made that we reinstate the patent which had expired through inadvertence, as has been commonly done in the House under similar circumstances, and that we should extend the time of the patents which will expire next year and make the life of these patents coextensive with the life of the patent which is still in existence and has a term of years to run.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the one having nine years to run ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. That proposal was accepted with some hesitation by the promoters of the Bill, and the committee adopted it unanimously and reported the Bill amended so as to accomplish that object.

Mr. FOSTER. The four subsequent patents are all for improvements or amendments to the original one ?

Mr. FISHER. No, they are all connected together, they are all dealing with car wheels and are more or less dependent on each other. The full use of the patent which is still in existence cannot be enjoyed by the patentees unless they have also the other patents ; that is to say, this patent is more or less dependent on the others.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In dealing with these applications to extend patents which have been allowed to lapse, we have used a uniform section with regard to the rights of persons who have begun to manufacture in the meantime. Is that reservation of the rights of such persons which has been made in this Bill, of precisely the same character as the one upon which we have acted ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, the clerk of the committee was instructed to draw it up in accordance with the usual section.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows :

GREY.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :—

I have received with much pleasure the address which you have adopted in reply to the speech with which I opened the session of parliament, and I thank you for it heartily.

Government House, Ottawa,
16th February, 1905.

QUESTIONS.

LIGHTHOUSE DEPOT AT PRESCOTT.

Mr. LALOR—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Were the buildings and constructions of the government in connection with the Dominion lighthouse depot at Prescott erected by contract ?

2. If so, were public tenders called ; in what newspapers and on what dates were they advertised ?

3. What tenders were received ; what were the offers and who received the contract ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. There were two small new buildings erected and only repairs made to old buildings, and this was done by day labour by the men employed at the depot.

2. Answered by the first.

3. Answered by the first.

ADULTERATION OF MAPLE PRODUCTS.

Mr. BELAND asked :

1. Is the government in a position at the present time to control the production of maple sugar and maple syrup in Canada ?

2. Is the government aware that the manufacture of those products is carried on in the large cities on an extensive scale, and that at Montreal at this moment, under the designations of ' maple sugar from Beauce ' and ' maple syrup from Beauce ' articles that contain only a slight proportion of maple sap are offered for sale ?

3. Is it the intention of the government to check this practice which is calculated to ruin the reputation that the county of Beauce rightly enjoys for its maple products ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Inland Revenue) :

1. No.

2. The department is not aware that the articles 'maple sugar from Beauce' and 'maple syrup from Beauce' containing only a slight proportion of maple sap are offered for sale in Montreal, but the matter will be immediately inquired into.

3. The department is taking active steps to prevent the adulteration of maple sugar and maple syrup. Already prosecutions have been instituted in cases where the 'Adulteration Act' has been violated.

CHILD IMMIGRATION.

Mr. U. WILSON—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked :

1. What assistance, if any, is given by the government to any person or persons bringing children to Canada from the old country ?

2. How many have been brought into this country during the fiscal year 1904, and of what age ? How many males and how many females?

3. From what sources in the old country do these immigrants come ?

4. To what institutions were they sent, and how many to each ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of the Interior.

1. There are two classes of children brought to Canada by Philanthropic Societies. (a.) Children from workhouses and industrial institutions, on whom no bonus or commission is paid. (b.) Children from private homes and educational institutions on whom it has been the practice since 1873-4, to pay a commission of $2 per head.

2. 2,212, of whom 525 were bonus children : 443 males and 82 females, their ages ranging from 5 to 18 years.

3. Private homes, educational, industrial institutions and workhouses.

4. To the following receiving homes in Canada : Bristol Emigration Society, St. John, N.B., 40 ; Canadian Catholic Emigration Society, Ottawa, Ont., 106 ; Dr. T. Bowman Stephenson, Hamilton, 60 ; Miss. Macpherson, Stratford, 142 ; Church of England, Waifs and Strays Society, Sherbrooke, 54 ; Church of England, Niagara-on-the-Lake, 29 ; J. W. C. Fagan's Home, Toronto, 49 ; Rev. Robert Wallace, Belleville, 94 ; Mrs. Birt, Knowlton, P.Q., 106 ; J. T. Middlemore, Halifax, N.S., 130 ; Dr. Barnardo's Homes, Toronto, Peterboro, Ontario, Winnipeg and Russell, Manitoba, 1,188 ; Catholic Emigrating Association, Montreal, P.Q., 206 ; Working Boys' Home, Lennoxville, P.Q., 8.

DELAY IN PRINTING SUPREME COURT REPORTS.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Barker—asked :

1. Is the government aware that numerous complaints have been made by members of the bar in regard to the delay in printing the Supreme Court reports ?

2. What is the cause of said delay, and what steps have been taken by the government to remove this cause of complaint ?

3. Has the registrar of the Supreme Court power to have said reports printed where he deems expedient ? If not, why not ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) :

1. No complaints have been heard, excepting recently concerning a delay in issuing the current number of the Supreme Court Reports.

2. (a.) The cause is the pressure on the bindery in consequence of the early session. To prevent delaying the House it was necessary to give precedence to departmental reports. During the last two months the pressure has been very exceptional.

(b.) For years the accommodation at the bureau has been insufficient. Changes are now in progress to extend the space for the bindery. In the meantime the departmental reports for this year are nearly all issued. The delayed number of Supreme Court Reports will be issued early this week.

3. The Registrar of the Supreme Court in common with other officials has not the power under the law to place printing outside of the Printing Bureau.

BLANK BALLOTS FOR DOMINION ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPROULE asked :

1. Adverting to the answer given by the First Minister on Monday, February 13th, regarding the method of issuing blank ballot papers to returning officers, what was the date of the complaint received from the returning officer in South Lanark ?

2. What was the date of the complaint received from the returning officer in the city of Ottawa?

3. When were the additional thousand ballots sent to him ?

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

1. The letter making the complaint in relation to South Lanark was dated October 29, 1904.

2. The complaint of shortage made at Ottawa was by telephone one or two days before October 31.

3. The request for additional ballots was made on October 31, and the additional 1,000 was sent on that date.

4. On November 21, 1,499 unused printed ballots were returned to the King's Printer.

I. C. R.—EMPLOYMENT OF MR. F. B. CHAPMAN.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. Was F. B. Chapman, now fuel inspector on the Intercolonial Railway, an employee of the road at any time previous to his present employment ? If so, in what capacity, and for what length of time ?

2. Was he at any time discharged from the service ? If so, when, and for what cause ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1 and 2. There is no Fuel Inspector on the Intercolonial Railway named F. B. Chapman ; there is, however, a young man named F. B. Chapman, who was employed in the service as checker and clerk from June 1891 until February 1897, when he was dropped on account of reduction of staff, and who has lately been re-employed as a clerk in the Mechanical Accountant's Office.

JOACHIM GODBOUT, LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, ST. LAURENT.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Barker—asked :

1. Is the government aware that one Joachim Godbout, a lighthouse-keeper, in the employ of the government at St. Laurent, Island of Orleans, took an active part in the last federal election, to the degree of insulting publicly in public meetings the opposition candidate and his friends ?

2. Is it the policy of the government to tolerate such conduct on the part of its employees ?

Hon. R. PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. No.

2. No. The policy of the government in this regard has been stated on more than one occasion.

EXPENDITURE BY J. HUOT, MAYOR OF L'ANGE GARDIEN.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Barker—asked :

1. During the course of the months of September, October or November last, did the government, or any other department of the government, or any officer of any of its departments, write to J. C. Huot, Esq., mayor of l'Ange Gardien, informing him that a sum of $600, or any other sum, had been placed at his disposal for the carrying on of certain works along the beach in front of the said parish ?

2. If so, has the sum in question been sent to the said J. C. Huot, and if not, why not ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER—(for the Minister of Public Works) :

1. On the 12th October 1904, Jos. Huot, at L'Ange Gardien, was authorized to expend the sum of $600 in removing boulders from the beach.

2. Pay-lists and accounts have not yet been received and consequently no money has been paid.

PARISH OF ST. FRANCOIS, ISLAND OF ORLEANS.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Barker—asked :

1. During the course of September, October or November last, was a certain sum of money sent to or placed at the disposal of any person in the parish of St. François, Island of Orleans, by the government, or by any department of the government, for repairs to be done to the wharf of the said parish, or for any other works ?

2. If so, what sum, and to whom ?

3. Has the money been expended, and has the person in question rendered an account thereof?

Mr. FOSTER.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Public Works). No

RESIGNATION AND APPOINTMENT TO SENATE OF MR. JUSTICE CHOQUETTE

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Barker—asked :

1. What is the date of the resignation of Honourable P. A. Choquette as puisne judge of the Supreme Court for the province of Quebec ?

2. What is the date of the nomination of the said Honourable P. A. Choquette as a member of the Senate ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Justice Choquette in the month of September last sent a letter of resignation to the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister was under the impression that he had immediately sent it to the Department of Justice, but since this question was asked he found that he had not done so. The letter was somewhat mislaid. Mr. Justice Choquette was appointed a senator on the 30th September, 1904, which ipso facto vacated his judgeship.

PIER AT GRAND BEND.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked :

1. Has there been any delay in building the pier at Grand Bend ?

2. If so, what is the cause of the delay, and when will the construction of the said pier be commenced ?

3. When will the pier and dredging be completed ?

4. What is the estimated cost of the said pier and dredging ?

5. How much has been expended on the said pier to date ?

6. Who is the inspector on behalf of the government for the construction of the said work?

7. What salary does he receive ?

8. When did his services begin ?

9. How much has been paid to him, and how much has he earned to date ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Public Works) :

1. Yes.

2. Delay due to difficulties experienced in procuring materials ; work will be started next spring, as early as possible.

3. Contract calls for completion of pier on the 30th June, 1905.

4. Contract price for pier $21,388. Contract does not include any dredging.

5. $300.

6. Mr. John Rae.

7. $3 per working day.

8. On July 4, 1904.

9. $300.

GOVERNMENT OFFICERS IN NORTHWEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. HERRON asked :

1. What officers or employees of the government in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories resigned during the calendar year 1904 ; at what dates, and for what reasons ?

2. Who, if any, of these have since been again employed by the government ; at what date, and in what capacity ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I presume this question refers only to the Department of the Interior ; at all events I have the answer only for that department which is as follows :

1. J. Kelso Hunter, 17th February, 1904, deputy registrar, land registrar district of Assiniboia ; no reason given. A. E. Wild, 31st January, 1904, sub-agent of Dominion lands, Melfort, Saskatchewan ; no reason given. David M. Logie, 13th January, 1904, clerk Dominion lands office, Prince Albert ; no reason given. W. H. Reed, 27th January, 1904, sub-Crown timber agent, Strathclair ; removed to Winnipeg. H. S. Chaplin, 18th April 1904, clerk Dominion lands office, Calgary ; no reason given. Miss. Minnie M. McDonald, 6th May, 1904, clerk, Dominion lands office, Regina ; no reason given. R. R. King, 26th May, 1904, sub-agent of Dominion lands, Melfort, Saskatchewan ; no reason given. P. A. Miquelon, 7th June, 1904, sub-agent of Dominion lands, Wetaskiwin, Alta. ; no reason given. James Brewster, 12th April, 1904, land guide, Innisfail ; left the district. H. M. Douglas, 1st July, 1904, sub-agent of Dominion lands, Innisfail ; no reason given. M. M. Reed, 3rd July, 1904, clerk, land titles office, Regina ; no reason given. Thos. Turnbull, 31st August, 1904, inspector Dominion lands surveys, Winnipeg ; no reason given. J. B. Holden, 30th September, 1904, sub-agent of Dominion lands, Leduc, Alta. ; no reason given. Miss M. L. Armstrong, 7th November, 1904, clerk, Dominion lands office, Regina ; no reason given. P. M. Bredt, 30th September, 1904, immigration agent, Regina ; no reason given.

2. A. E. Wild, 1st June, 1904, sub-agent of Dominion lands, Melfort, Saskatchewan.

GRAIN WAREHOUSES IN MONTREAL.

Mr. PICHE—by Mr. Talbot—asked :

1. By whom were the plans of the warehouses for the storing of grain in the port of Montreal prepared ?

2. Who were the persons employed in the preparation of those plans, and what was the cost entailed in the preparation of said plans ?

3. Who prepared the plans of the grain chutes intended to convey the grain from the elevator which was erected by the government in the port of Montreal to the steamers ?

4. Was Mr. Metcalfe employed in the preparation of these plans, and what remuneration was he to receive for the same ?

5. Was Mr. Johnson, now general superintendent and engineer of the Dominion Bridge Company, employed in the preparation of these plans, and will he receive payment for his work ?

Hon RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. The commissioners have no warehouses for the storing of grain in the harbour of Montreal, excepting a grain elevator.

2. The plans for the elevator were prepared by the Steel Storage and Elevator Construction Company, of Buffalo, N.Y., the contractors for the building of the elevator, and the cost of the plans was included in the cost of the building.

3. The government has no elevator in Montreal, the commissioners' elevator has two grain chutes for loading vessels which form part of the contract work and were included in the plans therefor. Two other grain chutes were added, the plans for which were prepared by the commissioners' chief engineer.

4. Neither Mr. Metcalfe nor Mr Johnson was employed in the preparation of the plans for the grain chutes, and neither received remuneration therefor.

5. Answered by No. 4.

CANADIAN NAVAL MILITIA.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Barker—asked :

1. What is the total expenditure incurred to date by the government in connection with the organization of a Canadian Naval Militia ?

2. What is the total number of officers and men at present engaged on the government steamship 'Canada' ?

3. Where is the steamship 'Canada' at present, and how is she going to be employed during the next four months ?

1. Nothing.

2. Seventy.

3. Nassau, West Indies. At present she is on an instructional cruise. About the middle of April she will join the Fisheries patrol fleet on the Nova Scotia coast.

RAILWAY SURVEYS IN JOLIETTE.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Barker—asked :

1. Did the government, during the months of October and November, 1904, employ civil engineers to make a survey for a line of railway in the county of Joliette, Quebec ?

2. For what object was this work and survey undertaken by said engineers, and was this work and survey undertaken in connection with the proposed Transcontinental Railway ?

3. What was the total cost of this work and survey already accomplished by said engineers and their assistants ?

4. Have said engineers made their report concerning this work and survey ? If so, what was the date of said report ?

5. Who was the overseer charged with the direction of this work, and what salary did he receive ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). The government did not during the months of October and November employ civil engineers to make a survey for a line of railway in the county of Joliette, but I have reason to assume that the transcontinental railway commissioners made a survey through that county, not under the direction of the government.

JURISDICTION OVER ESTUARY FISHERIES.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Barker—asked :

1. What is the present state of the issue between the Dominion and provincial govern-

ments in regard to jurisdiction over the fishing rights in estuaries of rivers flowing into the sea ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The matter is still in issue between the provinces and the Dominion government.

FISHERIES PROTECTION STEAMERS.

Mr. LEWIS asked :

1. What are the names of the steamers employed by the government in connection with the fisheries protection service ?
2. What is the tonnage, horse-power, number of average crew, name of builder, and the age of each vessel ?
3. Where is each vessel stationed, and what, in general terms, are its duties ?
4. How many months during the year is each vessel in active service ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. 'La Canadienne,' 'Petrel,' 'Constance,' 'Curlew,' 'Falcon,' 'Brant,' 'Kestrel,' 'Vigilant,' 'Canada,' 'Swan,' 'Georgia,' 'King Fisher,' 'Osprey.'

4. How many months during the year is each vessel in active service ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. 'Minto,' 'Stanley,' 'Lady Laurier,' 'Lansdowne,' 'Aberdeen,' 'Druid,' 'Quadra,' 'Montcalm,' 'Champlain.'

2. 'Minto'—Tonnage, 1,090 gross, 372 net; nominal horse-power, 216 ; average number of crew, 7 officers, 37 men ; name of builder, Gourlay Bros., Dundee ; age of vessel, 5 years.

'Stanley'—Tonnage, 914 gross, 395 net ; nominal horse-power, 206 ; average number of crew, 6 officers, 34 men ; name of builder, The Fairfield Ship-building and Engineer Company, Govan ; age of vessel, 16 years.

'Lady Laurier'—Tonnage, 1,051 gross, 413 net ; nominal horse-power, 186 ; average number of crew, 8 officers, 31 men ; name of builder, Fleming and Ferguson, Paisley; age of vessel, 2 years.

'Lansdowne'—Tonnage, 680 gross, 463 net ; nominal horse-power, 80 ; average number of crew, 7 officers, 26 men ; name of builder, J. O'Brien, Maccan, N.S. ; age of vessel, 20 years.

'Aberdeen'—Tonnage, 674 gross, 266 net ; nominal horse-power, 200 ; average number of crew, 7 officers, 31 men ; name of builders, Fleming and Ferguson, Paisley, age of vessel, 10 years.

'Druid'—Tonnage, 503 gross, 149 net ; nominal horse-power, 59; average number of crew, 6 officers, 23 men ; name of builders, Fleming and Ferguson, Paisley ; age of vessel, 2 years.

'Montcalm'—Tonnage, 1,432 gross, 526 net ; indicated horse-power, 3,600 ; average number of crew, 6 officers, 36 men ; name of builders, Napier and Miller, Yoker ; age of vessel, 1 year.

'Champlain'—Tonnage, 522 gross, 225 net; indicated horse-power, 850; average number of crew, 5 officers, 28 men ; name of build-

Vessel.	Tonnage.		Horse-power.	Average No. of Crew.	Builder.	When Built.
	Gross.	Net.				
'La Canadienne'	372	227	60	20	I. Duncan & Co., Pt. Glasgow, G.B.	1880
'Petrel'	192	98	54	13	Polson's, Toronto	1892
'Constance'	185	126	54	15	"	1891
'Curlew'	158	96	54	11	"	1892
'Falcon'	52	33	2	3	Mr. Wallace, Lake Bennett, B.C	1898
'Brant'	142	58	33	8	J. White, O'Leary, P.E.I	1899
'Kestrel'	311	188	59	17	A. Wallace, B.C	1903
'Vigilant'	396	242	65	.....	Polson's, Toronto	1904
'Canada'	411	136	209	48	Vickers Sons & Maxim, England	1904
'Swan'	12	8	3	2	Built at Nanaimo, B.C	1894
'King Fisher'	107	107	.....	18	Jos. McGill, Shelburne, N.S.	1892
'Osprey'	125	125	.....	16	"	

3. The duty of these vessels is to protect the three mile limit, and they therefore follow United States fishing vessels around the coast, their stations being continually changing.

4. Approximately nine months ; but always depending on the movements of United States fishing vessels.

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE STEAMERS.

Mr. LEWIS asked :

1. What are the names of the steamers employed by the government in the ocean and river service ?
2. What is the tonnage, horse-power, number of average crew, name of builder, and the age of each vessel ?
3. Where is each vessel stationed, and what, in general terms, are its duties ?

ers, Fleming and Ferguson, Paisley ; age of vessel, 1 year.

3. 'Minto,' Georgetown—Pictou ; winter navigation with mainland.

'Stanley,' Georgetown—Pictou ; winter navigation with mainland.

'Lady Laurier,' Halifax ; lighthouse and buoy service, Nova Scotia agency.

'Lansdowne,' St. John ; lighthouse and buoy service, New Brunswick agency.

'Aberdeen,' Quebec ; lighthouse and buoy service, Quebec agency.

'Druid,' Quebec ; lighthouse and buoy service, Quebec agency.

'Quadra,' Victoria ; lighthouse and buoy service, British Columbia agency.

'Montcalm,' Quebec ; ice-breaker—lighthouse and buoy service, Quebec agency in summer.

'Champlain,' River Ouelle ; ferry service, River Ouelle and Murray Bay.

4. Practically the whole year, except when laid up for repairs.

REPAIRS TO GOVERNMENT SHIPS.

Mr. CROCKET asked :

What amount was expended upon each of the vessels under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries during the year ending June 30, 1904, for renewals and repairs ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

REPAIRS, 1903-1904.

Dominion steamers :—

'Aberdeen'	$ 8,829 74
'Lansdowne'	6,030 93
'Quadra'	3,160 78
'Stanley'	11,053 59
'Minto'	6,130 88
'Druid'	7,079 32
'Lady Laurier'	36,107 62
'Constance'	6,134 55
'La Canadienne'	4,594 22
'Osprey'	292 87
'Curlew'	520 14
'Kingfisher'	445 99
'Kestrel'	2,115 34
'Georgia'	156 39
'Swan'	1,418 40

FISHERIES PROTECTION SERVICE.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. In respect of each of the steamers employed by the government in connection with the Fisheries Protection Service, what is approximately the ordinary weekly or monthly pay-roll ; the total amount paid last year for (a) wages ; for (b) supplies ; and (c) for other purposes ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

Vessel.	Monthly Pay-roll (average).	Total Wages.	Deck and Engine Supplies and Repairs.	Provisions, Fuel, Clothing, &c.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
'La Canadienne'	616 10	8,383 22	2,037 44	7,598 42
'Osprey'	310 17	4,722 08	2,404 14	6,158 32
'Curlew'	472 20	5,666 50	1,815 27	3,734 86
'Petrel'	554 55	6,654 50	997 97	4,000 63
'King Fisher'	331 94	3,983 32	1,670 77	5,048 34
'Kestrel'	1,065 59	12,787 12	4,085 26	9,153 84
'Swan'	115 00	1,380 00	1,912 18	589 63
'Georgia'	173 50	2,080 00	422 35	1,236 90
'Constance'	575 26	6,902 96	7,093 05	9,749 78

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

In respect of each of the steamers employed by the government in connection with the ocean and river service, what is, in round numbers, the ordinary weekly or monthly pay-roll ; the total amount paid last year for (a) wages ; (b) for supplies ; (c) for other purposes ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Fiscal year 1903-1904, average monthly pay-roll, $7,019.21. (a.) $84,426.02. (b.) $134,497.07. (c.) $78,392.86.

MIMINIGASH BREAKWATER.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Is any work being done on Miminigash breakwater for repairs, &c., for 1904 ?
2. How is the work being done ?
3. If by tender, who were the tenderers, and what was the figure of each tender ?
4. To whom was the contract given ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Public Works) :

1. Yes.
2. Work done by day labour.

PREVENTION OF TUBERCULOSIS.

Mr. GEO. H. PERLEY (Argenteuil) moved :

That in the opinion of this House the time has arrived when parliament should take some active steps to lessen the widespread suffering and the great mortality among the people of Canada, caused by the various forms of tuberculosis ?

He said : Mr. Speaker, as a layman in both medicine and law, I feel very diffident about bringing this question before the House ; but the national importance of it and the great interest I take in it must be my excuse for so doing. The disease to which the resolution refers needs no definition from me Consumption of the lungs, which is the most common and destructive form of tuberculosis, has been known ever since the dawn of medical science. It was discussed and studied by medical men even in the days of ancient Greece and Rome. I hold in my hand official returns from the secretaries of the boards of health of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, according to which I find that in the year 1903, the last year of which we have official statistics, 60,540 people died in these two provinces. Of these, in the province of Quebec, 2,943 died from tuberculosis, while only 2,017 died from all other contagious diseases. In the same year, in the province of Ontario, 2,723 died from tuberculosis, and only 1,938 from all other contagious diseases.

Now, on the basis of these two provinces, the total deaths in the Dominion from tuberculosis in 1903 were about 8,000. That would be about 10 per cent of all deaths throughout the Dominion. And I find that practically all authorities agree that all the deaths caused by tuberculosis are not tabulated under that disease. In fact, some of the best writers claim that one-eighth of all deaths are caused by this disease, and others even say as many as one-fifth are caused by it. I have the official report for 1901 of the province of British Columbia, which states that in this form—that is in the form of consumption—tuberculosis causes about one-sixth of all the deaths occurring in the human race, and that omitting the deaths among children up to fifteen years and adults after sixty, it causes about a quarter of all deaths, so that its ravages are most deadly at a period when the life of the individual is most useful. Not only are a great number of deaths caused by this disease, but it is estimated that between 30,000 and 40,000 persons are affected by it in the Dominion of Canada ; which means that a great percentage of these people are unfit to follow their ordinary occupations, and the families of those that are poor must be, more or less, a charge upon the public purse.

For many centuries, consumption was supposed to be an hereditary and incurable disease, and in consequence its visitations were accepted by the people in a spirit of fatalism and hopelessness, and practically nothing was done to stop the terrible ravages it caused. During the last few years, however, this has all been changed, and we now know that this disease is not inherited. In fact, it has been shown that the children of consumptives, when removed from their parents at the time of birth and brought up in proper surroundings are very little more likely to take this disease than any other children are. We also know now that the cause, and the only cause, of this disease is a living germ known as the turbercle bacillus, which is taken into the human body chiefly by breathing air which is laden with the germs in a dry state. While this disease, therefore, is not directly contagious, it is communicable, and very readily so, when the patients suffering from it are careless or ignorant. But, though this disease can be easily communicated, its spread is very easily prevented, and patients can be kept from giving the disease to others by very simple means, chiefly by keeping the sputum of the patients wet and destroying it. In fact, it is now well known that the place where one is least likely to contract tuberculosis is in a well organized sanatorium, because if the rules are properly carried out there is absolutely no danger of contagion from the patients. I have known, and I have no doubt that every member of this House has known, cases of families where one member has had this disease, and, one after the other, the other members have contracted it from the patient entirely through ignorance of the proper rules to be observed in such cases. If our homes were guided by the same rules that prevail in sanatoria, there is no reason why this disease should not disappear from our midst. Now, to show that work through sanatoria and in other ways does effect a reduction in the mortality, I may say that, in the year 1891, in the city of London, England, 22 out of every 10,000 of the population died of tuberculosis. They have hospitals for this disease and fight it in other ways. In fact, His Majesty the King, who was given a million dollars to use for charitable purposes, decided that it was best to use it in erecting sanatoria for consumptives. The result of that work has been that, while the death rate in 1891 was 22 per 10,000 of the population, in 1896 it was reduced to 17·3 per 10,000. Not only that, but we find that in the different cities the percentage of deaths from tuberculosis is chiefly in proportion of the work done in attempting to prevent its spread. In 1894, the deaths from tuberculosis per 10,000 of the population were, in St. Petersburg, 44·3 ; Paris, 41·6 ; New York, 24·1 ; Berlin, 22·3 and London, 17·3.

This disease is not only preventable but the researches of medical men within the last few years have shown that it is curable—in fact that it readily yields to

treatment if taken in its early stages. Dr. Brehmer, of Germany, who has had a great deal to do with sanatoria, found, after investigating and reporting on 5,000 cases of tuberculosis, that 50 per cent of the incipient cases were cured, and, even of the moderately advanced cases, 21 per cent were cured. And these figures are borne out by reports of sanatoria in this country and Europe. I find that the reports run from 40 to 60 per cent of cures of cases taken in the early stages. Some people think that climate has a great deal to do with the cure of this disease. Fortunately it is now known that a cure can be effected in any climate, provided the patient is able to be out of doors. The treatment is very simple; it consists almost entirely of sun, fresh-air and good food. The wealthy are able to take care of themselves in this respect. When a member of such a family is taken with the dread disease, means are at hand to afford him proper treatment which will probably effect a cure, but the poorer people of this country are unable to provide for themselves. I am sure that every member of this House knows of cases among the poorer people, where members of a family have died one after another with practically nothing done to help them. I have mentioned these facts about the preventability and curability of tuberculosis simply to show that, if this parliament will take the matter in hand, a great deal of good, beyond all doubt, can be accomplished. As a matter of fact, very little is being done in our great country in this respect. The only sanatorium in this country owned by a province, I believe, is one in Kentville, N.S., with a capacity of eighteen patients. There are several private sanitoria, one in Nova Scotia with a capacity of eight patients, one in Quebec with a capacity of sixteen, and three in Ontario with a total capacity of 210 patients. And I believe that one has lately been started in the Northwest, although I do not know whether it has yet been opened.

It will thus be seen that in the sanatoria which are now open there is room for only 252 patients, while there are 40,000 afflicted with this disease in the Dominion of Canada. The municipalities throughout the Dominion, I am sorry to say, have not done a great deal in the direction of endeavouring to control this disease. Some cities have done something, but on the whole the disease has been allowed to flourish and spread in almost every part of the Dominion. There is no other place where a patient can go but to one of these sanatoria. As for the hospitals, nearly all of them strongly object to admitting consumptive patients. I may mention a very pitiable case that occurred a few years ago in Ottawa at the time of the great fire. The wife of a man who was burned badly was a consumptive, and he himself contracted the disease, as also did their two childern later, as they had no place to go to, but had to remain at home and infect each other. Private charity has not yet been able to cope with this difficulty to any extent.

For the last five years we have had in existence in this country a society called the Canadian Association for the Prevention of Consumption and other forms of tuberculosis, with its headquarters in the city of Ottawa. This association was formed for the purpose of educating the people by disseminating literature and information, and urging on the municipalities and governments the necessity of doing something to stop the ravages of this dread disease. The late Governor General, Lord Minto, was the first honorary president, and took a great deal of interest in furthering its objects. I am happy to say that the present Governor General, Lord Grey, has taken up his work and has become honorary president. I have been a member of the executive since its organization, and am well acquainted with its operations, and believe we have accomplished something. We have a secretary and lecturer, who travels through the country for the purpose of teaching the people the danger of the disease and the methods of preventing it, and we have sent out a great deal of information. Thanks to this government, a sum of $2,000 has been given the last few years annually for the purposes of this association, and I am glad to say on behalf of the association, that we are very grateful for that assistance. Now, the first thing we would like to get done is the establishment of sanatoria. Last spring, at our annual meeting, this question was brought up, and a deputation was appointed to interview the Dominion government and ask for assistance towards the establishment of sanatoria. We asked the federal government to assist the provincial governments in some way to build a sanatorium in each province as an object lesson, which others might follow. Every patient suffering from this disease is now a source of contagion to all about him, and every patient who is taken to a sanatorium becomes thus an agent for the dissemination of information throughout the country, and, through his experience, the people learn what they ought to do in order to cure themselves of the disease and prevent their friends and relatives from taking it. In this way a sanatorium would do a double good, because, in saving the patient himself, it would help to save others.

Now, Sir, it has been said that this subject ought to be dealt with entirely by the provinces. To that argument I may answer that the provinces are unable properly and efficiently to deal wih this evil, it is so widely disseminated throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion. It is to be remembered that there are 30,000 or 40,000 people suffering from it in the Dominion of Canada, although many of them are able to work and move about. In fact, an ordin-

ary observer would not know that many of them had the disease at all. These people move about and spread the disease. It would be impracticable for a provincial government to take up the matter, because it could not draw a line at its own boundaries, and people suffering from this disease in other provinces would drift into the province which was providing for such sufferers. One province could not make rules and regulations to prevent people crossing into it from other provinces It is necessary for the patient to live much out of doors; the weather is so much pleasanter in some sections than in others at this time of year, that the patients naturally move into that section where they can live outside most comfortably. It is manifestly impracticable for the provinces separately to deal with this question, and I believe that they cannot do so efficiently. Now, Sir, I consider that no greater obligation devolves upon this House than to provide some means of lessening this great evil. If we wait for the municipalities and private charities to come to the rescue of these unfortunate people, many of them will die in the meantime, and the disease will go on spreading. I do not say that the Dominion should take this matter up alone, but it should do so jointly with the provinces, and the municipalities must help as well The association asks this parliament to help build sanatoria, as I have already explained, but personally, I believe that the disease will never be properly dealt with until the Dominion government takes full charge of it, under the management of the Director of Public Health and an official staff here in Ottawa. Professor Knopf, who is a specialist in this disease, has said :

> To combat consumption as a disease of the masses successfully, requires the combined action of a wise government, well-trained physicians and an intelligent people.

If as many deaths—8,000 occurred from smallpox or scarlet fever, there would be such a tremendous outcry raised throughout the Dominion, that nothing would be left undone to stop its progress. Now, this disease causes more deaths than small-pox, diphtheria, scarlet fever, measles, typhoid and yellow fever combined; still tuberculosis is a preventable disease, and to a large extent it is a curable one. Now, Mr. Speaker, to come down to material arguments, I may mention that this disease, besides being so fatal to so many thousands, costs the people of this Dominion millions of dollars every year. We are now spending large sums of money on immigration.

In the estimates of this year, page 33, there is a vote of $767,200 for immigration; and whatever difference of opinion there may exist regarding the quality of the immigrants we are bringing to this country, I am sure we will all agree that they are not as good a class of people as our own Canadians living in the country, and if we can lessen the mortality among our own people, caused by this dread disease of tuberculosis, we will be doing our country a far greater benefit than by any expenditure on immigration. It is generally admitted that every productive life is worth a thousand dollars to the country. Well, if you accept that estimate and apply it to the eight thousand people who are dying here of tuberculosis per annum, it means a loss of eight million dollars a year to the Dominion. And when, in addition to this mortality, there are from 30,000 to 40,000 people suffering from tuberculosis who are in a great measure unable to work, that loss is considerably increased. Some authorities estimate the loss arising from this cause much higher than I do, but it seems to me that at least eight million dollars per year must be lost to the country through the inability of these people to work. That makes a total loss of $16,000,000 per annum, caused by the ravages of this fell disease. Would it not then be well for this parliament to give some substantial help to assist in lessening this disease. The saving of half these people would be an immense benefit to the Dominion from a humanitarian as well as from a financial point of view.

The argument has been made, I believe, that this parliament has no power to deal with this question, that the matter of public health is entirely within the jurisdiction of the provinces. True it is that at present the provinces have almost the entire charge of the public health, but I do not find anything in the British North America Act to give them the exclusive charge and prevent the federal authorities taking any action. The matter of public health is not mentioned in any of the exclusive clauses of the British North America Act at all. And in the year 1868, I find that in the first Act providing for the organization of the Department of Agriculture, 31 Vic. chap. 53, it is enacted that public health and quarantine shall be under the control of that department. I find also in chapter 63 of the same year that in clauses 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 of the Quarantine and Health Act, it is provided that the government may make regulations regarding health. Further my view of the case is confirmed by a memorandum which was written on June 21, 1897, by Mr. John Low who was at that time the technical referee of the Department of Agriculture and who had been for years its deputy head. Mr. Low said :—

> The administration of the subject of public health is joint between the Dominion and the provinces, in virtue of the Act of Confederation.
>
> Until the year 1872, the Quarantine Act contained provisions charging the Department of Agriculture with the administration of public health, and which administration for many years before it had exercised as a bureau, there having been under it a public health

medical board, of which the late Dr. Taché, Deputy Minister of Agriculture, was the secretary.

In 1872, the Minister of Agriculture (the late Hon. J. H. Pope) advised the elimination of the public health clauses from the Quarantine Act, for the reason that he found heavy accounts for public health service were presented to him for payment by the provinces while he had no control in the direction of the service.

But in 1878, notwithstanding this decision, on the return of Sir John A. Macdonald to power, Mr. Pope, who became again Minister of Agriculture, took over, at the very urgent request and representation of Dr. Taché, the subject of leprosy and dealt with it as a part of the administration of his department, and ever since the treatment of leprosy throughout the Dominion and the hospital at Tracadie have been under the control of this government. I find besides a grant made to the Winnipeg and St. Boniface hospitals in our estimates of this year. It seems to me, therefore, that this question of the public health is joint between the Dominion and the provinces and that this parliament has every power to deal with it, particularly in virtue of section 91 of the British North America Act which provides that the federal parliament shall make laws in relation to all maters not assigned exclusively to the legislatures of the provinces.

Allow me, Sir, to briefly summarize the facts which I have brought before this House regarding this disease known throughout the world as the White Plague. It is a disease which carries off at least eight thousand of our people annually. It is a disease which costs this country at least $16,000,000 per annum and inflicts untold misery and woe throughout the land on the families of those whom it carries off. Today, medical science has discovered that to a large extent, if taken in its early stages, it may be cured; and it seems to me that we should not fail to take advantage of this knowledge and the means which medical science has placed at our disposal. There is nothing in the British North America Act to prevent our acting in the matter. Further there is not one of the provinces which is in the slightest degree adverse to our taking action, and in any case it would be criminal on our part to allow this great loss of life and wealth to continue simply because there should happen to be some few purely technical objections to our dealing with the subject. I appeal to this House to pass this motion. I appeal in the name of humanity, in the name of all the unfortunates who are suffering and dying from this disease, and I ask this parliament to take steps to save our people and keep this fair Dominion in the vanguard of civilization.

Mr. T. G. JOHNSTON. I think it my duty, Mr. Speaker, to second this very important motion, but as it is of too great importance to be discussed within the short space of time at the disposal of the House this afternoon, I shall confine my remarks exclusively to expressing the great sympathy I have in the ideas which my hon. friend (Mr. Perley) has expressed and the views he has brought forward. In the hope he has expressed that some action will eventually be taken by this House and government tending towards the repression of this scourge I most cordially join. The loss of life and the loss of money to the state caused by tuberculosis is almost incalculable. The disease may be almost called a social one. There is perhaps not a municipal centre in the Dominion entirely free from it in some form or other, and it certainly is high time that governing bodies should take cognizance of the fact and adopt means for its removal or at least its mitigation. We know that the disease can be prevented if taken in time. We know that if the proper means be taken at the outset, the patient may be cured. But in order that an effective system be put in operation, you require the combined action of an intelligent public, the professional men, and the statesmen. For years our professional men have been attempting to educate the public and have succeeded to some extent. Within the last few years, thanks to the medical profession, there has been great improvement in the knowledge of the public in this matter, and many attempts have been made to grapple with the evil by private individuals impelled by philanthropic motives. With the governments, however, we have not had the same success. They as a rule have given the subject very little attention. In fact the only class of individuals who still remain uneducated is our statesmen, but I am not without hope that in course of time they too will become educated and give to this subject the attention it deserves. I sincerely hope that those in charge of this movement will continue to press their representations upon governing bodies such as this until the governing bodies are thoroughly impressed with the sense of their duty and act accordingly.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John City). Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) who has introduced the subject to us this afternoon is deserving of the thanks of this House and of the people of this country. This is a subject which I think must receive the sympathetic consideration of this government, because I cannot conceive of any government having the interests of the people at heart which by any possibility can throw to one side a matter so important to them as that which has been brought before us this afternoon. The mover of this motion has gone so thoroughly into the matter that it leaves really very little for any one else to bring forward. This subject of tuberculosis has, within the

last few years, been brought so frequently and thoroughly to the notice of the people that the movement is having its effect as is indicated by the attitude now taken by the public at large towards this disease. Having been connected with public health matters for a number of years, it has been a matter of great gratification to me to find within the last few years, people in whose home a death has taken place from consumption sending of their own accord to the board of health and asking them to either go and disinfect the house in which the case was or to give them such directions as would enable it to be thoroughly done. I think this is a matter of great moment as showing that the people are beginning to take an interest in the measures which are necessary to prevent the spread of this disease. The great question for us to consider at the present time is: Can the disease be radicated? For my part, I believe it can, if sufficiently radical means are taken to that end. It will not be the first time in the history of the world that widespread disease has been completely eradicated. Four or five hundred years may be a long time for an individual to look forward to or look backward on, but it is really a comparatively short time in the history of a nation. Some four or five hundred years ago it is calculated that there were no less than 19,000 leper houses in Europe. There were 95 in England alone besides those in Scotland and Ireland. What has become of leprosy in Europe to-day? Do you ever hear of a case? Do you ever see a case? We know very well that leprosy as a disease has entirely disappeared from Europe, including England, Ireland and Scotland. How has that been accomplished? I think there is no doubt in the world that it was accomplished by segregating those afflicted with the disease in houses which were plentifully supplied for that purpose. When we compare those ancient leper houses with the sanatoria to which my hon. friend has referred, we must remember that over the former there must always have been written, if not in actual letters, at least in the imagination, 'Abandon hope all ye who enter here,' while on the other hand if any inscription is written over the doors of these sanatoria it would be one which should give to those entering the greatest hope in the world that they would be cured, certainly relieved; at all events, that they would have some hope upon entering and know that they were not simply going there to die.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that there are two points which the government might fairly take into consideration. They may say: What would you advise the government to do? My advice to the government in a case of this kind would be for them to take to their councils those who are expert in this disease, who have made a study of it, who have ascertained what they believe to be the best mode of dealing with it. They should take these people into their councils and act on their advice. My own view of this matter is that there are just two special points for them to consider. The first is a wide dissemination of knowledge all over the Dominion so that the people would have impressed upon them the great necessity there is of observing the rules of sanitation which have been especially prepared in regard to this disease, of putting them in practice and more especially of obtaining an early diagnosis of cases. If Koch's discovery has done one thing more than another that we should be grateful for, it is that it has given bacteriologists an opportunity of diagnosing the disease of tuberculosis even before any symptoms are apparent either of wasting or weakness or indeed any of the symptoms that would be understood or available or could be got at by a physical examination of the chest. If by an early diagnosis of the cases of those people who have sickness accompanied by a cough the presence of the disease can be detected, those people are in the most favourable position imaginable to get a cure. Then, there is the other subject of providing sanatoria. These are the two points, it appears to me, that should be taken into consideration by the government. In regard to the widespread knowledge that is being obtained by the people generally in regard to this matter and especially in connection with the subject of providing sanatoria, I should like to read to the House a short telegram that I read on Saturday night in one of the daily papers:

Tuberculosis Farms.

Cigar Workers' Union has under consideration big scheme for combatting the white plague.

Chicago, Feb. 17.—Tuberculosis farms to be established in different sections of the United States by labour organizations for the treatment of union workers with consumption have been advocated by President George W. Perkins of the Cigarmakers' International Union. The Cigarmakers' Union for a month has had under consideration the establishment of such an institution for the benefit of that organization. By a narrow margin the members voted against a plan submitted. A new plan, now in preparation, probably will be adopted. The new scheme is broadened to include other fraternal unions. Perkins' suggestion is for at least four of the largest unions in the country to join hands. According to the plan, farms would be located in North Carolina, the Adirondack Mountains, in the middle west and on the Pacific coast.

I simply read that extract, Mr. Speaker, to show to what an extent knowledge of and interest in the subject of tuberculosis is spreading over the world at large. There is no doubt, of course, that this is due in in the first place to Koch's great discovery and the practical advantage which the medical profession have taken of that discovery. It is also due, in large degree indeed, to the

great activity with which the press of this country have been popularizing all the knowledge that is to be gained on this subject, and also, Mr. Speaker, to the enthusiasm which is being created by the knowledge of the curability and preventability of this disease, among philanthropic people of both sexes, which has induced them to band together and to give their time, their means, their attention and their labour to do all they can to assist in eradicating this disease.

It might be asked: What benefit have these sanatoria exercised upon the health of the people. I think that the gentleman of whom I have already spoken once or twice, Professor Koch might be considered an authority on that matter. The great decrease that has taken place in the mortality from consumption in this country has been referred to this afternoon by the hon. member (Mr. Perley) who introduced this resolution and to emphasize that I might say that in the old country the mortality from tuberculosis has diminished at least one half since the establishment of these sanatoria there—and it is well known that some of them have been established there for a number of years. This is what Koch testifies with regard to it:

> The only country that boasts a considerable number of special hospitals for tuberculosis patients is England, and there can be no doubt that the diminution of tuberculosis in England, which is much greater than in any other country is very largely attributed to this circumstance.

It is hardly necessary, Sir, in view of the statements that have already been made and in view of the knowledge which we all have to endeavour by any lengthened remarks to induce the government to take up this subject to make them feel that there is no doubt whatever of the benefit which these sanatoria possess, but I certainly take great pleasure in adding my voice to that of the hon. gentlemen who have already spoken, and I hope that the government of this country will take this matter not only into their sympathetic consideration, but within the scope of their most sympathetic action.

Mr. J. B. BLACK (Hants). I shall not inflict upon the House a lecture on tuberculosis, its causes or its treatment; neither shall I take more than a few moments of your time. I would like to say that I consider that the government and parliament even as a matter of national defence should take active steps for the prevention of tuberculosis. If it is considered good statesmanship—and I have no doubt it is—that large sums of money should be spent in bringing immigrants into this country and increasing our population, it must be better statesmanship to save the lives of our own citizens, for I maintain that one good Canadian whose life has been saved is better than a score of Doukhobors.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLACK. I say nothing against the Doukhobors; I say that one good Canadian, whose life has been saved, is better than a score of Doukhobors. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that as a matter of self defence we should take steps to prevent the spread of tuberculosis. We have a department of agriculture; we give special attention to the prevention of this disease among cattle and why should we not protect the lives of our people? We have every encouragement in making the attempt to defend ourselves against this disease because we have learned so much from the last few years that we can now prevent tuberculosis, we can save lives, and judging from the short past of what may be done in the future we have every encouragement to hope that if proper steps are taken we shall accomplish a very great deal for the benefit of the state, for the benefit of this Dominion, in adopting some organized plans for the prevention of the disease. We all know that it is preventable; we all know now that in its earlier stages, it is curable. We know that if knowledge were spread among the people many lives could be spared.

There are, I believe, somewhere about half a million people in this Dominion affected with tuberculosis. The percentage of deaths has been enormous, but with the knowledge we have gained in the last few years of its prevention and treatment the percentage of deaths is growing smaller every year, which is a great encouragement for us to go on to the prevention of this disease. We know now that nobody can have tuberculosis unless they catch it just as no one can have small-pox unless they catch it. The people do not know how to escape the contagion as they should and I think it is the duty of this country to have the people instructed. It seems to be the general idea that sanatoria are the only means for the proper cure of this disease and for its prevention, but how is the poor man going to get into the sanitorium? I am very glad to say that my own province has taken a wise step and that a wise and a generous government there has built a provincial sanatorium. It is a good one and well equipped and I would say all credit to the government of Nova Scotia for having established it. But, Mr. Speaker, there are thousands of people, thousands of the poor, the workingmen, suffering and dying from this disease who have neither the opportunity nor the means of getting into the sanatoria, and the saddest part of all in these deaths from tuberculosis is that it is not the old, whose lives have been worn out for their families and for the State, but it is the lives of the young whose continued existence would be a benefit to the State and to their families—these are the classes that are going most rapidly from this disease. I was saying that the idea seems to prevail

that sanatoria scattered through the Dominion would be the only possible method of preventing the spread of this disease. But, Mr. Speaker, I think it is the duty of the government of this country to have the people instructed. The causes and treatment of tuberculosis are so easily explained —for we depend little on drugs, medicines and prescriptions for its cure— that plain language and plain teaching such as the common people can understand is all that is necessary to instruct the people how to avoid the contagion of the disease. I believe the first public pamphlet for the instruction of the people was issued by my late reverred friend Dr. Farrell, of Halifax, who was the delegate of the government of Canada to the first tuberculosis conference at Berlin. That pamphlet of that able gentleman was written in such simple language that even the ignorant might understand it. That is the class of literature which I think should be published all over the Dominion. Further, I think instruction on the subject should be given in the public schools and lecturers should be sent throughout the country. The knowledge of the disease is so easy to teach and understand that the people, even the most ignorant, may be instructed so effectually that they will be able to take such steps as are necessary to prevent their children catching it. For, as I said before, the disease is not inherited, it is not transmitted, but it is caught. Of course, there are many of us with broad shoulders and deep chests who will never be injured by it, but the child born of tubercular parents, with sloping shoulders and narrow chest, while he may not have the disease, has the ground in which it is easily cultivated. Such are the people whom it is our duty to teach how to avoid contracting the disease. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come when we should have a bureau of public health, when steps should be taken, not only for the planting all over this Dominion of sanatoria, but of other modes of teaching the people how to escape this disease. The prospect of accomplishing good in this respect is excellent. We have done so much in a very short time since we became acquainted with the cause and cure of this disease, that I think the time is now ripe for taking steps to teach the people throughout the Dominion how it can be avoided and how it can be cured.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I would have said nothing on this question but that my silence might have been misconstrued as a want of interest for suffering humanity or in the subject under discussion. In my judgment, the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) is entitled to the thanks not only of this House, but of the people of this country for the sympathetic way in which he has taken up this question, the philanthropic spirit which he has displayed and the able manner in which he has presented it to the House. We have too few people in the country to take an interest in this movement and give it that substantial aid which it must have if it is to be a success; and those individuals, one here and one there, who do take hold of it, as the hon. member has done, are entitled to the thanks of the people of this country. We have had this question before the House during my time, in the last quarter of a century, some four or five times. It has been discussed at great length, and the members of this House have shown a commendable desire to take it up in a practical way, but we have invariably been confronted with the contention that it is not within our jurisdiction to deal with the subject of public health—that the only matters relating to public health which the British North America Act places under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada are defined in clause 11 to be : quarantine and the establishment and maintenance of marine hospitals, and, therefore, whatever we do in this respect must be be done along these lines. But it has always been a mystery to me why we should not take up this question jointly with the provinces and apply to the Imperial Parliament for an amendment to the British North America Act that would give the Dominion Parliament power to deal with it, if not exclusively, at least conjointly with the provinces. In that way some substantial good might be accomplished, a great deal more than is accomplished at the present time. We are also confronted with the next clause of the Act, which assigns to the provinces the establishment, maintenance and management of hospitals, asylums, charities and eleemosynary institutions in and for the provinces, other than marine hospitals. So that the provinces have assigned to them the subject of public health. But it has always been curious to me that this parliament seems to have a greater interest in the health of brute creation than that of the human being. In the exercise of our power over quarantine, we made a law a few years ago to prevent the importation of tuberculosis. Under that law we would not allow a farmer to bring into Canada an animal which the tubercular test indicated to be affected by tuberculosis—the animal must be slaughtered. In the human being the bacteriological test enables us to detect it in the early stages. Why do we not apply it to immigrants coming in who show signs of disease—and refuse them admission into our country ? But we allow all classes of immigrants to come in without being subjected to any tubercular test, and we know, from the statistics gathered in Toronto, Montreal, Calgary, Vancouver and elsewhere, that many of these immigrants have been in the incipient stages of tuberculosis, and have had to go to the hospital shortly after their arrival. We do not examine them as we do the animals. I never could understand why that is so, and why we do not to that extent exercise the power we have in regard to quarantine. The result is that we

are importing the disease as well as allowing it to develop in the country; we are not doing all that we could in the interest of humanity. One reason why even more interest should be taken in this question to-day than was done a few years ago is that whereas it was formerly believed that tuberculosis was practically incurable, to-day the bacteriologist can tell from an examination of the sputa whether the tubercular bacillus is present or not in the early stages of the disease, which puts it within our power to cure a large percentage of the cases which could not a few years ago be cured.

No attempt was formerly made to affect a cure because the disease was not detected until too late, but at present it can be detected so readily that thousands of cases are cured in the incipient stages.

We are asked can we not do something. I think we can do a great deal. The hon. gentleman who preceded me said that we required greater education in the matter. Well, we can have that educational work done and there is nothing to prevent this government from undertaking to have it done. We can give the financial assistance required. We have the money and we have the power to spend it for that purpose. We can vote subsidies for the purpose of keeping up these sanatoria which are established and helping to establish others. One of the drawbacks which philanthropists have to contend with, in their efforts to do something for humanity, is the lack of the necessary financial assistance. We are not doing what we can. There can be no doubt that there is a large field in which we can act. There can be no doubt that there is an increasing need from year to year of means for the cure of these unfortunates who become afflicted with this disease. That need is increasing rapidly in many portions of the country despite the fact that if these unfortunates were only surrounded by favourable conditions the greater proportion of them would be cured. To prevent the spread of the disease is a work the importance of which is second to none. One individual will infect a whole family. I have seen six seven and eight members of a family one after another, dying in succession from the same disease. Why did they die? Not because of some inherent constitutional defects, but because the infection was transmitted from one to another, because they were living under the same conditions, in the same houses, and had not been removed to healthy surroundings. They died simply because they did not get proper care and attention. Cases have come under my own observation in which three or four members of the one family have died, and the rest who were taken away entirely and put under favourable conditions were not attacked at all. That being the case, this disease being so well known for its contagious character, it is our bounden duty to make every effort to prevent its spreading. I think, therefore, this parliament should take the matter up. There are certain lines in which we have the power to act. Why do we not have the turbercular tests applied to every immigrant that shows signs of weakness, so as to ascertain whether he is afflicted with tuberculosis or not; and if he is, he should not be allowed to land. Those who are in the country and are affected we should have put in an isolated hospital from which the contagion cannot spread. Why have we not quarantine regulations which would prevent people infected with this disease crossing into this country from the United States? Many of them are brought home here to die and no restraint is put upon their coming. We should go further. We should hold a conference between the federal parliament and the provincial legislature and apply to the Imperial parliament for an amendment to the British North America Act which will give us the right jointly or separately to deal with this most important subject. What is wanted is favourable conditions for those afflicted—plenty fresh air and good healthy diet. How is it that Indians, when they come under the conditions of civilization, perish in such a large number from the ravages of consumption, and yet in their nomadic condition are almost entirely free from it. It is because that when living in their wigwams they have plenty of fresh air. While their food is of the worst description, still the healthy conditions under which they lived kept them in perfect health. But let them come under the conditions of advanced civilization, let them live in warm sealed up houses, small rooms and general unsanitary conditions, and they very soon succumb to the ravages of consumption. This should be a lesson to us. It certainly appeals to medical men but it may not appeal with the same force to other members of the community. As a medical man I desire to emphasize the opinion that we are not doing all we can, that we are not working along the lines on which we have authority to work and are consequently not doing our duty to suffering humanity.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. As a friend for many years of Professor Robertson, he requested me, when this question came up, to say a few words on it. While I am only a layman, and consequently not as well qualified to discuss it as are our medical friends and some others who are giving the question greater consideration and thought, yet its importance is such that I feel impelled to take some part in it. Those of us who have kept at all in touch with the current literature of the day on this subject, must be convinced that it is high time we should, as a united people, take some decided and decisive action in the way of attempting to check the spread of this disease. For many years there has been a considerable amount of educational work going on both in the provinces and the Dominion. A considerable amount of literature has been distri-

buted and with good effect, for in various parts of the province of Ontario we find our health boards, municipal councils and county councils, taking action in the matter, thus showing that this educational work is making an impression on their minds. Take the county council of the county of Oxford, a part of which county I have the honour to represent, I noticed a few days ago in one of the papers that the said council had granted $300 for the support of the sanatorium at Gravenhurst.

In consideration of this grant, the county of Oxford will have the privilege of sending a certain number of persons to the sanatorium for treatment. I noticed a few days ago that an association had been formed in the city of Brantford to deal with this matter. And I notice that the subject has been taken up in Peterborough, and that it is proposed to establish there a sanatorium. Other instances might be given to show that the educational work that has been going on for the last three or four years has made an impression upon the minds and consciences of the people of this province.

Our attention has been called to the scientific aspect of this question. This, perhaps, is not the place to enter into a discussion of the question from a technical or scientific standpoint. But when we can consider the widespread effect and fearful ravages of this disease among our people it becomes our duty as far as possible to stem its tide. This Dominion is not peculiar as a place where tuberculosis has a foothold. We find that in European countries it is even more virulent. Russia, Austria, Germany and other countries have a larger percentage of deaths from this disease than we have. The loss through this disease is less in England than with us, being about 1,500 per million of the population, while in some of the other countries I have named it goes as high as 3,000 per million of the population. In the United States we find that the deaths resulting from this disease are in the neighbourhood of 100,000 per annum. I find in a newspaper published on February 4th a summary of the report of the New York State Board of Health, showing the mortality from various causes in that state. From tuberculosis, in its various forms, the deaths last year were 14,000. I do not doubt that these statistics were carefully prepared, and that they are to be relied upon. The number of deaths from this disease in the Dominion of Canada has already been stated—some 8,000, it is estimated, is our annual death rate from this cause. The number of our people who are supposed to be afflicted with this disease has also been added here as 40,000. I suppose these data are correct. Looking into this subject we find that where the establishment of sanatoria has been carried on with earnestness the reduction of deaths from this disease has been from 35 to 50 per cent. Where patients have been taken into these sanatoria in the initial stages of the disease, the cures are as high as 75 per cent. And, even taking the patients promiscuously, of all ages and all classes, we find that from 30 to 40 per cent of cures have been effected. With these facts before us, I think it is incumbent upon us as a parliament, if it is within our province, to make our influence felt upon the subject. I do not know whether we can properly deal with this subject in a financial way. If we may, then we should show, in a practical way, our appreciation of the efforts that have been made to prevent the spread of this disease. If that is not within our province, perhaps we might assist by the dissemination of literature or otherwise, as the wisdom of this parliament may deem best. In any case, the question is one which may well engage the attention of the government and parliament of Canada. Whether the government deals with it or not, the discussion of this subject in this House from this high vantage ground overlooking, as it were, this whole Dominion from ocean to ocean, cannot fail to have a good effect upon the people at large. Through the medium of the press, which is so largely represented in this House, the discussion here will have wide educational results. I believe, further, that the consensus of opinion in this House is that something tangible ought to be done in this matter. This is not a political question. Both sides of the House can take equal part in the discussion without being considered partisan and without reflecting upon or criticising one side or the other. I trust the question will be approached by the government as a non-partisan question, and one to be dealt with simply in the interest of the people at large. If it is true that we can save the lives of at least 4,000 of our people annually—and we are led to believe that this is the case—what a triumph that will be. We know that economic authorities place the value of a human life to the state at from $1,000 to $1,500. It is easy to see the financial gain that will come to the Dominion if we can effect this saving of life. And so, even if we leave out of sight the higher considerations, the sympathetic and humanitarian considerations, and regard the subject from the lowest standpoint of mere economic gain, the country will be well repaid for taking action in this matter. But I appeal to this House from the standpoint of sympathy, from the humanitarian standpoint, to try, so far as lies within the province of this parliament, to alleviate present suffering and assist the authorities and the private individuals who are working to put down this disease. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this House for the kind hearing you have given me.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The subject matter of the motion of the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) is one of very great importance to the members of

this House and to the people of Canada as a whole. The question of our public health is one which should engage the interest and attention of every representative of the people. In the past, in this House, we have frequently indulged in what appeared to be somewhat useless discussions of questions of minor importance and, apparently, begrudged neither the time nor the space in 'Hansard' necessary to lay our views before the country. The government of the day has evinced a desire in the past to spare neither time, energy nor expense in the enactment of certain legislation of much less importance than the protection of the health of the population of Canada. As has been stated here to-day, tuberculosis was at one time regarded as essentially an hereditary and incurable disease. But modern investigation has proved that, though contagious, it is a preventable disease, and the work of stamping it out is receiving the active sympathy and support of the government and people of almost every civilized country in the world.

This being the case, and since we have learned the nature of the disease, and especially when we have knowledge in our possession as to the means of grappling with it properly, it is the duty of any country to adopt every means and to devise every plan possible in order to prevent its ravages among the inhabitants of our common country. We are spending, as has been mentioned by an hon. member to-day, in round numbers this last year or two, $700,000 or $800,000 yearly for the purpose of bringing immigrants to our shores. Many of them are from foreign countries where this disease abounds, and some of them were coming here who have actually died while on their journey. Many of them have succumbed during their first year of residence in our country. Owing to this large addition to our population annually it is apparent to any person—it is not necessary to be a professional man, for even a layman can understand that this danger will increase in the future with this largely increased addition to our population from year to year, particularly if we do not adopt proper measures to grapple with it and restrict it in its ravages. It has been mentioned here this afternoon that there are from 30,000 to 40,000 of our population annually who are infected with tuberculosis bacilli, who are practically invalided, and when so large a number as that are placed practically out of business and on the sick list, what will be the dire results if sufficient methods are not taken to protect our people from it, not only in this generation but in future generations?

The Department of Agriculture has been spending during the past year, as has been stated by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), from $25,000 to $30,000 per annum—for what purpose? For the purpose of restricting, and curtailing, and attempting to stamp out bovine tuberculosis, and I believe that about two or two and a half per cent of our cattle have been afflicted with that disease, and the result therefrom has been practically nil. When this has been the result of our government action in looking after our cattle, is it not of vastly more consequence that our people should be protected against the ravages of this dire plague? If nearly one-half of the annual increase to our population—practically this last year about one-third of our annual immigration to this country—is required to replace those who are placed upon the sick list, those who are invalided through the tuberculosis bacilli in our country, it is evident that we have been making a very large waste of public money, especially when we have the means at our disposal, when by wise and judicious expenditure of money amongst our own people, we can effect so vast a saving in human life and thereby prevent the introduction of this disease. We have our experimental farms—for what purpose? For the purpose of carrying on experimentations, to give our agriculturists the benefit of those experiments and teach them the most modern methods of farming. We have our farmers' institutes where our agriculturists commingle and interchange their views as to the best methods of farming. These institutes are addressed by lecturers sent out by the central government, who are experts in their particular line, and who teach our farmers and educate them as to the best means of looking after their stock, their lands, their crops, their grains, &c. Now when this is the case in regard to our stock and lands, is it not of much more consequence to look after our human beings? It is true that much has been done and much is being done by the medical men of our country in carrying on an educational campaign by means of their medical associations and public discussions, their medical journals for the dissemination of literature among the people, endeavouring by such means to secure the co-operation of the public, educating the public to co-operate with the profession for the adoption of the best methods to stamp out and eradicate this disease. Not only that, but we have our own provincial governments and boards of health who are also carrying on an educational campaign, and they cannot fail to prove very beneficial in the near future. The hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) has referred to-day to the central association in the city of Ottawa that has been presided over by the ex-Governor General, Lord Minto, and that the hon. member is a member of the executive committee himself. This central association has been very useful in publishing its proceedings through the press of the country. And I may say here that the press of our country is a powerful lever in disseminating useful information; at the same time I think with all due deference to the press, that they have not been doing their full duty, and if they had given in the past as much of their

space to urging the public and teaching them the best methods of protecting themselves against the ravages of this disease as they have to advertisements of quack nostrums that have been deleterious to the public health, they would have been discharging more fully their duty. However, let justice be done where justice is due. It is necessary to say that they have evinced a desire lately, by the publication of the reports of the central association, to make amends in this regard. We have our provincial associations that are acting in concert with the central association. These associations are carrying on a very good work and cannot fail to be productive of great benefit. We have our sanatoria some of them under the direction of private individuals, some under provincial jurisdiction. These are doing a valuable work. But still very much remains to be done that cannot be done successfully, except by the central government, and in order to grapple sucessfully with this great plague we must have the assistance of the central government in our efforts to eradicate it.

It has been argued that the question of public health is one that belongs solely to provincial jurisdiction, but I think that argument should not have much weight when we are dealing with a question of such national magnitude. We have had this question of provincial rights raised on many questions in the past, but on a question of such great national importance affecting the public health in every portion of the Dominon, there is no reason why there should not be concerted action, why there should not be united action between the Dominion, provincial and municipal authorities. We have had introduced in this session a Census Bill, some of whose provisions have not been drafted with that due regard, with that excessive regard for provincial rights that has characterized the arguments of those who appear to be so jealous of them. We have this government appointing officers to look after infectious diseases of our stock in one of the provinces, notably in Manitoba where there is a division of authority by means of which this Dominion is doing a share in looking after the health of the animals in that province. In many other matters there has been united action and mutual understanding by means of which duties are assigned some to the provincial and some to the Dominion jurisdiction. Now the time may not have arrived when we should have in this country a distinct and separate department of public health, or a minister in the cabinet holding a portfolio of public health. I know that in some of the older settled countries where the population is more dense, and where the urban population is much larger, extending into the millions, notably in France and some other European countries, they have a separate portfolio of the government called the portfolio of public health. Possibly in this new country the population is yet too sparse for that, yet I think the time has already arrived when we should have a central bureau of public health, working in connection with one of the existing departments; possibly the Agriculture Department, owing to the nature of its duties, would be better fitted to take up this work. If such a branch was established in connection with one of the existing departments under the charge of officers thoroughly competent and selected because of their ability and expert knowledge, not because of political service, we would have the nucleus of a very valuable source of information to the public that would prove of great benefit in stamping out contagious diseases. Another necessary adjunct to this department would be a public laboratory where experiments could be carried on, the results of which would be printed and published and circulated, not only amongst the profession, but also amongst the laity.

We should then, in my opinion, have a public laboratory where we could have experiments carried on and have the results printed and published not only for the benefit of the medical profession but also for that of the laymen. Not only that, but, in connection with this laboratory, we should manufacture our own serums, our tuberculine serum, our prophylactic serum and our anti-toxines. I think it is humilating that a proud young country like Canada should be dependent on the United States and on European countries for these serums that we should make in our own country. There is the ability if it were only given a chance. There are young men in our country who are only awaiting an opportunity of developing that latent talent which opportunity they have not at the present time. We have all the elements that go to make up a strong Canadian nationality. Our climate is conducive to the protection of vigorous and stalwart men. Why should our young men not have an opportunity of discovering some of those drugs that have worked such great cures in recent years ? Why should we not give them an opportunity of making for themselves reputations not only national but world wide in their character and of reflecting credit upon themselves as well as upon the country that has given them birth ? We should also have a system of sanitary police working in connection with the provincial boards of health. We have a large number of people coming from other countries and bringing into this country their rather crude habits. A system of sanitary police, established under the jurisdiction of this parliament and working in harmony with the boards of health would be of incalculable benefit not only in connection with those at present here but also those who are coming to our shores. We should insist upon a rigid inspection of our immigrants before their embarkation for this country. I understand that within the last

year or two there has been a rather cursory examination of our immigrants before they leave, but in connection with this particular disease I do not think there has been so rigid an inspection as there should have been. Not only the government but the profession at large have been a little too apathetic on the question of this disease. We should not allow people to go to the trouble and expense of coming to Canada when they are likely to be deported again because they cannot comply with the immigration laws which I hope will be more rigid in the future. If we had a rigid inspection before they left their own country it would save them the expense of coming to this country. Immigrants' effects brought into this country should be put through a course of disinfection. All medical men know that a great deal of disease is introduced by this means, and if we had a rigid disinfection of settlers' effects we would put out of play one of the means through which that disease is often times introduced. In fact, there is a wide field of usefulness for this government in connection with the stamping out of this disease, and I trust it will rise equal to the occasion and adopt some means that will establish for Canada the reputation in this matter of keeping abreast of the progressive spirit of the age.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris). Mr. Speaker, I shall not attempt to speak very long on this question, but I feel that it is my duty to express my opinion upon it. I regret very much to-day that all of the ministers of the Crown are not present. I also regret that every hon. member of the House is not here to listen to this very interesting discussion on one of the most important questions that is before the people of Canada to-day. Now, I take exception to one of the remarks made by my hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Black). Speaking of the importance not only of bringing people into the country but of saving the people who are already in the country he said that one good Canadian was worth twenty Doukhobors, and I think I must have misunderstood him when he said one hundred Englishmen. An hon. member beside me says that it must have been one hundred Indians. If that were so it would save me making a few more remarks, and it would save the feelings of some of my hon. friends behind me. I am only going to refer to two phases of this subject. Although this is a subject that may come more particularly within the province of the medical profession, I am glad that it has been introduced by my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley), a layman and I am glad that a layman on the other side of the House has seen fit to speak upon this question. The medical profession are entirely in accord in regard to the measures that should be taken in the treatment of consumption. I use the word consumption because that is the term which is more generally understood. I would like the galleries and the pressmen to note what has been said on this question to-day as evidencing the great interest we take in it, and also because of the need there is of having the facts widely disseminated throughout the country. One of the phases of this subject to which I wish to refer is the educational value of the movement which has been carried on. The tendency at one time when a sanatorium was about to be established in any part of this country or in any other country was for people resident in the neighbourhood to dread that it should be placed in their midst. Experience has shown that this dread has been entirely overcome and that the people are now glad to have such an institution right in their midst because it has been proven beyond a doubt that the educational value of the institution is such that people become early educated in reference to taking care of the sputa and other things in connection with this disease, and the result is that those within the radius of the institution are safer than those outside of it. We have had that experience in Manitoba. Being a member of the provincial board of health, we have, during the last two years, taken up the question of providing a sanatorium for the province. The people are taking an interest in it. One means we took of finding out as to whether the people were interested or not was to ask them to subscribe. I think that is one of the best ways of ascertaining whether a man is interested or not. If he is willing to go down in his pocket he is certainly interested. Before going to the provincial government to ask them to give us a grant we thought we would interview the people, and the way to reach the people is through their municipal councils. We sent out a circular to every municipality in Manitoba and eighty per cent of those municipalities, without any very strong influence being brought to bear upon them, have returned subscriptions of all the way from $25 to $100, and have said in addition to that, something that pleased us more than all, that this was only the beginning of what they were willing to give. They indicated in that way their belief that the idea of a sanatorium was right and they said that they were willing to give their money in support of it. I hope the hon. Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) who is a medical man is paying some attention to me at least, as down in the province of Nova Scotia they have established the only provincial sanatorium there is in the Dominion of Canada. I do not want to take up the time of the House any longer, but I hope that the government and the people will appreciate the very great importance of this question of establishing sanatoria in this Dominion.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). Mr. Speaker, I feel that the appeal of the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) is one that this House ought not

to refuse. He has put a case that appeals to the sympathies of everybody—sympathy for those in affliction, for those who are suffering, for those who cannot help themselves,—and it is an appeal which every hon. member of this House must naturally feel he would like to respond to. But, Canada, has adopted its constitution allotting certain work to the provinces and certain work to the Dominion parliament and government to perform. It happens that in connection with public health certain well defined work is allotted to the provinces and certain other well defined work is allotted to the Dominion powers. To the Dominion is given, by the British North America Act, the establishment and maintenance of quarantine and the establishment and maintenance of marine hospitals, while to the provincial authorities is given equally clearly and equally definitely the establishment, maintenance and management of hospitals, asylums, charities, eleemosynary institutions in and for the province, other than marine hospitals. At the time that these respective works were committed to the respective authorities there is no doubt that the general question was considered, and while it was thoroughly understood that certain parts of hygienic work should be done by the Dominion and certain others by the provinces, we can only believe that the question was examined in order to find which definite piece of work could be done more properly, more beneficially and more effectively by the authority into whose hands it was given. We can quite understand and appreciate that quarantine work comes more properly within the purview of the government of the whole country.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Does the hon. gentleman mean that as purely frontier work ?

Mr. FISHER. Quarantine work as understood in the British North America Act, I think, applies to frontier quarantine. It will be necessary for the central Dominion authority to deal with work of that kind. As marine, and trade and commerce are also given into the power of the central government, it was quite natural that marine hospitals should also be given into the control of the Dominion government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) does not suggest that by reason of the words which he has quoted from the British North America Act this parliament might not have power to deal with the question of sanatoria throughout the Dominion ?

Mr. FISHER. No, what I meant to imply is that there is certain work which is definitely and clearly allotted to the provinces, and I was going on to point out that I think where this is the case, it is undesirable and would not be politic for the Dominion parliament to undertake that work. I would not go so far as to say that perhaps we might not have power to do that work ; that is a legal point in connection with the interpretation of the British North America Act on which I would not undertake to give an opinion, but at the same time I say—and I think that in this I am in the judgment of a majority of the people—that where, under the British North America Act, any particular piece of administration is definitely and clearly assigned to one or other of the powers, that is to the Dominion or to the provinces, it is well that it should be left to the power to which it is thus assigned. I say that in general terms. Most of the gentlemen who have spoken have discussed this question in general terms. I have understood, however, from the hon. member who introduced the question and from various discussions that have been held, that at the present moment there is a decided desire on the part of many whose sympathies are aroused on the question of tuberculosis and who have been strongly appealed to to aid in the prevention of this disease, a desire that the Dominion government should vote a sum for some one or more sanatoria. I venture to say that I think that would be inadvisable, and I do not think that this House ought to adopt any motion or resolution which would pledge it to that, that is to say, would pledge it to something which is practically for the establishment and maintenance and management of a hospital or an asylum or a charity for the purpose of tuberculosis any more than for any other disease. If this resolution were to be supposed to indicate an instruction to the government to do that I would feel it to be my duty to vote against it and to ask the House to reject it. But I grant fully that there is a very large work which can be done from a hygienic point of view outside of and altogether apart from sanatoria or hospital treatment. This government had the honour a few years ago of asking parliament to grant a small sum in aid of the Canadian Association for the prevention of tuberculosis. That grant has been renewed, I think, now twice, and in the estimates which are before the House for the coming year, we again ask for that grant. Several gentlemen have spoken about the spread of information and the gathering of information ; that grant has been devoted largely to that purpose. Without in any way wishing to take any credit, I think I may say that although the government has done so much for the purpose of spreading information and of drawing the attention of the people of Canada to the facts in regard to this dread disease, to the possibilities of preventing its spread, with a desire to rivet the attention of the people of the country everywhere on it and on what can be done to prevent its spread, till it may be that it will be wise, when we find a way to utilize the money, to increase that grant. That, I think, would

be quite within the purview of this parliament and it would be quite right for the government to do it, but I would point out that up to the present time no scheme has been put forward by those who are interested and who form this association which they could lay before the government or before parliament to indicate in what way such work as that might be improved, extended or rendered more effective. Speaking personally, I would be very glad indeed if such information could be given. It is quite possible that the association for preventing the spread of tuberculosis may be able to provide that information. The government would have to examine and investigate any scheme that was put forward and would have to take the responsibility of saying whether they would aid it financially. It would be impossible, I think, for me or any other member of the government to decide or to say what we ought to do or what we could do until some detail of a scheme of the kind were laid before parliament and before the government, but we think that it would be in the interest of the people at large that those who are to-day giving their attention to this work should turn their attention most particularly to devising something which might be done under the authority and through the intervention of this parliament, which would not in any way invade or overlap the authority and the work which ought to be done by the provincial authorities. I think that we should find some scheme which we could carry out without doing that, and I believe that the attention and the thought of those who are in earnest in this work—as many of the leading men of the country are—should be directed in the direction I have indicated, and that the question of the establishment and maintenance of sanatoria should be left to the provincial authorities in whom apparently it is very clearly indicated by the British North America Act they ought to be vested. Now, it happens that the province of Nova Scotia has taken a step. If that province has done it, there is no reason that I can see why the other provinces should not do the same, and I think it is better that it should be left to them.

I will allude briefly to one or two of the reasons which have been given by hon. gentlemen why we should take this matter up. The leper lazaretto has been mentioned. It is true that has been administered by and on behalf of the Dominion government and parliament. That is being done under a definite and distinct arrangement entered into between the Dominion government and the government of the province of New Brunswick, which at the time was managing that institution. I have not under my hand at the moment the exact date of that arrangement, but I think it was in the year 1872.

Mr. SPROULE. Why could you not make such a distinct and definite agreement with each province in regard to every other disease?

Mr. FISHER. I do not say that we could not, but as a matter of policy I think it better to leave the provinces the establishment of sanitoria. The question of animal tuberculosis has been brought forward. I would point out to my hon. friends that there are no clear or definite instructions as to the health of animals. That is left entirely open. It may be attended to either by the provinces or by the Dominion. As a matter of fact, our experience is that part of it is attended to by the provinces and part by the Dominion. But there is no such clear, defined line with regard to that as there is with regard to the establishment of sanataria for human beings. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) spoke of testing for tuberculosis animals. It is true, we can very easily test animals, but we would find great difficulty in testing human beings. As a matter of fact, while the tubercular test is as applicable to human beings as it is to animals, I think I am correct in saying that no country has yet applied that test to human beings.

Mr. SPROULE. But you have the bacteriological test of the sputa.

Mr. FISHER. The tubercular test is the one the hon. gentleman was referring to, and is the only one applied to animals. I do not think it would be advisable to employ this test on human beings, either immigrants or others. While I understand from experts on this question that the test is used to a certain extent in hospitals, where the patients are willing, it has never been used except to that limited extent. I sympathize very much indeed with those who are interested in this question. I feel that it is one which we ought to do everything we possibly can to solve. I am glad to know that a great deal has been done already, through the efforts of private individuals, and that to-day, in consequence of the information that has been spread by various agencies throughout the country in regard to the ways in which the spread of tuberculosis may be prevented and the way in which those already afflicted may be treated, the disease is becoming less dangerous and will probably in the near future become very much less widespread. If we can devise any scheme by which the Dominion parliament can, in the proper exercise of the functions allotted to it, do something more than it has already done in this direction, I, personally shall be very glad, and when such a scheme is brought forward, I think it would be well for the House to take it up and deal with it on its merits. With these observations, I am very glad indeed to support the motion of the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) and to express my gratification that the question has been

brought before the House in the way which it has.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not rise, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of addressing myself at any length to the practical aspect of the question which has been brought to the attention of the House, and which has been placed so forcibly before the House and the country by gentlemen who have spoken on this subject. I think the House is indebted to the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) for bringing the matter to the attention of the country, and for the very able and forcible way in which he has presented the subject. The same is true of my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. T. G. Johnston), who seconded the motion. The members of the medical profession have demonstrated the very great importance of the matter. I am thoroughly satisfied that if this House were composed for the main part of members of the medical profession, such pressure would be at once brought to bear upon the government as would result in prompt and effective action. There is no doubt whatever that the question is a very serious one to the people of Canada. The hon. gentleman who introduced the subject tells us, and tells us upon good authority, that this disease results in the death of about 8,000 of our people every year—more than twice as many as the number of men we sent to South Africa three or four years ago, and about four times or, perhaps, five times as many as the entire permanent military force we maintain, including the Northwest Mounted Police. If there is any means by which parliament can minimize, or altogether stop, this scourge, it seems highly desirable that we should use it. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) stated that the gentlemen interested in this question have placed no practical scheme before the House and the country. It seems to me that, if parliament has the power to deal with this question—and I think I shall be able to demonstrate, in a very few words, that it has—it is not for the government to sit idle on the treasury benches and wait for individual enterprise to place before them some scheme for dealing with this question ; but there is a duty and a responsibility placed upon the government themselves to take up this matter and deal with it promptly and in an effective way. The Minister of Agriculture seems to think that the government is in some way absolved from the duty of taking action in the matter, that they may sit silent and inactive for twenty or thirty years, perhaps, waiting for individuals to do that which the government ought to do. I do not take that view of the matter, unless it can be demonstrated that this government and this parliament have no right, and therefore no duty, to interfere. The Minister of Agriculture spoke of a section of the British North America Act—section 92. Well, that does not interfere at all with action by this parliament. In the first place, let me point out the resolution moved by my hon. friend from Argenteuil does not name the establishment of sanatoria. It is very simple and very general and, at the same time, very comprehensive :

> That in the opinion of this House the time has arrived when parliament should take some active steps to lessen the widespread suffering and the great mortality among the people of Canada, caused by the various forms of tuberculosis.

Should the resolution be adopted by this House, it would be simply a request or, if you like, a direction to the government to seek out the remedy which best would abate this scourge, and which would be within the jurisdiction of this parliament. The clause of the British North America Act which the Minister of Agriculture called attention to was subsection 7 of section 92. This subsection gives, as one of the subjects confided to the exclusive jurisdiction of the legislatures of the provinces :

> The establishment, maintenance and management of hospitals, asylums, charities and eleemosynary institutions in and for the province, other than marine hospitals.

Now, even if the view which the Minister of Agriculture seems inclined to take were the correct view, we could act in this matter in any one of three ways. The Dominion authority could gather information and diffuse literature on this subject. It could create a criminal jurisprudence in connection with the subject, if it thought fit or necessary ; or, as has been well pointed out by more than one member of the House in this debate, it could give financial aid. The Minister of Agriculture does not seem to realize how much this parliament and this government have aided matters which are of purely provincial interest, if you look merely at the scope of the British North America Act. For example, the Minister of Agriculture says it is not desirable for parliament to interfere by granting financial aid in connection with work to be done by the provinces, that it would be better, as I understood him, to leave such matters entirely to the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures. Does not the Minister of Agriculture remember that, during the past eight years, as well as before that time, we have interfered by assisting local enterprises in the shape of provincial railways, which are as much subject to the jurisdiction of the provinces as the establishment of sanatoria for the purpose of abating the ravages of this consumption. Almost every session since 1896 we have had aid granted by the parliament of Canada to local railways, provincial railways, which have not been declared works for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And inland navigation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, and inland navigation also, as my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) points out. I give these merely as illustrations; but, by looking over the estimates for the previous years, many illustrations could be found quite as forcible as those to which I have called attention. Therefore, there seems no good reason why, if the ravages of this disease are as extensive and as much to be dreaded as the hon. gentlemen have stated who have addressed the House, there is no good reason why parliament should not interfere. We have had royal commissions on various questions in the past on matters of very much less importance to the country as a whole than that which has engaged the attention of the House this afternoon. If the government have any doubt as to the extent of the evil that has been spoken of, or any doubt as to the best means of dealing with the evil, a short but thorough and comprehensive inquiry might be made by some such means as I have pointed out. In that way action on the part of the government might be expedited.

I rose more for the purpose of expressing my view, given without very much consideration, because I did not intend to speak, that, under the British North America Act, there is scope for this government and parliament to deal with the question. The parliament of Canada has a right under section 91 of the British North America Act, to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada. And, while the construction which, at one time, was placed upon these words has been supposed to be narrowed by a decision given not long ago in the Privy Council, I think that if we look at the whole scope of the authorities, including that which I have just mentioned, we can come to the conclusion that the parliament of Canada need not hold its hand in this matter for want of jurisdiction over this question. In a very well known work on the constitution of Canada, the work of Mr. Lefroy on legislative power in Canada, a work well known to all lawyers, and one that has been spoken of by the Minister of Justice in this House as one of the very best works that have ever been written on this subject, at page 384, the language of Lord Herschell is quoted:

> A sanitary regulation might be passed by a local legislature, but that would not prevent a general sanitary regulation of a similar nature necessary for the safety of the whole Dominion being enacted by parliament.

Further on, quoting again the language of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and dealing with the very clause of the British North America Act to which I have referred, I find the following:

> Laws of this nature designed for the promotion of public order, safety or morals, and which subject those who contravene them to criminal procedure and punishment belong to the subject of public wrongs rather than to that of civil rights.

But there is even more direct authority in the very case to which I have just referred, the case of the Attorney General of Canada against the Attorney General of Ontario, in which the validiy of the Liquor License Act for the province of Ontario was questioned before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. During the argument in that case Lord Herschell used the following very significant language:

> Take sanitation for example, suppose that the Dominion parliament had, with a view to the health of the whole Dominion, passed certain regulations, and supposing in a particular province a particular disease was raging which rendered it necessary for the safety of all those within the province that much more stringent regulations as to the inhabitants of the houses should come into force. Should not that be considered a merely local matter? If it is so, it is intended to be dealt with, and you limit your regulations to the locality; and why is that inconsistent if the legislation is on the same lines as that which is in force in the Dominion at large?

You will perceive, Sir, that Lord Herschell concedes the right of the parliament of Canada to make general sanitary regulations applicable to the whole Dominion, and at the same time he holds that, consistently with that federal jurisdiction, it might be possible for a local legislature, acting within its jurisdiction, to deal with the question of sanitary regulation purely from a local and provincial standpoint and with regard to a particular emergency which may have arisen in any province. Further than that, the very case to which I have just referred—and it is a case wherein it was supposed that the jurisdiction of this parliament was limited under the words of clause 91 of the British North America Act—even in that case you will find direct authority for the proposition which I have endeavoured to present in a very few words. The headnote or synopsis of that case is as follows, as far as this particular question is concerned:—

> The general power of legislation conferred upon the Dominion parliament by section 91 of the British North America Act of 1867, in supplement of its therein enumerated powers, must be strictly confined to such matters as are of unquestionable national interest and importance, and must not trench on any of the subjects enumerated in section 92 as being within the scope of provincial legislation, unless they have attained such dimensions as to affect the body politic of the Dominion.

If the statements of fact made this afternoon, and supported by the best authority, are correct, then it is impossible to deny that this is a question of national interest and importance and one which has attained such dimensions as to affect the body politic of the whole Dominion. Therefore under these circumstances and in view of

these and other authorities which might be cited, I for one have no doubt that means might be found and a measure devised by which parliament could deal with this subject and deal with it effectively in the interests of the whole Dominion.

Mr. MILLER. I shall not, Mr. Speaker, take up the time of the House for more than a few minutes. Most of the remarks made this afternoon were on the line of the government doing something by way of encouraging the maintenance and establishment of sanatoria. While I have no desire to say a word in disparagement of such a course, while I think that much may be done by means of sanatoria in preventing contagion and adopting methods of cure that may be practised within the institution itself, I think a great deal more can be done by means of education. No matter what the government may do for the establishment of sanitoria, there will always be throughout this country many men and women who will not be able to take advantage of these institutions. There must be many men and women who will have to continue to be bread winners as long as they are able to work, and to whom it will be an impossibility to leave their homes and their work and become inmates of these institutions. I remember that in the town in which I live some citizens became possessed of a pamphlet on this dread disease of consumption, and so great was the interest it excited that the pamphlet was passed from one to another and I think a great deal of benefit resulted. Therefore it seems to me that the distribution if literature and the impressing upon the minds of the people the fact that consumption is not hereditary but exceedingly contagious, and that there are methods which may be used in the ordinary homes by the ordinary householders that will lead to its cure, especially if practised in the early stages, and that there are likewise methods which may be used by the ordinary householder to prevent the spread of the contagion, is of great importance and that the information thus given cannot fail to result in a great deal of good. With that end in view, I think the suggestion an exceedingly good one that a commission be appointed by this House to gather all possible information on the subject. The report of such a commission would prove a splendid literature for circulation and distribution among the people and would contain no doubt much information regarding the means which the government might take to combat this dreaded scourge.

Mr. PERLEY. If there is no one else to address the House on this subject, I would like to say a few words in winding up the debate. I have very little to add to what has been said by those hon. gentlemen who spoke this afternoon. I was very glad to hear my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture express himself in favour of having something done in this matter, but of course one might naturally expect this of the hon. gentleman who has been a member of the executive committee ever since its formation and has always taken great interest in the work. I am sure that not one of us wishes to have anything done which would be in contravention of the British North America Act, and I was pleased to see my hon. friend the leader of the opposition put the case as he did, as it certainly confirms my view. I do not agree with the Minister of Agriculture, that there is a well defined division in the British North America Act with regard to this matter. There are many matters concerning the public health which are not referred to in that Act at all, and concerning which both the Dominion and the provinces have the right to legislate. In the Department of Agriculture itself, I have noticed that on one of the doors, not far from the minister's office, there is the inscription 'Director of Public Health' which must mean something. That must have been put there for some purpose, and the office, I may say, is occupied by a gentleman well qualified to fill it. In the Quarantine and Health Act, chapter 63 of the statutes of 1868, to which I referred this afternoon, you will find in clause seven a distinct reference to public health, and that great powers in that respect were assumed by this parliament. It reads as follows :—

> Whenever Canada or any part thereof appears to be threatened with any epidemic, endemic contagious or infectious disease the Governor may by proclamation make such regulations as he thinks proper and necessary to prevent the introduction of such disease from beyond the limits, or to prevent its spread within the limits of Canada, and otherwise protect the public health, and he may, from time to time, revoke or amend the same, or make others in their stead in like manner, and may impose penalties. forfeitures and punishments for the breach thereof, and such regulations shall be published at least twice in the 'Canada Gazette,' and the production of copies of the 'Gazette' containing such proclamation, shall be evidence of the making, date and contents of such regulations.

This Act was in force from 1868 to 1872, when it was repealed at the instance of the Minister of Agriculture because he objected to paying the expense of carrying it out. But if that Act was legal in 1868, surely a similar Act will be legal now. If it were in contravention of the British North America Act in 1868, surely it would have been objected to, more especially as the British North America Act was fresh in the minds of the members of parliament of that day, among whom were the fathers of confederation. I therefore contend that while technically sanatoria are placed by the British North America Act in the hands of the provinces, the question of public health is not so placed.

Now I may say that this resolution of mine is general in its terms. I do not ask especially for sanatoria, but the association thought this was the best way to start the fight against this disease. At the same time they have no set plan, they ask for no special thing. We simply come before this parliament with this resolution, and if it is passed I will take it as a request to the government to appoint a commission, or to adopt some means to find out in what way this parliament may help to stop the spread of this disease and the great number of deaths caused by it, without in any way contravening the British North America Act.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There can be no objection whatever to the passage of the resolution. I think that the discussion itself will have a very beneficial effect in attracting public attention to a subject that so seriously affects every household in the Dominion of Canada. There has been much light thrown upon the dreadful white plague within the last few years. Since the discoveries or the researches of Prof. Koch and his school of German scholars, the public have come to learn the first elements in connection with the prevention of the disease. Until a recent date it was regarded as hereditary ; that theory appears to have given away to another one now, one that is better founded, and I think pretty well established in that by acting upon it there has been a great dimunition in the spread of this scourage. I had not the advantage, Mr. Speaker, of hearing the early part of the discussion, but I do not understand from the few explanations the Minister of Agriculture has given me of it, that he for a moment takes the ground that the Dominion government has not jurisdiction to some extent. It might be possible, by some species of technicality, to oust our jurisdiction in some ways, but still there are methods that every legislature and every community in Canada may take, each contributing within its sphere towards the abatement, and we will hope ultimately the extirpation of this great danger to human life. This subject, education, and the dissemination of information, is one clearly within the jurisdiction of every parliament. There can be nothing in any constitution that will prevent this parliament, or any parliament, or any legislative body, municipal or otherwise, from contributing towards enlightening the people how they may best prevent the extension and spread of the disease, and perhaps with more or less success confine the disease where it has acquired a foothold. I think I am safe in making the pledge on behalf of this government, that whatever we can do in aid of the very meritorious object of this resolution, will be done.

Motion agreed to.

HALIFAX FISHERY AWARD.

Mr. ANGUS A. McLEAN moved for :

Copies of all correspondence, telegrams, reports, writings, documents, memorials, Orders in Council, memorandum, or written or printed information of any kind not already down, which passed between the government of Canada, or of any minister or official thereof, in any wise relating to the claim of the province of Prince Edward Island to a share of the Halifax fishery award.

He said : In making this motion, I desire to make a short statement. I noticed that in the speech from the Throne delivered by the Lieutenant Governor of Prince Edward Island at the opening of the session in 1903, it was stated that negotiations were then in progress with a view to settling this vexed question of the distribution of the Halifax fishery award. It was stated by the leader of the government of the province of Prince Edward Island that a conference had taken place in Ottawa between the premiers of New Brunswick, Quebec and Prince Edward Island, at which the Minister of Justice of the Dominion of Canada was present, and that it was settled at that time that the question should be submitted to the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada. The question came before the legislature during the session of 1903, and the premier of the province stated that negotiations with reference to the submission of the matter to the Supreme Court of Canada had been for some reason abandoned, and that negotiations were going on with a view to having the matter submitted to the decision of the Privy Council in England. It seems that though this took place some eighteen months ago, nothing, so far as the people of the maritime provinces know, has taken place since. I think it would be very interesting to the people of the maritime provinces, and to the others interested in the distribution of this award, to know what the negotiations are and how they stand to-day, and when, if at all, the distribution of this large amount will take place.

Motion agreed to.

MUNICIPAL TELEPHONE SYSTEMS.

Mr. BOYCE moved for :

Copies of all correspondence and documents relating to an application to the Board of Railway Commissioners, and relating to an application lately before the said board, by the towns of Port Arthur and Fort William, to obtain access for their municipal telephone system into the offices of the stations of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the two towns. And for copies of all correspondence between the said towns of Port Arthur and Fort William, and the officers thereof, with the government, with reference to such application, or prior or subsequent thereto. Also copies of any report or recommendation, decision or order made by the Railway Commissioners with reference to

such application or applications, or incident thereto.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Before that motion is carried I wish to refer for a moment to an incident that occurred within the last few days on this very question. The Prime Minister then made the statement that he thought well of introducing a General Act dealing with the telephone question in this country, and his attention at that time was called to this very substantial grievance in connection with the use of telephones in the towns of Port Arthur and Fort William. It has been pointed out in this House time after time that the decision, so far as the country is concerned, is a very interesting one, and that while the former Minister of Railways put a clause in the Railway Act compelling railroad companies to give access in their stations to all telephone companies, that Act was interpreted by the then chairman of the Railway Commission to mean that the compensation to be paid railways and to railway companies was of a general character and that they were entitled to large damages if such a thing took place.

Now, my belief is that the claim cannot be justified, that this contract, as it exists between the Bell Telephone Company and the railway companies, is against the public interest, is against the provisions of the Railway Act and if investigated by the government or in the courts, or if it were referred to the Supreme Court, it would be declared to be unconstitutional and against the public interest. Time after time this question has come up. The then Minister of Railways and Canals, when he passed his Railway Act and when he put that provision into the Act which secured telephonic entrance into all stations for all companies, said that the object desired at that time would be secured. It was not secured, but the then Minister of Railways and Canals went upon the Railway Commission as chairman of that commission and he interpreted that Act, as far as I can read his judgment, as against the public interest, as in the interest of the Bell Telephone Company, and although that decision was given months and months ago, nothing has been done to ascertain the rights of the public in this matter. Day after day we are passing legislation in this House in the interest of the three great railway companies who are parties to that contract which is against the public interest. I say it is the duty of the government not only to remedy the grievance, not only to make it clear in the Railway Act that this relief should be afforded, but that we should say to these railway companies : Until you grant the public the remedy of the grievance complained of in this matter we refuse to give you any legislation that you desire. Last year the Grand Trunk Railway Company was given the greatest franchise that was ever given in this country. The Canadian Pacific Railway, every session of this parliament, is given franchises and concessions of various kinds, and the only thing to be done on the part of the government, if they are interested in the public welfare, is to say to these railway corporations : Not one thing more will you get from this House or from this government until you remedy that grievance. But, the companies get more legislation and the grievance complained of is not remedied. This matter will come up later on in this session and it may come up during this very week, but again I point out that the cure of this grievance complained of is in the hands of the government, that they can cure it by legislation and they are bound to do it, they can cure it by negotiation with the companies or they can cure it by passing an Act declaring that such contracts are against the public interest. Then, for a moment let us recall what this contract involves. The Canadian Pacific Railway which had immense subsidies in money and immense grants of land from the people and great franchises, and the Grant Trunk Railway Company, which had the same from the people of this country and which only within the last two years got the greatest franchise that was ever given by this country, make a contract with the Bell Telephone Company that no independent telephone company shall have access to any railway station unless it be the Bell Telephone Company. My hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) pointed out the other day how far this thing was carried. In this county there is no Bell Telephone service given to the people, but so strong is the Bell Telephone Company under this contract that they say that the independent company shall not have a connection with the railway station. In Port Arthur and Fort William they have a splendid municipal telephone service. That telephone service is refused access to the Canadian Pacific Railway station and the Canadian Northern station, and yet the people of Port Arthur and Fort William are the main customers in those towns of both those railways. They are the people who do business with the railways, the people who travel over the railways the people who furnish and receive freight from these railways, and yet by reason of this iniquitous agreement, this agreement which is contrary to public policy and which should be declared to be contrary to public policy if the government were alive to their responsibilities is allowed to continue. For two years now this thing has continued. For two years attempts have been made to direct the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) to this iniquitous agreement but so far he has had nothing to say on the question. So far he has not facilitated the consideration of the question by the Supreme Court as the law provides but he has allowed it to drag along and that is the position of the question to-day. Surely the government have enough courage, surely they have a sufficiently high conception of their duty

to the people to tell these railway companies that if they do not cancel that contract the government will find a way of passing a law to abolish it. But, so far they have done nothing in that direction. What is the strength of the Bell Telephone Company in this country that they are allowed to maintain a monopoly of that kind ? I do not know what is the cause of the influence that they seem to have, but every proposition that was made during the discussion of the Railway Act that seemed to tread on the corns of the Bell Telephone monopoly was objected to, no attention is paid to the demand for redress of the grievance which is now complained of, and the Bell Telephone monopoly is allowed to ride roughshod not only over the rights of the people but over the rights of municipalities and provinces. The responsibility must rest with the administration of the day to find a cure for the existing state of things. It is all very well to tell the people at Port Arthur, Fort William, Locust Hill and Labelle to go to the courts and maintain their rights but their is an easy way to correct this grievance and that way is for the government to exercise the power that undoubtedly rests in them of declaring the contract to be against public interest, to rescind the Act if necessary and compel the company to treat every one justly. As I pointed out in the House the other day in connection with this subject the Bell Telephone Company was incorporated in this country for the public interest, and any company incorporated for the public interest is bound to treat every section of the community fairly and equitably. They do not treat every one equitably. They only allow Bell Telephone customers to have access to the railway stations. In two ways this grievance can be remedied immediately. It can be remedied immediately by a change in the Railway Act and it can be remedied by a general law in so far as this parliament has control over corporations created by this parliament. Again I ask the government : Why is this remedy denied ? Why have they not courage to rectify this grievance? Is it that the men who are identified with the Bell Telephone Company are warm political friends of theirs ? The only explanation I can arrive at after all that has taken place is that in some way political friendship has more control here than has the public interest, and I ask hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House why it is that this grievance of two years standing is not rectified and why we have to make motions of this kind, why we have to go to the courts and make motions of another kind when the power to remedy this grievance is in the hands of the government.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Railway Act has referred to the Railway Commision the determination of a question of this kind. I do not think any lawyer will say that the commissioners have not power to deal with this question. This is a motion respecting the Bell Telephone Company in two towns and a question arising under somewhat exclusive powers given by the Canadian Pacific Railway, I believe, to the Bell Telephone Company at these points. The matter came before the Board of Railway Commissioners after having heard evidence they gave judgment declaring that the exclusive privilege should come to an end, and that the only question remaining to be determined was that of compensation. I am not aware that the parties to the litigation, if we may so describe the nature of the strife, have since brought the subject before the commissioners.

Mr. BOYCE. When was that judgment given ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I believe it was given about last July. I do not remember exactly, but I remember reading the opinion of each commissioner. The result of their finding was that they would not yield to the contention of the Bell Telephone Company that it could exclude other lines from access to the Canadian Pacific Railway and they declined to allow the Canadian Pacific Railway to shelter itself behind the special contract made with the Bell Telephone Company and exclude other companies from access to their station. The question, therefore, simply became one of compensation, as to whether the applying company should pay compensation, not only for installing their wires, but also the damage for a breach of contract. That is the great question involved. I do not understand that any of the commissioners have expressed any opinion on that point. They have simply affirmed that it is a question of compensation, and if the parties desire to have an opinion and would prosecute the inquiry, then they would get a judgment from the commissioners as to their view of the law, as to whether or not in their judgment the company, the Canadian Pacific or the Bell Telephone Company, was entitled to any consequential damages by reason of the setting aside of this contract. I think that before we commence to amend laws we should try to find out what they mean by the proper tribunal and there is a proper tribunal to-day to determine the question. Of course we cannot prevent people, making such suggestions as have fallen from the lips of the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) ; I can only say that I am quite satisfied that there is no foundation for his suspicions whatever. We have, we think, vested the subject in an independent and competent tribunal, composed of three gentlemen who I believe are in no way biased by considerations towards any of the parties interested but are influenced only by a high consideration of public duty and high regard for the law. If that question, therefore, were threshed out, and we had a decision either from that tribunal or from the Supreme Court,—for the parties

have a right to appeal to the Supreme Court, —then parliament would know whether or not the present legislation was adequate to meet the situation, and if it was not, parliament would then be in a position to consider what would be proper amendments to the law.

Mr. BOYCE. I can assure the hon. Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) that I am not indulging in satire when I say that the House must be indebted to him for his explanation of this all-important question, and I must express my regret that the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. H. R. Emmerson) was not so well informed, so anxious or so willing to give information, as the minister who has given the explanation to-night. I would draw the attention of the minister and of the House, with regard to the explanation of the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock), that on the 6th day of February of the present session, I formally asked certain questions which will be found at page 595 of 'Hansard' (Revised). The questions were as follows :

What is the present status of the application now before the Board of Railway Commissioners, of the town of Port Arthur and Fort William, to get access for their municipal telephone system into the Canadian Pacific Railway stations in the two towns ?

Did I get an answer, Sir, to that question ? Did the Minister of Railways who is supposed to have knowledge of these facts, to have the knowledge which the Postmaster General has given, vouchsafe any explanation in answer to this or any other question ? No, Sir. The minister said that he would ask that I make a motion for a return. For what purpose ? Was it to obtain delay ? The information given by the Postmaster General was clearly in the hands of the government and was important to the people directly concerned, to the towns of Port Arthur and Fort William, to the municipalities generally, to the country at large and to this House. It was information directly in the custody and control of the government and it has been disclosed here to-night.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The judgments were published in the press and my information as to the opinions of the commissioners was derived from perusing the judgments in the press.

Mr. BOYCE. If the matter can be referred to now, if the Postmaster General can refer to a judgment, can give dicta of the judges, and a synopsis of the judgment pronounced last summer, surely, when a question is regularly put upon the order paper it should be answered by the Minister of Railways and Canals, who is supposed to have knowledge or who could have acquired it from the records. The next question was :

Did the Board of Railway Commissioners decide that the Canadian Pacific Railway must allow the municipal telephone system in Port Arthur and Fort William to be connected with the railway stations on the payment of compensation ? If so, has the order been carried out ?

There was a judgment of the Railway Commission, if we are to judge by the remarks of the Postmaster General. Surely the Minister of Railways should have looked up that judgment. Surely it was in his power to send for the record and give an answer, yes or no, to that very simple question. I need not comment on the fact that he did not answer the latter part of it. He might have been able to say it was not within his knowledge. There are many matters that are not within the ministerial knowledge of that hon. gentleman, but the fact might have been within his knowledge as to whether or not that order had been carried out. The third question was :

Has the extent of the compensation to be paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway been determined ? If so, by whom, and what is the amount ? If not, who will determine it ?

If I understand the remarks of the Postmaster General upon that point, that question might have been answered by a direct negative, if the information now given by the Postmaster General was correct that the question of compensation had not been decided. Then question four was :

Is the government aware that the municipalities throughout Canada are anxiously awaiting the final settlement of this question, other applications being dependent upon the result ?

The hon. gentleman might have found it difficult to answer that question, and possibly there may be something in the fact that he withheld answers to all the questions because of the difficulties in the way of answering the fourth question, but the hon. gentleman said that he would ask me to move for a return. A return of what ? Might I ask the Minister of Railways, a return of what ? Why put this House to the trouble, why encumber the records of this House with a motion for an address to the Crown for a return of all these documents when the simple answers to the questions might have been given if there was nothing to conceal ? I think it is due to the House that the Minister of Railways should explain how it is that these questions, which are so simple, should not be answered.

Mr. EMMERSON. Will my hon. friend give the date on which he asked the question ?

Mr. BOYCE. On the 6th of February on page 595 of Hansard. I think it is due to this House that the hon Minister of Railways should now explain how it was that on that date he could not or would not give a definite answer to these questions, while he has given the information with which he has

favoured this House to-night, showing that it was within his power to obtain the answers and they were within his personal knowledge. But there is in question something to which my hon. friend from South York referred the other day, and which may have occasioned the hon. minister some little difficulty, that is, the question of the rights of municipalities in this important matter—a question on which the hon. gentleman perhaps thought there was a little danger of committing the government either to one policy or the other, and as to which he was treading on somewhat dangerous ground. The municipalities, as the hon. gentleman perhaps knows, and as perhaps he knew when these questions were before him, are and have been awaiting a decision of these important questions. The municipalities are anxious to know whether they can be held up in this way by the corporations or any number of corporations enjoying public franchises granted to them by this parliament. It is of the utmost importance that the municipalities should be informed with regard to what their rights are, and if the facts be, as shown by the hon. member for South York, that in this case as in other cases the franchise granted to the Bell Telephone Company has enabled it to exclude municipal franchises and to trample on the rights of other corporations and individuals, the sooner that state of affairs is put an end to the better it will be for the liberties of the people.

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that in answering the question put by my hon. friend on February 6 I did not cover all the points mentioned in that question. My hon. friend, if I am to judge by his tone and attitude in this House, would never confess that he lacked any information or that he was unable to answer any question that might be put to him. I invite the attention of the House to the question:

What is the present status of the application now before the Board of Railway Commissioners of the town of Port Arthur and Fort William, to get access for their municipal telephone system into the Canadian Pacific Railway stations in the two towns?

My hon. friend, I understand, is a lawyer, and I am sure that he will recognize that there is a question of law. He must bear in mind that it was the subject matter of litigation before the Railway Commission, that the commission had delivered a judgment in respect to it, and, therefore, the best information that could be given to this House and the country in regard to it would be a return of the judgment delivered by that tribunal. My hon. friend the Postmaster General has given his opinion with respect to this case, but my hon. friend did not for a moment contend that he was giving more than his own interpretation of the judgment delivered by that court. The next question was:

Did the Board of Railway Commissioners decide that the Canadian Pacific Railway must allow the municipal telephone system in Port Arthur and Fort William to be connected with the railway stations on the payment of compensation?

That is a question that can only be fully and amply answered by a recital of the judgment. I could have brought to this House the judgment, and I could have read it, but that would not have been a proper answer; that is not the ordinary way of answering these questions. My hon. friend might very well have read it himself. The whole question could be best answered by a return of the papers, which are in the possession of the Board of Railway Commissioners. They are not in the Department of Railways and have no connection with that department. A return will bring all these papers before this House, and my hon. friend and all others will then be in a position to form their own opinions on the subject; because it is a matter of legal interpretation just what the status was and what that tribunal decided. My opinion as to what it was might differ materially from that of my hon. friend or that of any other hon. member of this House. In fact, as I understand it, there is a difference of opinion among lawyers as to the status of the case; there is a difference of opinion even among the members of the Board of Railway Commissioners; so that it would not be for me to interpret the judgment. My hon. friend might assume to do all this, but certainly, with all modesty, I would refrain from attempting to give my judgment as to the conclusion at which that court has arrived.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the question asked by my hon. friend were a question of law, it would not be a proper question at all, as the Minister of Railways ought to know. Questions of law are not put across the floor of this House. The question asked was not a question of law in the ordinary sense. It was a question as to the effect of a judgment.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is a question of law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it? That is news. For example, when the Privy Council dismissed the appeal of the provinces of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, could we not ask across the floor of the House what that decision was? Would not the answer be that this parliament had the power to pass the legislation which it had passed? Would that be a question of law in the ordinary sense? I have heard the Minister of Justice in this House over and over again state the effect of a judgment.

Mr. EMMERSON. Will my hon. friend pardon me for a moment? The Privy Council decided a case with reference to the fisheries situation in this Dominion, and I believe it is a question of law to-day what that decision was. It is a disputed point and a

point that has to be referred, as I understand, to the courts to determine.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does that suggestion illumine the situation very much? If this were a question of law, how are you going to improve it by moving for a return? If the judgment were of a complicated character, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways need simply have given what he considered to be its effect and lay the copy of it on the table. If the judgment were not complicated and its effect could be stated in a few words, my hon. friend could very easily have stated it, as the Postmaster General did to-night, pointing out in that regard to the Minister of Railways what he might very well have done. How are you going to deal with this question :

What is the present status of the application now before the Board of Railway Commissioners——

Mr. EMMERSON. The judgment will show it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And my hon. friend ought to be able to state it in a few words.

Mr. EMMERSON. My interpretation might be different from that of my hon. friend.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman might have stated his opinion as to the effect of the judgment, and laid a copy of it on the table. How are you going to deal with this question : 'Has the question of compensation to be paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway been determined?' Did the government understand it had not? We would like to have the information in possession of the government. Then take this question : 'If so, by whom, and what is the amount?' Surely you do not want a return for that? Take the last question :

Is the government aware that the municipalities throughout Canada are anxiously awaiting the final settlement of this question, other applications being dependent upon the result?

How are you going to deal with that by means of a return?

Mr. EMMERSON. The municipalities in the east are not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, the hon. gentleman might give the information with regard to the east which he happens to possess. I would only suggest to him that on other occasions he has answered questions in a very courteous way, the answers to which, I think, took up more room in 'Hansard' than the answer to this would occupy. Look, for instance, at the reply in the 'Hansard' of the 8th February to the question of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). Look at the host of other questions which have been answered by the hon. gentleman and other members of the government. If the same attention had been paid to this question, it would not have been necessary to waste time in moving for returns.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend says that I have courteously answered other questions. I assure him that I intended no discourtesy in asking that a return be moved for in this case.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Certainly ; I did not intend to suggest that. I was only endeavouring to impress upon my hon. friend that if he had given the matter a little attention there would have been no great difficulty in putting such an answer on 'Hansard,' and placing such documents on the table as would have made a motion absolutely unnecessary.

Motion agreed to.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL—CLAIM OF JAMES CLARK.

Mr. WARD—by Mr. Sam. Hughes—moved:

For copies of all correspondence, documents and other papers relating to the claim of Mr. James Clark, of the township of Otonabee, for compensation for land drowned by the waters of the Otonabee river, caused by the government works on the Trent Valley canal.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). There appears to be no record of any correspondence whatever in the department in relation to a claim of James Clark of the township of Otonabee, for compensation for land drowned by the waters of the Otonabee in consequence of the works of the government on the Trent Valley canal.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There may be some mistake in the name. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the motion might be allowed to stand until the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Ward) is here.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

COST OF SURVEYS—NORTHWEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE moved :

For a return showing the number of miles of land in the Northwest Territories surveyed in block outlines, and the cost per mile ; the number of miles of township outlines, and the cost per mile ; the number of acres subdivided, and the cost per acre ; for the years 1880, 1881, 1882, 1883, 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903 ; the average for the first four years, and the average for the latter four years.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for the Minister of Agriculture). I would ask the mover of the motion to agree to amend it slightly by inserting after the word 'acre' in the fourth line as printed in the Orders of the Day, the following words : 'The proportion of open prairie to the whole of the land surveyed; the contract survey rate per mile of

section line in open prairie ; the rate of pay of surveyors employed by the day.'

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended, agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For copies of all correspondence addressed to the government, or any minister, in reference to the cables of the Empire.—Mr. Logan.

For copies of all correspondence between the government, or any minister, and any party or parties, concerning the dismissal of the postmaster at St. Claude, Manitoba, Mr. J. P. Benrier, on or about the 1st day of November, 1904.—Mr. Staples.

For a return showing the amount and nature of each and every claim that has been made by the firm of P. Lyall & Sons, for extras in connection with their contract for the erection of steel sheds in the port of Montreal ; and further indicating in each instance whether the claim has been admitted and approved by the Harbour Commissioners or their chief engineer ; whether it has been recommended for payment by the government superintendent engineer ; and in case of dispute between the engineers, what decision the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has given in each case ; and the amount paid or agreed to be paid to the contractor in connection with each claim.—Mr. Ames.

For a return setting forth seriatim all orders given for works or for supplies by the Department of Marine and Fisheries since July 1st, 1903, without having previously invited tenders by public advertisement, as provided for in article 5 of the Act 55-56 Victoria, chapter 17.—Mr. Lalor.

For a return showing the date of sailing of each vessel from Canada to South Africa, under the contract made in 1902 with the government of Canada, for the establishment of steamship service with South Africa. Also showing the respective nature, quantities and values of the various exports carried from Canada to South Africa by each vessel on each sailing.—Mr. Alex. Johnston.

For a return showing the number of railway and steamboat disasters in Canada in 1904. The number in which investigation for cause was made, such cause, and the cause given. The means, if any employed by the proper authorities to prevent the recurrence of such accidents, wherever due to any preventable cause. The methods adopted in England where railway accidents are so rare, and any other information which may lead to the safe-guarding of the lives and property of Canadians, obliged to make use of those public facilities.—Mr. Alex. Martin.

For a copy of all correspondence relating to the Order in Council of 25th of August, 1904, providing for the preparation of voters' lists in the unorganized territories of Ontario together with a copy of such Order in Council, and all correspondence relating to the voters' lists prepared under or pursuant to such Order in Council, and especially all correspondence between any of the ministers or their deputies or officers in any of the departments, and the following persons, namely : His Honour Edward O'Connor, junior judge of Algoma, W. A. Quibell. police magistrate, Sault Ste. Marie, W. H. Carney, sheriff of Algoma, J. J. Kehoe, clerk of the peace of Algoma, Jacob Stevenson, Sault St. Marie, and all other persons, relating to the preparation or revision of such voters' lists. Also for copies of all instructions sent, issued or delivered to any of the said persons, or to any other persons, relative to the preparation or revision of such voters' lists, or any of them.—Mr. Boyce.

For a return showing the number and the names of all the public buildings erected by the Federal government in the different provinces since confederation, and the cost of the same.—Mr. A. Lavergne.

For a return showing the quantities of anthracite coal used in the several departments of the government of Canada, in the provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, in the years 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903 and 1904. Also of the total expenditure per year for said coal for each of said provinces during said years ; and separately, the names of the parties to whom paid, and the price per ton paid to each.—Mr. A. A. McLean.

For copies of all correspondence had with the government in regard to the delay in printing the reports of the Supreme Court.—Mr. Monk.

For a return showing the sums of money spent by the Dominion government since 1896 upon each of the following : (a) Port Arthur Harbour ; (b) Fort William Harbour ; (c) Kaministiquia River ; classified into (1) dredging ; (2) breakwaters ; (3) other purposes. The quantities of each of the following to be excavated during 1905-6 in each of the three locations above named : mud and sand, clay, hard-pan, rock. The dates and terms of the contracts entered into with those engaged in dredging at the aforesaid points in 1903-4 and 1904-05. The said contracts. The horse-power, tonnage and dimensions of each of the dredges engaged in the said work. The cost of dredges newly built, similar to those engaged at the above three points.—Mr. Sam. Hughes.

For a return showing in tabular form the amounts first voted for public buildings in towns in Canada of not more than 5,000 inhabitants ; the year in which the first amount was in each case voted ; the total amount expended to complete each building ; the year in which it was completed ; the revenue derived from post office, customs and inland revenue, separately, for the year in which the first vote was taken ; and the rentals paid for the buildings in use for the above services during same year, and the population of each town for that year ; said return to cover the period from January, 1888, to February, 1905, inclusive.—Mr. Foster.

For copies of all correspondence, papers, letters, recommendations, reports, petitions, &c., in possession of the government or any member or official thereof, relating to the dismissal of Henry Curtis Lawson, as postmaster at Stanhope, Prince Edward Island, and the appointment of his successor.—Mr. A. Martin.

For a return showing the number of witnesses who appeared before the Agriculture Committee, whose expenses were paid by the government, for each year from 1896 to 1904, inclusive; the amount paid to each such witness ; the name of each, where each came from, when their attendance was required and at whose instance each such witness was brought.—Mr. A. Wilson.

For copies of all reports made by Mr. Burley, or any other officer, in regard to reservations

of water rights for stock purposes in the North-west Territories during the last five years.—W. J. Roche.

For a return showing the amount of money expended in equipping and provisioning the government steamship 'Canada'; the names of those who received orders in or due connection therewith; and the amount paid to each. Also the number of officers and men employed on the said steamship; together with a statement of the pay of said officers and men; and the terms of engagement of said officers and men.—Mr. Monk.

For a return showing the total amount expended in wages to men employed at the Sorel shipyard, from the 30th June, 1904, to the 1st February, 1905 indicating separately the amount so expended for each month. Also the total amount expended in purchases for the same shipyard during the same period.—Mr. Monk.

For copies of all correspondence between the Department of Marine and Fisheries and Mr. A. E. Dyment, M.P.; and also between the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the late commissioner of fisheries of Ontario, the Honourable Mr. Latchford, during the past four years, regarding the granting of pound net licenses east of Little Current, Manitoulin Island, to Mr. T. H. Jackman, of Killarney, Ontario.—Mr. Crocket.

For a return showing (a) when and to whom circulars or other communications were issued or sent by or through the agencies of the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Quebec, Charlottetown, St. John and Halifax, respectively, inviting private tenders for supplies, (in cases where public tenders were not called for by newspaper advertisement), and copies of all such circulars and communications; (b) from whom replies to such circulars were received, and copies of such replies; (c) who in consequence of such reply, received contracts or orders for supplies or commodities required during the year ending June 30th, 1904, by vessels under control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries; (d) copies of all correspondence in reference to these private tenders, or to the supplies or commodities so required or furnished, exchanged between the minister or his deputy and the above named agencies.—Mr. Ames.

CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES.

On the order:

Second reading of Bill (No. 44) to amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships.—Mr. Lancaster.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) this afternoon asked me to allow this order to stand until next day on account of the absence of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick).

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

EXCHEQUER COURT—RAILWAY DEBTS.

Bill (No. 59) to amend the Act respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to Railway Debts—Mr. Geoffrion—was read the second time, and House went into committee on the Bill.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think we ought to have some explanation as to why this is necessary and whether it would be advisable to make it of general application. What is the particular object?

Mr. V. GEOFFRION. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) wish to know why it is proposed to apply it only to the province of Quebec?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. GEOFFRION. It is because that provision was placed in the old Insolvent Act and Winding Up Act. I understand that the other provinces do not care about having this inserted, because they have a different system; but in the province of Quebec there is the difficulty that only judicial sales made by the sheriff clear immovable property from all incumbrances. For instance, in the old Insolvent Act such a provision was inserted. In chapter 16, section 76, 38 Vic., 1875, there is this provision:

All sales of real estate made by the assignee shall vest in the purchasers all the legal and equitable estates of the insolvent therein, and the conveyance may be in the form 'N'; but in the province of Quebec such sale shall, in all respects, have the same effect as to mortgages, hypothecs or privileges then existing thereon, as if the same had been made by a sheriff under a writ of execution issued in the ordinary course, but shall have no other greater or less effect than such sheriff's sale, and in the province of Quebec the title conveyed by such sale shall have no equal validity with a title created by a sheriff's sale.

Now we passed an Act in 1903 giving jurisdiction to the Exchequer Court, in case of the insolvency of a railway, to put it in the hands of a receiver, who may proceed to sell it. But when we came to apply that law in the province of Quebec to the Quebec Southern road, and the road was put up for sale, nobody would buy it, because a clear title could not be given. This was clearly an oversight in the law of 1903, and by this Bill I wish to give to a sale made by the Exchequer Court, the very same effect as a sale by a sheriff in the province of Quebec, and to apply the same principle as was applied in the old Insolvency Act and the Winding Up Act. I think the members of this House will see the necessity of amending the Act in the way I have pointed out; particularly is there a necessity for this amendment in the province of Quebec. But I have no objection to make it applicable to all the provinces, although another system seems to prevail in the other provinces. But I have no objection to amend it so that it will apply to all the provinces. In any case, I desire to provide that a sale made by the Exchequer Court shall convey the same guarantee and the same title as a sale made by a sheriff in the province of Quebec.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course it is highly desirable that any title obtained under a judicial sale such as this should be a good title, or at least that any one purchasing should know exactly what he is purchasing. I am not at all suggesting that some amendment to the law should not be made ; but if the Act is defective so far as the province of Quebec is concerned, I do not see how it can be absolutely effective so far as the other provinces are concerned. It is the practice in Nova Scotia, for the most part, to have judicial sales conducted by sheriffs under the direction of the court, and that practice, as I understand, prevails in the province of Quebec ; in the province of Ontario, I think it is different ; there judicial sales, at least sales under mortgage, and I suppose all judicial sales are conducted by the master in chancery.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. By any officer appointed for the purpose.

Mr. EMMERSON. In New Brunswick it is by a referee in equity.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, I think we should have the same general legislation making such sales legal in all the provinces, and we should have some provision, either in this Act or by means of power given to the judge of the Exchequer Court, to make rules, if that is not already in existence, so that we may have the same uniform practice throughout the whole country. I would think it undesirable for courts of this character, having jurisdiction in every province in Canada, to have one practice in one province and another practice in another province ; except of course in so far as such variation may be absolutely necessary in consequence of the different systems of jurisprudence which prevail in this country.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend (Mr. Geoffrion) has not pointed out, at least I did not hear him point out, that this law is applicable to a railway communicating between two provinces. Is it intended to be a law applicable exclusively to railways generally, or merely to railways of one province ? If it is applicable to railways connecting different provinces, it is impossible to accept the measure.

Mr. GEOFFRION. The law applies only to railways under the jurisdiction of the federal government. That is evident by the Act, Edward VII., chap. 21, which applies only to railways under the jurisdiction of the federal parliament.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In that event I suggest that we might possibly have this condition of things, that a railway going through the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario, or any other province, would be dealt with differently as to that part of its road in the province of Quebec is concerned, from the way in which you would deal with it in another part of the country. I say that is impossible.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, here you have its application to a railway wholly within the province of Quebec.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Then it would be entirely different.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I take it for granted. although I did not hear the hon. gentleman perfectly, that he had reference to a railway of that character.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend (Mr. Geoffrion) suggested that the legislation would be applicable to railways connecting different provinces of the country. However, I think my hon. friend had better allow the Bill to stand until such time as I have an opportunity to confer with him.

Mr. GEOFFRION. I have no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK moved that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

SUPPLY—DEFENCES OF CANADA.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Before you leave the chair, I desire to draw the attention of the House and especially of the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir F. W. Borden) to a statement in the 'Evening Journal' of today. It gives in large headlines : 'Canada will take over the defences of the Dominion' and goes on to say that by agreement between the Canadian government, through the Minister of Militia, and the imperial authorities, Canada is to assume full control and pay the expense of garrisoning the cities and defences of Halifax and Esquimalt. I will read the article :

The Canadian government will take over from the Imperial authorities on July 1 next the Halifax and Esquimalt defences.

Canada will foot the entire bill for the garrisons on the Pacific and on the Atlantic coasts. All that the Dominion does at present is to pay part of the cost of the defences at Esquimalt.

It is understood that the British government suggested that Canada should pay £250,000, or a million and a quarter dollars of the cost of maintaining those defences and leave the control in the hands of the British government.

Canada would not consent to do this. She adhered to her outstanding offer to assume control and foot the whole bill.

It was not a question of cost with the Dominion, because the entire outlay will be over two million dollars. What Canada objected to was making any permanent expenditure which would not be under the control of the Dominion parliament.

The British authorities have agreed to Canada's offer, which means a saving to begin with

of over two million dollars to the British taxpayer.

While the control of the Halifax and Esquimalt garrisons will pass into the hands of Canada on July 1, the Dominion will only take over the different services gradually. There is certain work with which Canadians are not yet familiar, and British officers and men will continue in such positions until Canadians qualify. Canada could supply the necessary infantry in short order, but it would take some time to get an engineering staff, &c.

Canada regards with great favour the compliment which Britain has paid her in handing over these important defences to her care. The trust will be well looked after. Great credit is due Lord Grey for the interest he has taken in carrying these negotiations to a speedy and satisfactory conclusion.

It will be remembered that during the colonial conference Sir Frederick Borden made an offer to take over Halifax and Esquimalt defences. Canada is prepared to pay every dollar that is required for Canadian defences on Canadian soil.

I do not know whether this article is inspired or not, especially the last clause of it, where it speaks of Canadian defences on Canadian soil. As far as I am personally concerned, I hope the statement is not true. I would be very sorry that Great Britain should so far forget her duties to the empire as to surrender Halifax and Esquimalt; and, secondly, I hope that if Canada is to contribute to Imperial defence —and I trust at no far distant day she will —in place of garrisoning Halifax and Esquimalt, she may be found garrisoning Portsmouth, Gibraltar, Malta and other places, and we will contribute our fair share towards the defence of the empire. I notified the hon. minister that I would bring this up, and I would be pleased to receive his statement.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). Mr. Speaker, I may say at once to my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes), and to the House, that the article which he has read was not inspired by the government, nor by any member of it, so far as I know; in fact, it was an entirely unauthorized publication. However, it may be a convenient opportunity at this moment to state what has happened. I had intended to make a statement when the negotiations, which are now pending, were completed, and to lay the papers on the table of the House then; but, as the matter has been mentioned, I desire to say that it is true that Canada, a short time ago, renewed the offer which was made to the Imperial government as long ago as 1902, at the time of the colonial conference, to relieve the mother country from all expenditure in maintaining the garrisons of Halifax and Esquimalt, and that the offer has been gladly accepted by the Imperial authorities. Correspondence is now going on and negotiations pending by which the transfer can be carried out. The principles upon which this transfer is to be made are these: First, that the Dominion government shall control these garrisons, and secondly that the Dominion government shall bear all the expenditure connected with maintaining them. In 1902, as I have said, in the papers which were exchanged between the government and the Colonial Office, and which form part of the papers which have been laid on the table of the House, giving the details of what took place at the colonial conference, it was stated in general terms—and there can be no doubt as to the meaning—that while Canada was not able to accept the suggestions of the Imperial government—the War Office and the Admiralty particularly—as to the method by which Canada would aid in the defence of the empire, the government and people of Canada would be desirous of relieving the Britsh tax-payer, so far as that could possibly be done, and it seemed to the government, as I am sure it will appear to the people of this country, that obviously the first way in which that could be done would be by relieving the mother country from expenditure on Canadian territory. I will only make a single allusion to what my hon. friend said, and I am sorry that he differs from my views in this matter. I believe he will find that he is differing from the views of a large majority of the people of this country. My hon. friend, while he is not willing to take over the responsibility for the expenditure in connection with the garrisons at Halifax and Esquimalt, wishes to send troops to Malta and other places outside of the country. Let me say to my hon. friend that charity begins at home. Let us discharge our responsibilities within our own borders first. I hope, during the present session, at any rate, to be able to lay all the papers connected with this matter upon the table of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the hon. gentleman (Sir Frederick Borden) sits down, I woud like to ask him one question. It will be more convenient, of course, to discuss the question fully when the papers are brought down. Will these two ports, Esquimalt and Halifax, be maintained in the same state of efficiency as they have in the past as far as the fortifications are concerned?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Probably so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It has been suggested, as far as Halifax is concerned, that the main reason for maintaining the fortifications which exist there at the present time is the fact that Halifax is a naval base for the North Atlantic squadron. If it is not to be a naval base in the future, will that modify the attitude of the government in regard to these fortifications, or is there any probability that, although it is not intended in the immediate future that it shall be retained as a naval base, the policy which apparently has been entered upon by

the Imperial government in that regard may in the future be modified? I have heard suggestions along both of these lines from gentlemen who ought to be pretty well informed on the subject, and possibly the hon. minister, without discussing the matter very fully, can give the House some statement as to what the future is to be in that regard in connection with these two points.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I regret that I am not sufficiently well informed to answer that question, but I may say to my hon. friend that, so far as the negotiations have gone, there is no indication of any intention on the part of the British government to abandon Halifax as a naval base.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But have they not dismantled the dockyard?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Well, they have removed some men from there but I do not think they have dismantled it in that sense. I think it is to be continued as a naval base.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I had a different impression. However, the hon. gentleman (Sir Frederick Borden) may be right.

MANITOBA ELECTION RETURNS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before you leave the chair, I would like to ask the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) who is leading the House in the absence of the hon. the Prime Minister, to give, not to-night but at some future date, information to the House with regard to a certain matter affecting recent elections in some constitueices of Canada. If the hon. gentleman will refer to section 21 of the Dominion Elections Act, 1900, he will observe that it is therein provided that:

> Immediately after the issue of the writ of election the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall transmit to the returning officer a sufficient number of copies of voters' lists, if there are any, one copy of this Act and of such instructions approved by the Governor in Council as are required to carry out the election according to the provisions of this Act——

That is the important part of it, a sufficient number of copies of the voters' lists.

By another provision of the same Act which is to be found in section 92 subsection 3 and which deals with the duties of the returning officer after the election it is provided that:

> The returning officer shall also transmit to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery the writ, with his return, the stamp furnished him for stamping the ballot papers and all the ballot papers, including those unused, the original statements of the several deputy returning officers, hereinbefore referred to, together with the lists of voters and poll-books, used in the several polling divisions.

The Postmaster General will observe that, in short, there is a direction to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to forward to the returning officer a sufficient number of copies of the voters' lists and a further direction to him, after the election has been completed, to return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery the voters' lists that have just been used in the several polling divisions. It has been a matter of public notoriety and the circumstances has, as I understand, been disclosed in judicial proceedings in Manitoba, that the voters' lists which should have been returned to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery by the several returning officers have not been so returned, or at least they are not forthcoming, although they have been required under subpœna and by the ordinary process of law in proceedings in Manitoba. I would like information from the government as to whether or not all the voters' lists so used in the several polling districts in the electoral divisions of Brandon, Lisgar, Marquette, Macdonald, Provencher, Portage la Prairie, Selkirk and Souris, have been returned to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. I would like also any information which may be in the possession of the government as to the reasons for any difficulty which has occurred in procuring for production in evidence these documents which should have been returned by the returning officers to whom I have alluded. I thought this matter of sufficient importance to justify me in bringing this subject to the attention of the government in this way because these officials, as is well understood, are officers of this House. They are bound to obey the provisions of the statute to which I have referred and if through any malfeasance, or indeed through any unintentional dereliction of duty, through carelessness merely, they have not returned these lists as they were bound to do under the law, it may be necessary that some notice of that circumstance by appropriate means should be taken by this House at a later day.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I shall call the attention of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to the remarks of my hon. friend, and I have no doubt that he will give the information that is desired.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Sault Ste. Marie canal—construction, $100,000.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). On Friday evening I explained the reasons why this vote was asked and gave all of the facts connected with the several contracts entered into in regard to the completion of the work. I need not further explain, I suppose.

Mr. BOYCE. Where do the Hickler Brothers reside?

Mr. EMMERSON. I could not say.

Mr. BOYCE. Will the appropriation complete the work of deepening and widening?

Mr. EMMERSON. I stated that $150,000 more would be required.

Mr. BOYCE. And is all this work intended to be done at the lower end of the canal?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, some of it is at the upper end.

Mr. BOYCE. Is the upper end not completed?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, there is still some work in connection with the upper end. I am not personally very familiar with the work there but if I mistake not there is an extension at the upper end to protect vessels in approaching the canal on account of the cross current, and furthermore I think there is some difficulty in connection with the foundations of the piers at the upper entrance. Of course it is schedule work; the contractors are not bound to secure a foundation they are paid by the cubic yard. If they have to go away down, that will of course mean so much more return for them. There was some difficulty in connection with the foundation, and the department has found it necessary to use stone for filling, which is much cheaper than concrete, and a contract will be entered into for that. There is also some back filling to be done. For this loose stones will be used, in consequence of which the cost will be very much reduced.

Mr. BOYCE. Is there any more dredging to be done?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is all completed.

Mr. BOYCE. Is it possible to obtain the names of these contractors who figure so conspicuously in these contracts? I find that in 1900 there was a contract for 10,958 cubic yards at $3 per yard given to Bowman & Porter; another in 1901 to Bowman & Porter; and another again in 1902 to Bowman & Porter; in 1903 and in 1904, Hickler Bros. were the contractors. Would the hon. gentleman state further if there is any special clause in these government contracts in regard to the employment of alien labour?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BOYCE. May I ask the nature of that clause?

Mr. EMMERSON. That Canadian labour is to be employed. There is also the fair-wage clause with respect to the amount to be paid.

Mr. BOYCE. Does the hon. gentleman know what the fair-wage clause is?

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot speak from memory. That is always provided. It is the rate prevailing in the district where the work is being carried on. The schedule of wages is furnished by the Department of Labour before a contract is entered into, and is incorporated in the contract.

Mr. BOYCE. Then, do I understand the hon. gentleman correctly, that there is first a clause making it obligatory on the contractor to employ only Canadian labour, and secondly an obligation upon him to pay such wages as are provided for in the schedule which may from time to time be handed by the Department of Labour to the hon. gentleman's department? Is there a schedule fixed to each contract?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, there is a schedule fixed to each contract.

Mr. BOYCE. I am not desirous in any way of placing myself on record as obstructing appropriations of any moneys necessary for the completion and proper equipment of the Sault Ste. Marie canal and its approaches. From time to time during the last five years at least these appropriations have been before the House. In 1900, $40,000 was appropriated, and in 1901 $100,000 was appropriated, to deepen and widen the entrance. In 1901 it was stated that the total cost of deepening and widening would be $450,000. This statement was repeated in 1902. Again, in connection with the supplementary estimates for the same year, the estimate for the completion was $420,000. In 1902 $50,000 was appropriated, besides $20,000 in the supplementary estimates. In 1903, $94,000 was appropriated, in 1904, $170,000, and we are now asked to appropriate $100,000. These make a grand total of $599,000, and the hon. minister says that will not complete the work. Will the hon. gentleman explain what circumstances or difficulties have arisen to have so far increased the cost?

Mr. EMMERSON. In the first place, there has been from time to time quite a variation with respect to the cost of the work. It has all been done by tender. The cost of dredging has varied from 80 cents to $3 per cubic yard.

Mr. BOYCE. What is $3 paid for?

Mr. EMMERSON. For rock dredging at the upper entrance.

Mr. BOYCE. Is $3 per yard paid for removing boulders?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, the contractors are obliged to take everything, whether solid rock, hard-pan, or whatever it may be. This same firm, Hickler Bros., had a contract for deepening the upper entrance or a portion of the upper entrance at the end of the Vidal Shoal, and their price was 80 cents. We let another contract last fall for deepening another portion of the upper entrance, from the eastern end of the entrance to the eastern end of what is known as Vidal Shoal. The lowest tender for that was $1.74 per cubic yard. This was let to C. S.

Boone, of Toronto. We have some work at the south entrance pier, which is under contract to Mr. Birmingham, of Ottawa. We have expended on that up to the 30th of November, 1904, $37,500.

Mr. BOYCE. Whenever these items are submitted to the House, the question is raised as to the utility of this canal, and that question seems to resolve itself under two headings. First, as to whether the fact that the canal is not being used as much as the American one, is due to the difficulty in getting supplies or to the lack of dock accommodation on the Canadian side. I wish to draw to the attention of the hon. minister the present condition of affairs. It is true that when last this appropriation was asked for, it was stated that the government dock was then in course of construction. That dock has since been completed, but I might point out that it is some distance below the canal and does not seem to have remedied the condition of affairs. It seems that the Canadian Pacific Railway boats prefer, in coming down from the west or the north, to turn round and go to the American side rather than proceed along the shoally channel to where the new dock is situated. There is no doubt that between the eastern outlet of that canal and the present newly constructed government dock there is a channel difficult of navigation. It has repeatedly been represented to me that the captains of these Canadian Pacific Railway vessels will not follow that channel if they can avoid doing so. They invariably make a sharp detour to the south and go over to the American side. In 1902, when the appropriation was first asked for (see page 4002 of 'Hansard') the then Minister of Railways and Canals used these words :

> We desire to place our canal upon an equally satisfactory footing with that of our neighbours.

The footing of the canal proper is no doubt equally satisfactory to that of the American canal because when vessels go into the Canadian canal, they go into a better lock than the American, a lock which will serve vessels very much quicker, which is in many respects a superior lock and under excellent management. But the difficulties are the difficulties of approach and the difficulties of docking. The difficulties of approach seem to have been grappled with to some extent by the large amount of dredging and deepening done, but I would point out that these difficulties have not been entirely removed although the expenditure has far exceeded the amount estimated. The difficulty of docking too is one that still calls for some consideration. The government dock is nearly a mile south of the entrance on the southern outlet of the canal, and there is in addition to the distance between the outlet and this government dock an unsatisfactory channel. I earnestly trust that the hon. minister will investigate these matters as they stand. Speaking purely for the local constituency and having natural interest in the condition of affairs as they exist there by contrast with the condition of affairs existing at the American Soo, I would much prefer that the government should undertake to place our canal on an equally satisfactory footing with that of our neighbours from every point of view ; and the hon. minister will meet with no dissent from me if he will provide an amount sufficient to complete that work and place it on a satisfactory footing. Whilst speaking on this matter, I consider that the conditions which have prevailed with regard to these contracts on the canal call for some comment at my hands, and I regret that the Postmaster General, who is also the Minister of Labour, is not in his place.

Mr. PRINGLE. Is this the contract referred to in answer to a question which I put on February 6. I asked :

1. In what month in 1903 was the contract for dredging Sault Ste. Marie canal given ?
2. If given in the fall, why was it given at a season when Canadian contractors were unable to take the work ?
3. Did United States contractors get the work?
4. What was the price ?
5. Was there such a rush to have the work done that Canadian contractors were excluded from doing the work ?

The answer to the question was as follows :

1. In November.
2. It was given in the autumn because parliamentary appropriations were not available until then, parliament having prorogued on October 24, 1903.
3. Yes.
4. Eighty cents per cubic yard.
5. It was necessary to let the work as early after the House prorogued to avail of the appropriation.

Mr. EMMERSON. That contract was completed. This contract was entered into last autumn.

Mr. PRINGLE. But, under this head, I dare say, I can refer to this for a moment. In answer to question 3, the minister states that the contractors who got the work were United States contractors. I suppose the reason they got the work was that tenders were called for late in the fall, when it was impossible for Canadian contractors to get their plant in place for the work. Consequently, the government are paying for the work double what they are paying on the Welland canal for a similar class of work. On the Welland canal they are paying 38½ cents, while on the Sault Ste. Marie canal they are paying 80 cents a yard, as I understand it, for a similar class of excavation.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is no comparison.

Mr. PRINGLE. This is earth, not rock, excavation.

Mr. EMMERSON. It includes boulders and hardpan. The work the Hickler Bros. are doing at 80 cents we are obliged to pay $1.74 for, and the offers made have been as high as $3.

Mr. PRINGLE. I am advised by a very competent contractor that at the time the tenders were called for it was absolutely impossible for any Canadian contractor to put in a tender, because it was at a season of the year when it would have been impossible for them to get their plant there, and consequently Americans got the contract at higher prices. Were there any Canadian contractors tendering for this work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I was not then in the department, and am not prepared to answer that question off-hand. The appropriation having been passed late, the asking for tenders was late. The Canadian contractors tendered in 1904, and it seems to me they had equal opportunities to do so in 1903. My hon. friend (Mr. Pringle) is certainly misinformed as to the character of the work. It is absolutely different from the work on the Welland canal. I myself naturally asked the question why the tenders in connection with the Sault Ste. Marie canal were so much higher than those on the Welland canal, and so I was informed of the difference in the work. The successful tenderer last fall was Mr. Boone, whose figure was $1.74. Messrs. Magann & Finn, who are doing the work at 38½ cents on the Welland canal, tendered at $2, and Messrs. Battle & Manley, tendered at $2.25. It is practically the same class of work. It was just at the entrance at the upper or northern end of the canal.

Mr. PRINGLE. I am advised that the contract was let late in November, when very little if any work could be done, because the canal is usually frozen about the first week in December. The work would have to be held over until the spring, and there was no advantage in letting the contract so late in the fall, when only a few days' work could be done. If a reasonable time had been given our Canadian contractors would have had an opportpnity to bid for the work.

Mr. EMMERSON. Though the work was given out late in the fall, the Canadian contractors were in quite as good a position to tender as those on the other side of the line. The point was to get the work under contract and have it ready to proceed with in the spring. It has been a crying necessity. Complaints were made that there was only 18 feet of water there, and it was said the Canadian Pacific Railway boats could not come down because of the shallow entrance to the canal. Another objection was the cross-current which was said to make the shallow water much more dangerous. The money, no doubt, should have ben voted earlier in the session, but we all recognize the conditions which prevailed here in 1903. The moment the vote was available tenders were asked for. The prices were certainly very low. And if, as the hon. gentleman says, no work was done that fall, surely the other contractors might have been quite as wide awake to the point as were Hickler Bros., the successful tenderers. Of course, we hear these rumours, but I think that when the facts are inquired into no cause for complaint can be found. When it came down to last fall the tenders were sky-high. They did not offer to take the work at any such figure as 38½ cents a yard. And, by the way, somebody complained the other night that 38½ cents was too nigh.

Mr. PRINGLE. I may not correctly understand this matter, but, as I am advised, tenders were called for on this work, work to proceed in the fall of 1903.

Mr. EMMERSON. Nobody is expected to do the impossible.

Mr. PRINGLE. Tenders were not called for until such time as it would have been impossible for Canadian contractors to get their plant on the Sault Ste. Marie canal. As to the minister's excuse that there was no appropriation, we all know that in 1903 a special vote was passed early in the session, so that these public works could be carried on, and thus there was no reason why tenders should not have been called for early in that session instead of waiting until the fall. Now, so far as the cost of the work is concerned, I am not prepared to say.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think that was on the main estimates, there was a certain percentage.

Mr. PRINGLE. You could have done the same thing again. What was to prevent you from bringing down an interim estimate to carry on this work, instead of leaving it to the fall so as to throw this contract into the hands of these American contractors ?

Mr. BOYCE. Was the work kept going?

Mr. EMMERSON. That particular work was kept going, because I do not think it was under contract. As for the other work, I do not think any dredging was being done at that period.

Mr. BOYCE. As the Minister of Labour is now in his place I desire to draw his attention to the condition of affairs which has existed at that place, on both government contracts and other works of a large nature, with regard to the employment of aliens. The matter has been brought from time to time, with a great deal of pertinacity, to the attention of the Department of Labour, and absolutely no relief whatsoever has been afforded. Now, here you

have a dredge contract involving a large amount of money, with foreign contracts, a foreign dredge, manned by foreign engineers, supplied from a foreign port, and employing foreign workmen.

Mr. EMMERSON. Are you sure ?

Mr. BOYCE. I am speaking from very excellent information, that notwithstanding the clause that may have been imported into the contract, as it was imported into a contract by the Public Works Department, these conditions do and did exist at the time, and complaint was made with regard to it. There were importations of labour from the other side of the river for the purpose of dredging and deepening this canal—that can be established. There were importations of cheap foreign labour for the construction of the government dock, and that can be established. There was a time last year when the post office work there was under construction, that the stonemasons employed at the work were almost entirely, as I am informed, engaged from the United States across the river. So that on the three public works that were going on under a contract with this government at the town of Sault Ste. Marie, although that contract provided as the minister states, that the contractor should employ none but Canadian labour, that clause was honoured more in the breach than in the observance. Then what was the effect upon the town ? We find that during this time, according to this estimable publication from the bureau of labour, there is a report from Sault Ste. Marie on the labour conditions there—I am referring to the number for July, 1904, which, I may state, was the month following the date on which urgent petitions were sent to the Minister of Labour from the labouring men and other persons asking for relief. In the month of July, 1904, this article or minute appeared in the 'Labour Gazette :'

> Labour conditions in Sault Ste. Marie are at present duller than at any previous period in the last seven years. There is a large number of men employed, yet there are many more here than the amount of work calls for.

Yet what work there was there was being filled up by aliens imported under a government contract by government contractors upon a government work.

> The receiver, however, has as yet only three plants in operation, viz., the mechanical pulp mill, employing 140 men ; the veneer mill, employing 100 men, and the sawmill, employing 100 men. The contractor who is extending the government dock has 25 men employed, at a rate from $1.50 to $2 per day. The contractors on the post office building employ 45 men at wages ranging from $1.75 to $4.50, and on the extension of the pier, on the eastern approach to the ship canal, 45 men were employed at daily wages ranging from $1.50 to $4.50.

That is the report in the month of July, and in the month of August not a single word was said with regard to the urgent petitions that were presented to the Department of Labour in this issue of July. So it would appear that the organ of that department desired to say smooth things instead of true things. Then in the month for August, I extract from the report from Sault Ste. Marie, page 165 :

> Sixty men are employed on the extension of the piers of the government canal at from $1.50 to $2.50 per day. The men employed on the post office building are as follows :— 6 stonemasons at 45 cents per hour ; 7 carpenters at 25 cents per hour ; 9 stone-cutters at 50 cents per hour ; 7 quarrymen at from $2.52 to $2.75 per day, and 20 labourers at from 17½ to 20 cents per hour.

Then we are told that labour conditions in August had somewhat improved. The petitions that were sent down to the Department of Labour I would ask the minister, when it is convenient, to lay on the table of the House. They set forth the grievances that then existed, namely, that Canadian workingmen were being ousted and being pushed on one side by importations of alien labour under a government contract. The result was that men in Canada, some of them owning property and paying taxes at the Canadian Soo, went over and endeavoured to obtain work in American factories on the Michigan side, with the result that the American officials deported them and sent them back with their chests of tools by the same ferry by which they came. These matters were, as I understand, represented by these petitions to the department and a request was made that an inspector be appointed under the Dominion Alien Labour law to retaliate against that kind of treatment, so that these gentlemen who were employed on government work and eating up the bread of Canadian citizens might be dealt with at least on the same basis as our Canadians were dealt with by American officials. There was a meeting held at the Soo at which I was present, and the gentleman who was the government candidate at the last election, was also present. This question was put forcibly before us by a number of workingmen who were immediately affected by it, who represented the pros and the cons. The whole difficulty was discussed, and the government candidate at the last election stated—I think I am quoting his words fairly, I am sure I am desirous of doing so—stated that in his judgment the present law was unworkable, and he would see that pressure was brought to bear upon the government so that the conditions which were then presented to the meeting might be remedied.

Two instances were cited of the character I have mentioned of men living in Canada being deported by the American authorities with a number of cases where men were imported from the American Soo opposite, and were engaged upon the post office and other public works to which I have referred. These matters were represented to the De-

partment of Labour. A request was made for an inspector. No inspector for the enforcement of the labour law of Canada, as far as I know—if I am wrong the hon. minister will correct me—was appointed or is now on duty. The conditions there call for action, they call for the enforcement of some law even though it be enforcement by retaliation. Men there who own property and pay taxes—I am quoting from instances that came to my personal knowledge—are deprived of work. A man occupying the position of a stationary engineer, for instance, is pushed to one side and remains at home idle while a gentleman from the other side of the river who lives over there comes over and takes his work, brings his dinner pail over, eats his dinner, does his work and goes back to the southern side of the line at six o'clock and when wage day comes he carries his pay over there, while the man who fulfils the duties and bears the burdens of Canadian citizenship by the payment of taxation and in other ways is looking for work. This is an example of the way in which the Alien Labour Law is administered at the present time. I would respectfully ask the hon. minister whether he has dealt with the petitions which were presented and whether he intends in pursuance of the prayer of these petitions which were sent down last June to appoint an inspector and to carry into effect, as far as they can be made effective, the provisions of the Alien Labour Law so as to prevent this condition of things in the future. I would also ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals if in regard to the same appropriations he would see to it that the clause in the contract for the expenditure of this money on this dredging and deepening work providing for the employment of Canadian labour is not a matter of mere form more honoured in the breach than in the observance.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would say in reply to my hon. friend that if he is not more accurate in respect to the Department of Railways and Canals, I fear that he has not given us very correct information as respects the conditions at the Soo. I happen to know from an inquiry that was made by the Department of Railways and Canals that Hickler Bros. who had the contract and who were said to be American citizens and employed in their work aliens—

Mr. BOYCE. Yes, I understand so.

Mr. EMMERSON. Inquiry was made at the time and there was only one man on each dredge who was an American citizen. That was the engineer and captain, and further inquiry was made and it was found that it was impossible to get on the Canadian side any one who would undertake that work.

Mr. BOYCE. May I ask the hon. minister at what time he made these inquiries ?

Mr. EMMERSON. These inquiries were made in the spring of 1904. The contract was let in November, I think, 1903. I came into my department in January, 1904. My attention was called to the matter, and I asked the chief engineer to make inquiry and the result of that inquiry was as I have stated.

Mr. BOYCE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. EMMERSON. I hope my hon. friend is not subject to any little fits of that kind ; jumping up and interrupting me. I am stating the facts as they are and if he will bear with me I will get them all placed before him. The results of the inquiry were that it was impossible to get any one to act in that capacity on these dredges and in view of these circumstances permission was given to the contractors to employ these men in the operation of the dredges. They did the work excellently well. All other employees in connection with the work were Canadian citizens, as they informed me.

Mr. BOYCE. At the risk of speaking too much, which, in the eyes of the hon. minister, appears to be a heinous offence, I want to say that if he will read my remarks as taken down by ' Hansard ' he will see that the meeting I referred to was held in June of this year at which certain instances were brought to the attention of the meeting. He is groping away back in January of last year when everything was frozen up and I do not think anything was working. The hon. gentleman has referred in almost uncalled for manner to some desire on my part, possibly impulsively exhibited, of making myself right with him in regard to the facts. I might discourse upon that enigmatical stare and inscrutable smile with which the hon. gentleman meets certain questions which are asked in regard to the expenditures of his department, but I refrain out of courtesy to the hon. gentleman. But, although I am a new member I trust I am not a fresh one, and I want to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that I have never violated my rights here, that I have kept strictly within the lines of courtesy and no one can complain of me on that score. I do not think when I am addressing myself to public questions that I should be subject to remarks and insinuations of that character from the hon. gentleman.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) stated that some petitions and communications had last year been addressed to the Department of Labour complaining of some infractions of the Alien Labour law at the Soo. If the hon. gentleman had informed me in advance, I should have examined the papers and put myself in a position to discuss what has occurred, or is supposed to have occurred, but as the hon. gentleman has not done so—

I am sure it was from inadvertence—I am not in a position to-night to enter into any controversy as to what might or might not have occurred. The hon. gentleman says there were infractions of the Alien Labour law and he asks whether an inspector has been sent up there, or will be, and why one is not sent. Let me remind him that the Alien Labour Act is not administered in that way at all. At one time it was for the government to administer the Alien Act, but, at the instance of I think, speaking from memory, the Congress of Labour,—although I would not say positively as to which organization it was,—but on the application of labour organizations, the law was changed and the administration taken from the Department of Justice. It was left to any private citizen to enforce the law. If the hon. gentleman had turned up the Act at that time and had found there were infractions of the law all he had to do was to have a complaint made to a judicial or semi-judicial officer at the Sault, or to have had proceedings instituted and that would have brought about the proper remedy. That has been done with great success in many parts of Canada.

Mr. BOYCE. But these proceedings would have to be undertaken at the expense of the prosecutor, some poor labouring man who has not a dollar.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The law is as we were asked to make it by the labour organizations, the persons supposed to be particularly interested in it. The law provides that the government give one-half the penalty recovered to the complainant; in every instance that has been done, and it has not been complained to us that there are not people there prepared to undertake a prosecution. If my hon. friend in his zeal to help the workmen, had given them the benefit of his legal knowledge—for I presume he knows the law—he would have applied the remedy and we would not have had the grievance dragged out at such length in this House.

Mr. BOYCE. I am grateful for the explanation, but I wish to point out this difficulty. The average workman does not see the profit to himself or the advisability or the expediency of engaging personally in litigation, engaging lawyers to pursue a claim for penalties and giving security for costs, with the gracious promise that he may get one-half the reward. We know that the result of penal actions is exceedingly hazardous, much more so than civil actions, for the construction of the statutes is so strict that in a very small percentage of cases that are instituted to recover penalties is the plaintiff successful. Then what is the chance of his recovering against aliens or against a class of men who stand between the contractor and the employer of alien labour? There are many difficulties, and, knowing as I do that the minister is familiar with the provisions of the Act, it is with exceeding diffidence that I bring these matters to his notice and respectfully urge that they receive the attention they should receive.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. These are observations that would be properly addressed to the House in framing amendments to the law, but they have no application, no force, as against the existing law. It is not necessary to repeat that the enforcement of the penalties does not rest with the government and the government has no legal right to institute proceedings such as the hon. gentleman refers to. We cannot by force of arms proceed to grab men and throw them out of the country. There is a legal way of doing these things. My hon. friend holds out the great bug-bear of security for costs. On referring to the Act he will not find anything in it with reference to security for costs there is nothing in the Act on the subject.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to ask the hon. minister, as I was not here the other evening, whether he has done anything towards changing the method of swinging the bridge at the Cardinal locks, and also if it is his intention to ask for public tenders for the erection of the new wharf to be built at Cardinal?

Mr. EMMERSON. The intention is to fix the swing. If I remember rightly there was an item in that estimate for $11,000 or $12,000 for a wharf at Cardinal. Of course tenders will be asked for.

Mr. J. D. REID. I saw by the discussion that took place that there was $11,000 in the estimates for a wharf at Cardinal, but I would like to know if he will give the public an opportunity of competing for this contract? That is, will he advertise it in the local papers for that section?

Mr. EMMERSON. All these works are tendered for by public advertisement.

Mr. J. D. REID. Sometimes they are not.

Mr. EMMERSON. Not in the Department of Railways and Canals; the tenders for public works are always by newspaper advertisement.

Mr. J. D. REID. As I understand, this is not part of the original Davis contract for enlarging that canal.

Mr. EMMERSON. Oh, no, this is entirely separate; it is not part of their contract.

Mr. J. D. REID. You say you are going to arrange to have the bridge swung differently from the present system? It is now done by hand and with a great deal of inconvenience.

Mr. BOYCE. I would ask the minister now what were the conditions which led to

the tremendous increase in the expenditure for the deepening and widening of the canal from $420,000 as originally estimated and as it was declared would cover the cost, up to the present $599,000 with the statement from the minister that that will not complete the work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Does my hon. friend mean simply the dredging ?

Mr. BOYCE. The deepening and widening of the entrance of the canal. He states that the amount was estimated $420,000 in 1902. Again, when the supplementary estimates came on, the Minister of Railways and Canals at that time said—I am quoting from 'Hansard,' at page 4002 :

> The estimated cost for both the upper and lower entrance is in the neighbourhood of $450,000. The lower entrance will cost in the neighbourhood of $140,000 to $150,000, and the upper entrance in the neighbourhood of $300,000. We have not commenced the upper entrance yet.

Again, on an item in the supplementary estimates for $20,000 towards deepening and widening the entrance, at page 4298, the hon. minister was asked : What will it require to complete the whole entrance to a 21-foot depth of navigation ?' The Minister of Railways answered : 'The estimated cost is $420,000.' The Hon. Mr. Haggart asked : 'Will the whole of it be finished this season,' and he was answered 'No.'

Mr. EMMERSON. The reason the estimate has been exceeded is that the channel has very much widened at both the upper and the lower entrance, further than was intended. That was found to be necessary. The cost of dredging also has been exceeded. My hon. friend knows that wages have very materially increased since 1902.

Mr. J. D. REID. What is the policy of the hon. minister in regard to these dredging contracts ? Is he going to give them to Americans in case they apply for them, or will he see that they are kept entirely for Canadians ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Our contracts contain clauses with respect to Canadian labour and wages. It becomes a serious matter sometimes, if an American tender is away down, perhaps half of what the lowest Canadian tender is. It would be problematical what should be done. My own inclination under these circumstances would be to give the lowest Canadian tender the benefit. But it is a question of dollars and cents.

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. gentleman will remember that, when the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill was going through, he did not hesitate to see that a clause was put in the Bill that contracts must be let entirely to Canadians, although that measure involved a very large expenditure. Yet in regard to these contracts, when there is no question about Canadians having the plant, he seems to have changed his mind entirely, because he is now willing to give these contracts to Americans. He stated that he would give the contract to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. EMMERSON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I said my inclination would be to give it to a Canadian, even though the lowest tender was very much below his. I am speaking of my own judgment in this matter. Each case must be governed by the circumstances which surround it. That question is not involved in this vote, because all these are Canadian contractors.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the minister any data concerning the American channel through Hay lake, below the Sault Ste. Marie locks, lowering the water at the foot of the Canadian canal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That matter was discussed last year, and nothing has occurred respecting it since. That question, I think, is now involved in the commission.

Trent canal—construction, $300,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. The work on the original contract is about completed, but the contractors have been required to do some extra work, some portion of it being the construction of a road across the fourth concession of the township of Eldon, and this road has two bridges on it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is in the township of Carden, I think.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not as familiar with the district as the hon. gentleman. There was a special agreement entered into with respect to the extra work, the prices being 25 cents per yard for earth and $4.25 per yard for concrete. The contractors are Larkin & Sangster.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This $300,000 completes the work between Balsam lake and Heeley's falls ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This has nothing to do with the locks at Kirkfield ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Will the minister tell us his policy with regard to those locks?

Mr. EMMERSON. The sub-structure has been completed, or nearly so, with a view to the construction at that point of a lift-lock, which has been contracted for.

Mr. LENNOX. What kind of piers are they ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Steel piers.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I would ask the hon. minister to let that item stand until the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) and the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Ward) are here.

Item allowed to stand.

Lachine canal—rebuilding wharf below dock, $10,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is for concrete work running around the pier between the entrance and the head of the lock. The items is $10,000 to complete.

Lachine canal—rebuilding wall basin No. 2, $37,500.

Mr. EMMERSON. Length of wall 1,500 feet, height 17 feet, average thickness 4½ feet.

Soulanges canal—general repairs including gasoline boat, $15,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is that boat for ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is estimated to cost $2,000. It is for hauling scows along the line for repairs.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Sir William Mulock, House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 21, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 67) to amend the Criminal Code, 1902.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 68) respecting the patents of the Paper Goods Company, Limited.—Mr. A. C. Macdonell.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 69) to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta. He said : Mr. Speaker, the Bill which I have now the honour to present is for the admission of another member into the Canadian family of provinces. As the House, no doubt, has noticed, this Bill is to be followed immediately by another for the same purpose, in relation to the province of Saskatchewan. These two Bills are intimately connected ; they form part of the same subject ; and, by your leave, Sir, the explanations which I shall have the honour to give to the House, will apply to both. They will apply likewise to the resolutions which will be introduced as the basis for the financial clauses of these Bills.

It has been observed on the floor of this House, as well as outside of this House, that as the nineteenth century had been the century of the United States, so the twentieth century would be the century of Canada. This opinion has not been deemed extravagant. On this continent and across the waters, it has been accepted as the statement of a truth, beyond controversy. The wonderful development of the United States during the space of scarcely more than one hundred years may well be an incitement to our efforts and our ambition. Yet to the emulation of such an example there may well be some exception taken ; for if it be true that settlement of the western portion of the American union has been marked by almost phenomenal rapidity, it is also true that every other consideration seems to have been sacrificed to this one consideration of rapid growth. Little attention was given, up to the last few years, to the materials which were introduced into the republic; little regard was paid among the new settlers to the observance of the law ; and it is not a slander upon our neighbours—for, indeed, the fact is admitted in their current literature—that frontier civilization was with them a by-word for lawlessness. We have proceeded upon different methods. We have been satisfied with slower progress. Our institutions in our own Northwest have been developed by gradual stages, so as to ensure at all times among these new communities law and order, and the restraints and safeguards of the highest civilization.

The time has arrived when we are all agreed, I believe, nay, I feel sure, upon both sides of the House, that another step, and the last, can now be taken to complete the passage of the Northwest Territories from what was once necessary tutelage, into the fulness of the rights which, under our constitution, appertain to provinces.

I may remind the House, though the fact is well known to every body, that when confederation was established in the year 1867, the Canada of that day was not at all what is the Canada of the present day. The Canada of that day did not extend beyond the western limits of the province of Ontario. On the other side of the continent, on the shores of the Pacific ocean, there was a British colony, British Columbia, absolutely isolated; and between British Columbia on one side and Ontario on the other side there was a vast extent of territory, the fairest portion perhaps of the continent, which was under British sovereignty, but in which British sovereignty had always been dormant. That vast extent of the continent, the fairest, as I said, and the most fertile, was administered, loosely administered by the Hudson Bay Company, under a charter which the company claimed, gave her almost sovereign sway, and which she used to keep this vast extent of country as a close preserve for her immense operations in the fur trade. I need not tell you, Sir, the fact is well known and present to the memory of all, that it was the intention of the fathers of confederation not to limit it to the comparatively narrow

bounds in which it was included in 1867, but to extend it eastward and westward between the two oceans. I need hardly tell you, Sir, the fact is known to all and well remembered by every one, that provision was made in the instrument of confederation itself, for the admission into confederation of British Columbia, Prince Edward Island, and even Newfoundland, and especially for these territories which at last have come in to-day as part of the Canadian family. In the very first year of confederation, the very first session of the first parliament, resolutions were introduced into this House and adopted unanimously for the acquisition of Rupert's Land and the Northwest Territories, and the extinguishment therein of the title of the Hudson Bay Company. This was accomplished in a very short time, and as soon as accomplished, the government of that day, the government of Sir John Macdonald, proceeded to carve the new province of Manitoba out of the wilderness, and without any preliminary stage endowed it at once with all the rights and privileges of a province.

If we go back to the history of those days, perhaps the opinion will not be unwarranted that it would have been a wiser course, if instead of bringing Manitoba at once into the confederation full fledged and fully equipped as a province, that maturity had been reached by gradual stages extended over a few years. If that course had been adopted, perhaps some mistakes would have been avoided from the effects of which we have not yet completely recovered.

Very different was the course and policy of Mr. Mackenzie when he came into office with regard to the Northwest Territory. Up to the year 1875 the Northwest Territories had been administered under no special form of government. But in 1875 Mr. Mackenzie, being then Prime Minister of Canada, introduced into this House and carried unanimously a measure, a very important measure, the object of which, as he said himself, was to give to the Northwest Territories an 'entirely independent government.' This measure has been the charter under which the Northwest Territories have come to their present state of manhood. It has never been repealed. Additions have been made to it from time to time, but it has remained and is to this day the rock upon which has been reared the structure, which we are about to crown with complete and absolute autonomy. By this measure it was provided that a Lieutenant Governor should be appointed for the Northwest Territories. The Lieutenant Governor was to be vested with executive power, and he was to administer that power with the assistance of a council to be composed of five members, the Lieutenant Governor and his advisers to be appointed by the Governor in Council. Apart from these administrative powers the Lieutenant Governor was also invested with large legislative authority. He could make laws for taxation, for local and municipal purposes, property and civil rights, the administration of justice, public health, police, roads, highways and bridges—generally all matters of a purely local and private nature. There was also an enactment in that measure to the effect that when any district, not exceeding 1,000 square miles, contained a population of not less than 1,000 people of adult age, exclusive of aliens and unenfranchised Indians, it could be erected into an electoral district which should thenceforward be entitled to elect a member to the council. There was also an important enactment with regard to education, introducing into that country the system of separate schools in force in the province of Ontario. But I shall say nothing at the present time of this important part of the law of 1875, as I propose to come again to it at a later stage of the observations which I desire to offer to the House. This Act remained in force without any important modifications up to the year 1886, when the Territories were given representation in this parliament. Two years later an important step in advance was also taken in their development, that is to say, in 1888. The executive council was abolished, so far, at all events, as its powers of legislation were concerned, and a legislative assembly was created, to be composed of twenty-five members, twenty-two of which were to be elected by the people and three to be known as legal experts, to be appointed by the Governor in Council; and a new executive council was to be appointed under the name of advisory council to advise the Lieutenant Governor upon all matters of finance. In 1891 another step forward was taken, and a very important one. The legislative assembly of the Territories was given additional powers; and if you take section 92 of the British North America Act and compare it with the powers which were then given to the legislature, you will find that that legislature was invested with powers almost as complete as those which are vested in the provinces under the British North America Act. In fact, with the exception of borrowing money most of the essential powers which are now given to the provinces were given to the legislative assembly of the Northwest Territories. In 1894 another departure, another change, was made—I call it a departure. The change which was then made was not, in my estimation, quite in accordance with the spirit of our constitution. It was that the legislative assembly could select four members of its own body to be called an executive committee to advise the Lieutenant Governor. This is not, as I say, in accordance with the principles of the British constitution. It is not in accordance with the principles of British constitution that parliament itself should elect the members who are to advise the Crown. The principle of the British constitution is that the Crown, or the representative of the Crown selects, him-

self, his own advisers ; and under our own well known practice in these modern days, the only restriction put upon the executive, the Crown, or the sovereign, is that he must select advisers who have the support of a majority of the elected body. This new departure introduced in the statute of 1894 did not last long, and at this I am not surprised. In 1897 another and a final change took place. In 1897 an Act was passed in this House whereby it was provided that there should be an executive council to be chosen by the Lieutenant Governor from the members of the House, and practically having the support of a majority of the elected members of the legislature. This was in fact the last and final concession and it was the application of the principle of ministerial responsibility. This has been the law ever since ; it is the law to-day. So that, Sir, it is manifest that at this moment the people of the Northwest Territories are in the enjoyment and have been for several years, not only of full ministerial responsibility, not only of full constitutional government, but also of a large measure of local autonomy. A great deal has been done, in fact, more has been done than we have to do to-day. We have to take the last step but it is easy and comparatively unimportant in view of and in comparison with what has already been accomplished. The metal has been in the crucible and all we have to do now, is to put the stamp of Canadian nationality upon it.

The House is aware that some two years ago or thereabouts there came to us a very general desire from the Northwest Territories for immediate admission into the confederation as provinces. I did not believe at the time for my part, that this request, respectable as it was, proceeded so much from an actual need as from a sentiment. It was to me the expression of a sentiment, a sentiment most honourable, a sentiment most worthy because it was an expression of the self-reliance of young and ambitious communities. The House is also aware of the answer which we gave to the Territories at that time. We represented to them that in our judgment, the time was inopportune for taking this question into parliament, that as we were on the eve of a general election, the time and occasion would be more propitious and more fitting after that event when the Territories would have the benefit on this floor of a larger representation. These views were generally accepted. The elections have taken place and immediately after the elections, or as soon as was practicable thereafter, we invited the executive of the Northwest Territories to send delegates here to confer with us upon the measure which was to be introduced so as to admit them into the confederation. We have had the benefit of the presence of Mr. Haultain, the Premier of the Northwest Territories and of Mr. Bulyea, one of his colleagues, and we have had the advantage of several conferences with them. We have had the advantage also of the presence and advice of several of the members from the Territories, and now, Sir, it is my privilege and my honour—I deem it indeed a privilege and an honour—to offer this Bill to the House.

When we came to consider the problem before us it became very soon apparent to me, at all events, that there were four subjects which dominated all the others ; that the others were of comparatively minor importance, but that there were four which I was sure the parliament of Canada and the Canadian people at large might be expected to take a deep interest in. The first was : How many provinces should be admitted into the confederation coming from the Northwest Territories—one, or two or more ? The next question was : in whom should be vested the ownership of the public lands? The third question was : What should be the financial terms to be granted to these new provinces ? And the fourth and not the least important by any means was the question of the school system which would be introduced—not introduced because it was introduced long ago, but should be continued in the Territories.

Now, Sir, I will proceed to examine one after the other, all these questions. The first, as I have just said is : How many provinces should be admitted into the confederation ? There is considerable variety, as everybody knows, in the area of the different provinces of the confederation. Prince Edward Island has an area of 2,184 miles, Nova Scotia 21,428 miles, New Brunswick 27,985 miles, Quebec 351,873, Ontario 260,862, Manitoba 73,732, and British Columbia 372,630, or a total area for the seven provinces of confederation of 1,110,694 miles. Now, the Territories which are to-day under the control and jurisdiction of the local legislature have exactly the same area as that of the seven provinces of the Dominion. The total area of the seven provinces, as I said a moment ago is 1,110,694 miles and the area of the different territories is as follows :

	Miles.
Assiniboia	88,879
Saskatchewan	107,618
Alberta	101,883
Athabaska	251,965
Mackenzie	562,182
Total	1,112,527

Or, an area a little greater than the total area of the seven provinces of the Dominion. Now, as I have said there is a great variety in the sizes of our provinces ; in fact, it is very much with the Canadian Confederation as with the American Union. There are in the Canadian Confederation provinces of unequal sizes as

there are in the American Union states of unequal sizes. It is not a fatal fault as has been proved by the history of the American Union, but I believe that when provinces are not the result of historic tradition, when they have not come to us formed and when we have the control of events, it is preferable that the provinces should be as near as possible about the same size. Therefore, it is impossible to suppose that this immense territory of 1,112,527 miles should be formed into one single province. There is another objection. The territories are naturally divided into two portions from the point of view of agriculture, climate, and productions generally, the northern portion and the southern portion, and I would place the boundary of these two sections a little south of the boundary which now divides the provisional district of Mackenzie from the provisional district of Athabaska. This northern portion of the continent has not yet been fully explored, but still we know enough of it, there has been enough exploration of it and it has been travelled over sufficiently, to make us sure that it is absolutely unfit for agriculture. The climate is too cold and the soil is too poor. There are, however, very excellent and very promising indications of mineral wealth in that district. There are indications to-day of petroleum, coal, gold, copper and other minerals, and perhaps some day we may have in what is to-day a barren section, another Yukon. But we know by the experience of the past that mineral wealth, when not coupled with agriculture, is but a precarious ground on which to found the hope of thick and permanent settlement. Therefore, we put aside this northern section ; but the southern section is of an absolutely different character.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What does the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) refer to exactly ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would divide the two sections at about the line which now divides the provisional district of Mackenzie and the provisional district of Athabaska, about the 60th parallel of north latitude.

The southern section is of a different character. It is absolutely an agricultural country, and I need not say that it is one of the finest in the world to-day. It is traversed by large rivers flowing from the Rocky mountains to Hudson's bay, and the valley of the Saskatchewan is, as every one knows, equal in fertility to the valley of the Red river. Everybody knows also that the valley of the Red river and the valley of the Saskatchewan are to-day the most fertile wheat fields under the sun. We propose to give autonomy, not to the whole of the Territories, but to that section which extends from the American boundary up to the boundary line between the provisional district of Mackenzie and the provisional district of Athabaska, that is the 60th parallel of north latitude.

When we were first approached on this subject, it was proposed to us that we should make a province extending from the American boundary up to the 57th parallel, that is to say, somewhat to the south of the provisional boundary between the provisional districts of Mackenzie and Athabaska, but we thought it preferable to take in the whole district of Athabaska. The reason for this is, that although Athabaska is not considered to be a fertile country, and the eastern portion of it is barren, the western portion, the valley of the Peace river, is equal to the valley of the Saskatchewan and settlement there is already proceeding rapidly. There are to-day on the Peace river two grist mills, provided absolutely from wheat grown in the Peace river valley, and therefore we have decided to include within the new provinces the provisional district of Athabaska. The area of these two provinces together will be about 550,345 square miles. This is, in our estimation, altogether too large an area to be made into one single province according to the size of the other provinces, the largest of which is British Columbia, and the next largest Quebec, British Columbia with an area of 372,000 square miles and Quebec with an area of 351,000 square miles. By dividing it into two you have two provinces of 275,000 square miles in round numbers, each about the size of the province of Ontario. If any of the members of the House will care to look at the map, they will see that we have put the provisional boundary on the fourth meridian and according to our present information, this will give about the same area and also the same population to the two provinces. It is estimated that the population to-day in these two provinces is about 500,000 souls. We have no accurate data, but we can proceed pretty confidently upon this information. The census in 1901 gave to these Northwest Territories a population of a little over 160,000 souls. Since that time, during the seasons of 1901, 1902, 1903 and 1904, the population, by immigration alone, has increased by over 100,000 a year, so that to-day we feel we are on pretty safe ground when we say that there is in those two provinces a total population of 500,000 souls, and we calculate that this population is about equally divided between the two provinces, giving a population of 250,000 to each.

Since I am upon the question of boundaries I shall also come to another question, connected therewith, that is to say, the demand which has been made upon us by the province of Manitoba for an extension of its boundaries, westward, northward and eastward. Yesterday a morning paper in this city published an interview given by the Hon. Mr. Rogers, a member of the govern-

ment of Manitoba, upon this subject. I shall take the liberty of referring to that interview of Mr. Rogers, so that the House will better understand the point to which I am about to direct its attention. Mr. Rogers said in this interview :

It is not a matter of agreement. We are simply presenting the unanimous request of the people of our province for the extension of our boundaries at least as far west as Regina and north as far as the northern boundary of Athabaska, which would include Fort Churchill, the Nelson river and the territory tributary thereto. This is no new request on behalf of Manitoba. In 1901 a resolution was introduced in the legislature by Mr. T. A. Burrows, then a member of the legislature and now a member of the Dominion parliament. This resolution was supported by Mr. Greenway, who was then leader of the opposition, now a member of the House of Commons. This was accepted and supported by the government of the day and voted for by every member of the House. A similar resolution was introduced by Mr. Roblin, leader of the government, and unanimously carried in 1902. A further resolution was introduced at the recent session and voted for by every member of the legislature, in which action they reflected the unanimous desire of all Manitobans. Mr. Campbell and myself have been appointed to come here to plead for what is considered by Manitoba to be her just claims, before the government who are the tribunal in the case and whose decision must be final.

I may observe that Mr. Rogers might have gone back much further than 1901 for records of the presentation of the claims of Manitoba for an extension of territory. Indeed as far back as 1884 a similar request was presented to the government of Sir John Macdonald. At that time the Privy Council dealt with this question in these words :

The boundaries of Manitoba were originally fixed at the instance of the delegates from that province who came to Ottawa in 1870 to adjust with the government of Canada the terms upon which Manitoba was to enter the confederation of Her Majesty's North American provinces.

The limits then agreed to embrace an area of about 9,500,000 acres. In the year 1881 these limits were enlarged and territory added to the west and north, making the total area of the province 96,000,000 acres or 150,000 square miles.

The further enlargement now asked for by Manitoba would add about 180,000 square miles to the already large area of the province, and would be viewed with disfavour as well by the old provinces as by the new districts of Assiniboia, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Athabaska, which have been created in the Northwest Territories, and which will ultimately become provinces of the Dominion. It would largely add to the expense of the government, without increasing the resources of Manitoba, already pronounced by the government of the province to be insufficient to meet its normal and necessary expense.

The committee, under these circumstances, humbly submit to Your Excellency, that it is inexpedient to alter the boundaries of the province as prayed for.

This answer to the request of Manitoba was a categorical refusal. I may say that there is an error in this Order in Council. It states that the area of the province of Manitoba at that time was 150,000 square miles, whereas it was only 73,000. That, however, is not very material. But I want to point out that the request of Manitoba now is one which could not be granted except with great difficulty. It would have been far more easy for the government of that day, twenty years ago, to have extended the limits of Manitoba than it would be to-day. At that time the Territories were still in their infancy ; but to-day they have grown to manhood, and how can it be expected that we shall take from them a portion of their territory to give it to Manitoba ? If this could not be done in 1884, I submit that there is still less reason for doing it in 1905.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I ask the right hon. gentleman if in that calculation was not included the disputed territory between Manitoba and Lake Superior?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, I think not. It was in dispute at that very moment. But even if it had been included, what would it have mattered ? We want to deal as fairly as we can with Manitoba and to give it all the consideration which is due to her. But is there a member of this House who would advise us that we should carve out of the Territories which for thirty years have been under the jurisdiction of their own legislature, which are to-day represented by ten members in this House, any portion of what belongs to them and hand it over to the province of Manitoba against the consent of the people of those territories ? If they agreed to it, well and good; I would have nothing to say. But the legislature of the Territories has more than once declared that they would not under any circumstances consent to any portion of their territory westward of the province of Manitoba being taken from them.

There is another consideration. For my part, I am prepared to give a full hearing to the province of Manitoba. When that province asks to have her limits extended westward, I am bound to say that we cannot entertain that prayer, for this simple reason, that the Territories, through their legislature, have passed upon it and have pronounced against it. But I understand that as to a certain portion of territory north of Lake Winnipegosis and Lake Manitoba, the Northwest legislature has declared that it has no pronounced views, and that that might be given to the province of Manitoba. But even this I am not prepared for my part to grant at this moment; because members representing that section to-day sit on the floor of this House, and they and their people have the right to be heard on that question; and if they do not agree to it, I do not think the parliament of Canada should make the grant against their wishes.

But, Sir, there is another demand of the

province of Manitoba which I think is entitled to fair consideration. Manitoba has asked to have her territory extended to the shores of Hudson's bay; and this is a prayer which seems to me to be entitled to a fair hearing. The province of Manitoba is not, however, the only one whose territory could be extended towards Hudson's bay. The province of Ontario would have the same right; the province of Quebec would also have that right; and the new province of Saskatchewan also. Therefore, in the project which we have to present to the House to-day, instead of including in the province of Saskatchewan that portion of territory lying north of Lake Winnipegosis and Lake Manitoba, we propose to leave that outside, to be included neither in Saskatchewan nor in Manitoba, but to be dealt with at a future day. And I may say at once, and I have the authority of my colleagues to make the announcement, that we propose to invite the province of Ontario, the province of Quebec, the province of Manitoba and the province of Saskatchewan to meet us here to decide whether or not it is advisable that the limits of any of these provinces should be extended to the shores of Hudson's Bay, and if so, in what manner it should be done. We have not considered the matter yet, but perhaps it may not be unadvisable even to consult the other provinces. I venture to think that the proposal which I now make to the House with reference to the province of Manitoba is a fair one, which will commend itself to the approval of all those who have given the matter fair and impartial consideration.

The new provinces shall, as a matter of course, be represented on the floor of this House, and, until another election takes place, they shall continue to be represented as they are to-day. There will be in each province a legislative assembly, of which it is proposed that the number of members shall be twenty-five.

A question which has given some difficulty to the members of the committee who had the preparation of this Bill, has been the selection of the capitals of the respective provinces. As to the capital of the province of Saskatchewan, the difficulty is easily solved, it will be, as it is at present, Regina. But as to the capital of Alberta, the selection was not so easy. There were three claimants for it—Calgary, Red Deer and Edmonton, each of which had a good claim. We have decided that we would not make any final selection, leaving the final selection to the province itself. In the meantime, if you look at the map, you will see that Edmonton seems to be the most central point, and therefore we propose to make Edmonton the capital for the present.

Beyond this, I have only to say that it is the intention to have this Bill come into force on July 1 next.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

The point being settled as to the number of provinces to be admitted into confederation, the next question is that regarding the public lands. In whom should the ownership of the lands be vested ? Should they belong to the provinces or to the Dominion? A strong plea was presented to us on behalf of the provinces. It was represented that as a matter of law and of equity, the public lands in these two provinces should belong to their governments. This plea was no doubt suggested by the fact that at the time of confederation, all the parties to the original contract, that is to say, the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and Quebec, each retained her own lands ; and when at a later day the province of British Columbia was admitted to the Dominion, she also retained her lands. But, Sir, the cases are not at all parallel. When the provinces which I have named came into confederation, they were already sovereignties. I use that term, because barring their dependence as colonies they were sovereignties in the sense of having the management of their own affairs. Each had a department of government called the Crown Lands Department, which was entrusted with the power of dealing with those lands, either for revenue or for settlement. But the case of these new provinces is not at all similar. They never had the ownership of the lands. Those lands were bought by the Dominion government, and they have remained ever since the property of the Dominion government, and have been administered by the Dominion government. Therefore I say the two cases are not in any way parallel; they are indeed absolutely different. When the provinces which I have named came into confederation they retained the ownership of their lands ; but when the two new provinces come into the Dominion, it cannot be said that they can retain the ownership of their lands, as they never had the ownership.

Therefore, the proposition that in equity and justice these lands belong to the provinces is not tenable. But for my part I would not care, in a question of this importance, to rest the case on a mere abstract proposition. We must view it from the grounds of policy ; and from the highest grounds of policy, I think it is advisable that the ownership of these lands should continue to be vested in the Dominion government. We have precedents for this. This is a case in which we can go to the United States for precedents. They are situated very much as we are regarding the ownership of lands and the establishment of new states. Whenever a new state has been created in the American Union, the Federal government has always retained the ownership and management of the public lands. And when we take the records of our own country, we know that when Manitoba was brought into the Dominion, that province was not given the ownership of her lands,

but it remained in the Dominion government. True it is that Manitoba made several efforts to acquire the ownership of the lands within her boundaries. She applied more than once to the successive governments of the Dominion, but her application was always met in the same way. It was always met by the statement that it was impossible to grant her request. The matter was finally closed in 1884 when the government of Sir John Macdonald, which had been approached on the subject, gave very forcibly and clearly the reasons why the prayer of that province could not be entertained. I may be allowed to quote to the House the language used by the government of Sir John Macdonald on the occasion. It will be found in an Order in Council of the 30th May, 1884 :—

> The success of the undertakings by the Dominion government in and for the Northwest, depends largely upon the settlement of the lands. Combined with a great expenditure in organizing and maintaining an immigration service abroad and at home, parliament pledged its faith to the world that a large portion of those lands should be set apart for free homesteads to all coming settlers, and another portion to be held in trust for the education of their children. No transfer could, therefore, be made, without exacting from the province the most ample securities that this pledged policy shall be maintained ; hence in so far as the free lands extend there would be no monetary advantage to the province, whilst a transfer would most assuredly seriously embarrass all the costly immigration operations which the Dominion government is making mainly in behalf of Manitoba and the Territories.
>
> The great attraction which the Canadian government now offers, the impressive fact to the mind of the men contemplating immigration is that a well known and recognized government holds unfettered in its own hand the lands which it offers free, and that that government has its agencies and organizations for directing, receiving, transporting and placing the immigrant upon the homestead which he may select. And if the immigration operations of the Dominion, which involve so large a cost, are to have continued success and to be of advantage to Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, your sub-committee deem it to be of the utmost importance that the Dominion government shall retain and control the lands which it has proclaimed free to all comers. Were there other considerations of sufficient force to induce them to recommend their transfer to Manitoba, and as a consequence and by precedent the surrender to the provinces to be created from the Northwest Territory, all the lands within their boundaries, then they would advise that the provinces holding the lands should conduct their own immigration operations at their own expense.

These reasons, strong and forcible as they were in 1884, are even stronger and more forcible in 1905, because the current of immigration is now flowing into these Territories in an unprecedented volume, and we are therefore compelled to say to the new provinces that we must continue the policy of retaining the ownership and control of the lands in our own hands. It is conceivable that if these lands were given to the new provinces, the policy of either one of them might differ from ours and clash with our efforts to increase immigration. It might possibly render these efforts nugatory. For instance, if either of the new provinces, under the strain of financial difficulty, were to abolish the free homesteads, which have proved so beneficial and so great an inducement to immigration, one can readily understand what a great blow that would be to our immigration policy. Or if the price of government lands for sale were to be increased over the present very moderate rate, that would also be another blow to that policy. But I frankly admit, and we must all recognize, that the provinces in the west, in being deprived of the public lands, are deprived of a valuable source of income. And in that way they complain that they are put on a footing of inequality as compared with the older provinces of the Dominion. Realizing that fact, it is the duty of parliament to make ample, even generous, provision which will compensate the provinces for the retention of the lands by the Federal government, and I believe that in makng this provision we shall have the full support of hon. members whether on one side or on the other.

Now I come to the financial terms which should be given to the new provinces. Our constitution, which is to be found in the British North America Act, contains a very remarkable provision. It contains the provision that out of the Federal treasury there shall be paid to the provinces a large amount of money in the shape of subsidies to assist them in carrying on their business. This, I say, is a very extraordinary provision. It is, I believe, unique. At all events, so far as my information goes, I do not know that any similar provision is to be found in the constitution of any other federal government. It is a sound principle of finance, and a still sounder principle of government, that those who have the duty of expending the revenue of a country should also be saddled with the responsibility of levying and providing it. That principle has been departed from in our case, and no doubt was departed from with some object. What can have been the reasons which induced the fathers of confederation in 1867 to depart from so obvious a principle of finance and government. The reasons are simply these. Confederation was the result of several compromises. It would have been impossible to establish it if there had not been a policy of give and take adopted among all the constituent bodies. And I am quite sure, I am speaking absolute historical truth when I say that neither Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario nor Quebec would ever have consented to part with their revenues, to give up their powers of taxation in customs and excise, if they had not been promised that out of the federal revenues they would be

allowed a certain sum every year to defray the expenses of their own local governments and administrations. This is the reason why this provision is to be found in the British North America Act. It is there. I do not think it is sound, but though in my judgment unsound, it is the duty of everybody in this House and in this country to take confederation as we find it, with its good points and its blemishes, and carry it to the end on the principle upon which it was established. Therefore upon this point I believe it is the duty of the Canadian parliament to continue that policy in this instance and make a liberal provision for these two new provinces which we are about to admit into the Canadian family.

But before I come to the revenue to be given these provinces, it will perhaps be preferable that I should give an idea of their present requirements. Last year there was expended out of appropriations by this parliament for the use of the local legislature and by the local legislature itself.

Civil government	$101,540
Legislation	21,375
Administration of Justice	29,000
Public Works	680,000
Education	345,125
Agriculture and Statistics	47,680
Hospitals, charities and public health	20,000
Miscellaneous	68,175

To these must be added sums which were spent by this government on services which in the future will have to be carried on by the governments of the provinces :

Public Works	$100,000
Justice	100,000
Miscellaneous	124,310

And this item of 'miscellaneous' was composed as follows :

Lieutenant-Governor's office	$ 3,880
Incidental Justice	32,000
Insane patients	70,000
Schools in unorganized districts	6,500

So that, last year there was provided for and expended by the Northwest Territories a total sum of $1,636,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that provided by this government ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the right hon. gentleman know what was raised by the government itself ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Included in this was what was raised by the local government, which, was I believe in the neighbourhood of $150,000. So, this year, if the conditions were to remain as they are, without any increased demands, we should have to provide about $1,636,000, or an average of $818,000 for each province. Of course, there are some items of this expenditure which, under the new conditions, must be duplicated, because there will be two governments instead of one. Besides, as every one knows immigration is flowing rapidly into the Territories, and it is no wonder if the present requirements of the Territories are not sufficiently represented by these figures. More liberal provision must be made for their expenses.

So, I come to the terms which we have made with the provinces—the terms we propose to give them. As the House knows, we are guided in this by the terms of the British North America Act. Section 118 of that Act reads as follows :

The following sums shall be paid yearly by Canada to the several provinces for the support of their governments and legislatures :

Ontario	$80,000
Quebec	70,000
Nova Scotia	60,000
New Brunswick	50,000

Two hundred and sixty thousand,—and an annual grant in aid of each province shall be made, equal to eighty cents per head of the population as ascertained by the census of one thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, and in case of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, by subsequent decennial census until the population of each of those two provinces amount to four hundred thousand souls, at which rate such grant shall thereafter remain. Such grants shall be in full settlement of all future demands on Canada, and shall be paid half-yearly in advance to each province ; but the government of Canada shall deduct from such grants, as against any province, all sums chargeable as interest on the public debt of that province in excess of the several amounts stipulated in this Act.

Now, we propose to make the following terms, keeping as close as possible to the British North America Act. I cite from the Bill :

The following amounts shall be allowed as an annual subsidy to the province of Alberta and shall be paid by the government of Canada by half-yearly instalments in advance : Support of government and legislature, $50,000,—

That is the sum paid to New Brunswick, when the population of that province was about the same as that of Alberta.

—on an estimated population of 250,000 at eighty cents per head $200,000, subject to be increased as hereinafter mentioned, that is to say : The census of the province shall be taken every fifth year, reckoning from the general census of 1901, and an approximate estimate of population shall be made at equal intervals between each quinquennial and decennial census, and, whenever the population, by any such census or estimate should exceed 250,000, the allowance shall be increased accordingly until the population has reached 800,000.

Now, the House has observed that in clause 118 of the British North America Act, which I have just read, the capitation allowance of the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick was fixed at a maximum

of 400,000 population. This rule was applied also to Manitoba and British Columbia. The reason why the maximum was fixed at 400,000 population is not very apparent, but I imagine that it was supposed at that time that the population of these provinces was not likely to reach a very much higher figure than 400,000. And this calculation has proven true. It took years for Nova Scotia to reach that maximum ; New Brunswick has not reached it yet, nor has Manitoba nor British Columbia. But it would be manifestly unfair to these new provinces to limit their maximum to 400,000. Already the population is about 250,000. Therefore, instead of fixing the maximum at 400,000 population, we have fixed it at 800,000.

A more important allowance is the allowance for debt. And this is what we propose:

Inasmuch as the province is not in debt, the said province should be entitled to be paid and to receive from the government of Canada by half-yearly instalments, interest at the rate of 5 per cent on the sum of $8,107,500.

The reason of this is familiar to everybody, but perhaps, it is not unimportant that I should review it here, and present it again to the House. In 1867, when confederation was established the debts of the provinces were assumed by the Dominion—the debts of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Now, the debt at that time of Old Canada, that is the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, amounted to $67,000,000 in round numbers. The debt of New Brunswick was about $7,000,000 and that of Nova Scotia about $8,000,000. It so happened that the debt of New Brunswick represented an average of about $25 per head of the population, and the debt of Nova Scotia of about $8,000,000 was nearly the same per head of her population. The debt of Old Canada was a little greater per head. Therefore, when allowance was made for the debts of the provinces, the debt of Ontario and Quebec was taken not at $67,000,000, but at $62,000,00. That is, Ontario and Quebec were each relieved of about $31,000,000, Nova Scotia of $8,000,000, and New Brunswick of $7,000,000. The provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick entered confederation without debt, while Ontario and Quebec had between them a debt of about $5,000,000. Later on, new arrangements were made, new debts of the provinces were assumed by the Dominion, and the provinces were freed from such liabilities. By this means the capitation allowance for debt was increased from $25 to $32.43 per head. This is the last allowance that was made for debt, and, if I remember well this was made by statute passed in 1884 or 1885. Therefore, we make this allowance of $34.43 per head to these new provinces. They have a population of 250,000 souls each. This makes a total of $8,107,500.

Mr. FOSTER. On the basis of $32.43 ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. On the basis of $32.43, $8,107,500. Upon this we allow the large rate of interest which has been given to all the provinces of 5 per cent. We now come to the allowance for land.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the right hon. gentleman touches the land—he has spoken of the population of the Territories as amounting, at the present time, to 500,000 souls, and the allowance both for debt and subsidies based on that ; would he be good enough to give us any information in his possession as to that question ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As I stated a moment ago, by the last census the population of the Northwest Territories was 165,555 souls. Since that time increases have been made, and the population now amounts, according to the last returns placed in my hands, to 417,956 souls. The population is increasing rapidly.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the basis of the estimate ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The returns mostly of immigration, but I will give the exact basis as we have it correctly from the Interior Department. Total population as per census of 1901, 165,555 souls ; increase of population by homesteaders since the census of 1901, 221,251 souls.

Mr. FOSTER. Entries or actual settlers ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know that they are actual entries, but we calculate the population upon entries for homesteads. I will read the figures :

Population at present of Northwest Territories (estimated) 417,956.	
Total population as per census of 1901..	165,555
Increase of population of homesteaders since the census of 1901..	221,251
Increase of population other than homesteaders since census, 1901, say.. .. .. (Estimated from Waghorn's Guide.)	16,000
Estimated natural increase of the population at 1901 to date is..	9,900
Estimated natural increase of the increase of population in 1902 to date is	1,935
Estimated natural increase of the increase of population in 1903 to date is	2,370
Estimated natural increase of the increase of population in 1904 to date is	945
	417,956

Now, this Act is not to come into force until the 1st of July, and we estimate that by the 1st of July the population will have increased to 500,000 souls. This is the basis of our calculation. Now, I said a moment ago, and the House seemed to agree with me, that as we retain the lands in our own hands, it is natural and to be expected that government and parliament would be liberal in their allowance to the new provinces for compensation in that respect. Manitoba, which has an area of 73,000 square miles, received as compensation for her lands some fifteen or twenty years ago an annual grant of $100,000. Apart from that, Manitoba has

received the swamp lands. The swamp lands are perhaps the most valuable lands in the province of Manitoba. They require some preliminary work for drainage, but when drained there are no better lands in the whole province. When the late government gave to the province of Manitoba the swamp lands, they made her a valuable gift, and it has proved to her a most important asset. But the Northwest Territories have no swamp lands, we could not do for them what the government did for the province of Manitoba. We have, therefore, made the following arrangement, which we commend to the favourable consideration of the House :

As the public lands in the said provinces are to remain the property of Canada, there shall be paid by Canada to the said provinces annually by way of compensation therefor a sum based upon the estimated value of such lands, (namely, $37,500,000) ; the same being assumed to be of an area of 25,000,000 acres and to be of the value of $1.50 per acre, and upon the population of the said provinces as from time to time ascertained by the quinquennial census thereof, such sum to be arrived at as follows :—

The population of the said provinces being assumed to be at present 250,000, the sum payable until such population reaches 400,000 is to be one per cent on such estimated value, or $375,000.

Thereafter until such population reaches 800,000, the sum payable is to be one and one-half per cent on such estimated value, or $562,500.

Thereafter until such population reaches 1,200,000, the sum payable is to be two per cent on such estimated value, or $750,000.

And thereafter such payment is to be three per cent on such estimated value, or $1,112,500.

In additional compensation for such lands, there shall be paid by Canada to such province annually for five years from the time this Act comes into force to provide for the construction of necessary public buildings, $62,500.

Let me now recapitulate to see the minimum each province is to receive. At present, this year, the province is to receive for civil government $50,000 ; for capitation allowance, $200,000, which is going to increase until the population has reached 800,000 souls. It will receive for debt allowance $405,375, and this year it will receive also for land compensation $375,000 ; total, $1,030,375, to which sum must be added, for five years, $62,500, in order to allow the province to provide for her buildings and public works generally.

This is the minimum which will be paid to the province. The only thing new in these arrangements is in respect to the lands. The maximum which will be paid to the province at any time when the population shall have reached 1,200,000 souls is $1,125,000 ; that is to say, we pay to each of these provinces the maximum sum of $1,125,000 as compensation for the lands which we retain in our possession. I submit to the House that this is a very fair, a very moderate and very equitable adjustment indeed ; at all events, I so present it to the House, and I think it will be so regarded.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The maximum of the subsidy to the provinces will be reached, as I understand it, when the population reaches the number of 1,200,000. The total annual payments of all kinds reach their maximum when the population reaches the number of 1,200,000, that is, including both the per capita allowance and the allowance for land. Would the right hon. gentleman be good enough to tell us just what that maximum sum will be, including both the subsidy and the allowance in respect of land ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The per capita allowance will be $640,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But the total of all kinds. Perhaps if the right hon. gentleman has not the figures it is not important.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The total of all kinds would be in the neighbourhood of a little more than $2,000,000.

Now, Sir, it is my duty to advert to a special feature of this Bill, a feature which I wish we could have averted, and which we introduced with great respect. The special clause which I now call the attention of the House to is as follows :—

The territory comprised in the said province shall be and continue to be subject to all such provisions as shall have been enacted respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

It is within the memory of the House, I have no doubt, that the contract which was made with the Canadian Pacific Railway contained a most extraordinary provision. It was the 16th section :

The Canadian Pacific Railway and all stations and station grounds, workshops, buildings, yards and other property, rolling stock and appurtenances required and used for the construction and working thereof and the capital stock of the company shall be for ever free from taxation by the Dominion, or by any province hereafter to be established or by any municipal corporation therein.

Thus it happens that in 1881 the then parliament deliberately gave to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which it was incorporating, an absolute exemption from federal, provincial and municipal taxation. It was an extraordinary contract, but the fact stares us in the face, and it is in accordance with British precedent and British policy that contracts have to be executed whether they are good or bad, whether they are advantageous or disadvantageous. In 1884 or 1885, when the limits of the province of Manitoba were extended westward, a similar provision was introduced into the Act of that time to exempt the company from taxation by that province in the territory thus added to her limits. We have to do the same thing to-day. It is a most lamentable condition of things, but all I have to say to the provinces, is that they have to abide

by the conditions which exist. In this respect, however, they are in no worse position than the Dominion government itself. We stand to-day, to use a common phrase in the same box. If the Minister of Finance were to introduce a budget wherein he thought it advantageous for the Dominion of Canada to impose taxation upon big corporations, upon the Grand Trunk Railway Company, upon the Bank of Montreal, upon all the other banks and corporations we could do so, but we could not lay a farthing of taxation on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. That is the result of the condition of things which was enacted by this parliament twenty-four years ago. At that time the opposition led by Mr. Blake protested vigorously against that provision. Mr. Charlton moved the following amendment :—

That the contract respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway exempts perpetually the railway and all stations and station grounds, workshops, buildings, yards and other property, rolling stock and appurtenances, required for the construction and working thereof, and the capital stock of the company, from taxation by the Dominion or by any other province hereafter established, or by any municipal corporation therein. That the property of the corporation shall be in substance a gift from the public ; and its exemption from taxation is unjust, creates an unfair incidence of taxation, and gives an undue advantage to the company over other railway companies, calculated to prevent the construction of competing lines, and the contract is, in this respect, objectionable.

Unfortunately this amendment was defeated and that clause of the contract was carried into effect. We have to deal with it to-day as we find it and the provinces as well as the Dominion have to abide by it. All I can say at this moment is that if our efforts and their efforts could rid the new provinces of this incubus, we would be only too glad to give them all the help and assistance in our power, but it is not possible to do so, except by some method that I am not able at the present time to find out. It might be by the way of legislation, it might be through a mutual agreement, or by expropriation. There are some of these methods perhaps open to us, but I have only to say at this moment, that, regrettable as it is, the Dominion and the provinces the provinces and the Dominion must abide by it loyally until such time as it may be possible to find a remedy. That is all I have to say upon the financial clauses of the contract.

I now come to the question of education, and this question is perhaps under existing circumstances the most important of all that we have to deal with. There are evidences not a few coming to us from all directions, that the old passions which such a subject has always aroused are not, unfortunately, buried ; indeed, already, before the policy of the government has been known, before the subject is fairly before the people, the government has been warned as to its duty in this matter, and not only warned but threatened as well. The government has been warned, threatened from both sides of this question, from those who believe in separate schools and from those who oppose separate schools. These violent appeals are not a surprise to me, at all events, nor do I believe they are a surprise to anybody. We have known by the experience of the past, within the short life of this confederation, that public opinion is always inflammable whenever questions arise which ever so remotely touch upon the religious convictions of the people. It behooves us therefore all the more at this solemn moment to approach this subject with care, with calmness and deliberation and with the firm purpose of dealing with it not only in accordance with the inherent principles of abstract justice, but in accordance with the spirit—the Canadian spirit of tolerance and charity, this Canadian spirit of tolerance and charity of which confederation is the essence and of which in practice it ought to be the expression and embodiment. Before I proceed further, before I pass the threshold of this question, I put at once this inquiry to the House : What are separate schools ? What is the meaning of the term ? Whence does it come, what was its origin and what was its object ? Perhaps somebody will say : What is the use of discussing such a question ? The term separate schools ought to be familiar to every one. Sir, if any one were to make such an observation and to interpose such an objection, I would tell him that never was objection taken with less ground. Mankind is ever the same. New problems and new complications will always arise, but new problems and complications, when they do arise, always revolve within the same well beaten circle of man's passions, man's prejudices and man's selfishness. History therefore should be a safe guide, and it is generally by appealing to the past, by investigating the problems with which our fathers had to deal, that we may find the solutions of the complications that face us. If we look back to the history of our own country, if we find what is the origin of the separate schools, perhaps history may be the pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night to show us the way and give us the light.

Separate schools, Sir, go back to the old days of the legislature of Lower Canada. In these old days the system of schools in my province, in my native province, was rudimentary ; there was practically no system, but from year to year allowances were made by the legislature for the support and maintenance of schools. I need not say that the population within the limits of the province of Lower Canada at that time was, as it is to-day, divided in origin and in creed ; it was largely Roman Catholic with a small Protestant minority. I am glad to say, and perhaps it would be permitted if, in this matter, being myself a son of the province of Quebec I indulged in

N.B.

what may be not altogether unpardonable pride when I say, that I am not aware that the Protestant minority ever had any cause of complaint of the treatment they had received at the hands of the majority. One of the most eminent men of that day, one of the most eminent colleagues of Sir John Macdonald at the time of confederation, Sir John Rose, bore ample testimony to what I have now stated. This is what he said speaking in the confederation debate :

Now we, the English Protestant minority of Lower Canada, cannot forget that whatever right of separate education we have, was accorded to us in the most unrestricted way before the union of the provinces, when we were in a minority and entirely in the hands of the French population. We cannot forget that in no way was there any attempt to prevent us educating our children in the manner we saw fit and deemed best ; and I would be untrue to what is just if I forgot to state that the distribution of state funds for educational purposes was made in such a way as to cause no complaint on the part of the minority.

The system, as I said, was rudimentary ; it became more effective, more regulative, after the union of the two provinces, Upper and Lower Canada in 1841.

Mr. SPROULE. Would that not seem to be an argument in favour of leaving it to the provinces ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall come to that presently and I hope I will be able to satisfy my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) if he will have an open ear on this subject. In 1841 the parliament of United Canada passed a law for the establishment of schools all over the province. Section 11 of that statute provided that :

Whenever any number of the inhabitants of any township or parish professing a religious faith different from that of the majority of the inhabitants of such township or parish, shall dissent from the regulations, arrangements, or proceedings of the common school commissioners, with reference to any common school in such township or parish it shall be lawful for the inhabitants so dissenting, collectively to signify such dissent in writing to the clerk of the district council . . . . and it shall be lawful for such dissenting inhabitants . . . . to establish and maintain one or more common schools in the manner and subject to the visitation, conditions, rules and obligations in this Act provided, with reference to other common schools.

Section 12 enacted that :

No common schools shall be entitled to any apportionment of money out of the common school fund except on the terms and conditions following :

And so forth. No exception was made, whether they were separate or common schools. But it appears that some doubt arose in Upper Canada as to whether or not separate schools were entitled to state aid. In 1855 a school law was adopted and this section was passed.

Every such separate school shall be entitled to share in the fund annually granted by the legislature of the province for the support of common schools according to the average number of pupils attending such school during the twelve preceding months, or during the number of months that may have elapsed from the establishment of said such school as compared with the whole number of pupils attending the schools in the said city, town or village.

In 1863 a law was passed upon this same subject and that was the last passed on the subject by the old legislature of Canada before confederation, not to enact a new principle but simply to confirm the principle of separate schools. I remember very well—I was a young man in those days, a law student in Montreal—that the discussion of that law created a great deal of passion, but it was passed by an overwhelming majority in the parliament of Canada.

Before I proceed, let me make a few observations to show the origin and object of all this legislation concerning separate schools. You find in this legislation the terms constantly recurring of Protestant or Catholic. I need not say that the Christian religion is not only a religion founded on moral laws, prescribing moral duties, but it is also a religion of dogmas. Dogmas from the earliest times have occupied just as strong and commanding a position in the faith of all Christians as morals themselves. The reformation created a cleavage between Christians. The old section remained Roman Catholics ; the new called themselves Protestants. Between the Roman Catholics and Protestants there is a deep divergence in dogmas. Between the various Protestant denominations there are but small differences in dogmas ; the differences are more matters of discipline than of dogma. Therefore the old legislature of Canada, finding a population of Catholics and different denominations of Protestants all mixed together, finding only one cause of cleavage between them in Christian faith, that is dogmas, allowed religious teaching to be had in all the schools of our country, so that every man could give to his own child the religious tenets which he held sometimes dearer than life. That is the whole meaning of separate schools.

I have just stated that in 1863 a law was passed on this subject. At that time, in 1863, there were two men in Canada who each within his own circle and his own party, maintained a sovereign sway. One was Mr. Macdonald, now known to history as Sir John Macdonald, and the other was Mr. George Brown. Mr. Macdonald was a supporter of separate schools. He gave to the law of 1863 his vote and his influence. Mr. George Brown, on the contrary, was a most determined opponent of separate schools. He attacked the system relentless-

ly ; he attacked it in his paper, on the floor of the House of Commons and upon the hustings. He attacked it with all the vehemence of his strongly impassioned nature. The arguments we hear to-day against separate schools are not new ; they were heard 50 years ago. The arguments we hear to-day are but the attenuated echo of the strong denunciations of Mr. Brown, which were heard by our fathers two generations ago. But the views of Mr. Brown did not prevail, and notwithstanding his efforts, he was not in the House when the law of 1863 passed, which confirmed to the Roman Catholic minority of Upper Canada the privilege of separate schools. In view of the agitation then maintained by Mr. Brown in favour of representation by population, it is perhaps not inopportune to analyse that vote. The Bill of 1863 in favour of separate schools was carried by a vote of 80 against a minority of 22. Of this minority of 22, 21 belonged to the province of Upper Canada, and of the majority of 80, 33 belonged to that province, so that, leaving the vote of Lower Canada aside, taking only the vote of Upper Canada, we find that the law of 1863 was carried by a majority of the representatives of Upper Canada at that time. This is significant. Mr. Brown at that time was carrying on the strong agitation which he had maintained for years, and which he continued to maintain in favour, within the constitution of that day, of representation by population.

Sir, if we review the events of that period of our history, we must all admit that the constitution of 1841, which united Upper Canada and Lower Canada, was radically faulty. It was so constructed that it never gave satisfaction to either province. Lower Canada from the first looked upon it as an instrument of oppression, designed to deprive her of some of those institutions which she held dearer than life. Yet she it was who in after years held to that constitution, and defended it against reforms which she regarded as fraught with still greater dangers to herself. Upper Canada accepted that constitution, not with any enthusiasm, but because it relieved her for the time from serious financial embarrassments. But Upper Canada, before many years had elapsed commenced also to find herself oppressed by the clumsy clauses which it contained, and sought relief in the agitation of Mr. Brown in favour of representation by population. The radical fault of the constitution of 1841 was that it was neither federative nor legislative. It united two provinces, but kept them as separate entities, gave them the same number of members, provided against an increase of representation, and allowed only a single executive. This equality in representation coupled with a single executive was a defect which no expedients thereafter could altogether overcome. As soon as Mr. Papineau had returned from exile, he attacked that feature of the constitution, and demanded its repeal. He was opposed by Mr. Lafontaine, not on principle, but simply from expediency. Mr. Lafontaine represented to him that Upper Canada would grow in population faster than Lower Canada, because as Upper Canada was getting an immigration which Lower Canada did not, Upper Canada would soon be the stronger province and therefore all the arguments which Mr. Papineau advanced for the repeal of that portion of the constitution on behalf of Lower Canada, would react against her. The predictions of Mr. Lafontaine as to the movement of population were soon fulfilled. Upper Canada became the more populous province. Then Mr. Brown took up the agitation where Mr. Papineau had left it, and carried it on for years, with never abating vigour. He opened a current in the public opinion of Upper Canada, which yearly increased in volume until it became well nigh irresistible ; successive and short-lived administrations succeeded one another, and the day came in 1864 when there were two hostile majorities, one from Lower Canada and one from Upper Canada, facing each other and unyielding. There was a deadlock, and the government of the Queen was almost impossible if not actually impossible in the province of Canada. That was Mr. Brown's opportunity, and he seized it, it must be said, with alertness and courage ; and whoever has to speak of those events must admit that on that occasion Mr. Brown rose to the highest stature of statesmanship. He was not satisfied to take advantage of the occasion simply to obtain the realization of the principle which he had at heart, but he made it the basis for a union of all the British provinces on the continent of America. That is his glory, and that is his chief title to fame—every Canadian acknowledges it. But, Sir, the difficulties of the task were simply enormous, greater in my judgment, at all events, than the difficulties which arose in connection with the creation of the American union. History has recorded how jealously, how tenaciously, the thirteen colonies, after their joint efforts had wrought their independence, each clung to its own individual life. History has recorded how reluctantly each of the thirteen colonies at last consented to part with those powers, the concession of which was necessary to form a strong central government. The incentive which proved effective, and which forced a final consent, was the memory of dangers which they had recently shared together, and the necessity of guarding against a possible recurrence of such dangers. No such sentiment abode in the Canadian colonies. The various Canadian colonies were isolated from one another—isolated by distances and by racial distinctions. The two groups which were ethnically connected,

Ontario and maritime provinces, were separated by long distances. The two groups which were geographically united, Ontario and Quebec, were separated by the deeper cleavage of difference of origin. In all there was a strong sense of local pride, in all there was a strong assertion of self interest, and in all there were peculiar institutions as to the security of which all dreaded to be launched into the unknown. This was particularly true of education in Lower Canada and in Upper Canada. In Lower Canada the Protestant minority had long enjoyed their own system of separate schools. In Upper Canada the Roman Catholic minority had just secured a similar system. These two minorities feared that in the new constitution, under the separation of legislative powers which must ensue, the rights of each might be put in jeopardy by a hostile majority. The minority of Lower Canada felt perfectly secure under the then existing condition of things because those of their own creed and race were in the majority in United Canada. The Roman Catholic minority in Upper Canada feared also the constitution because it would be deprived of the powerful alliance of those of their own origin in another province. Under such circumstances, what was to be done? How could a scheme of confederation be devised so as to ensure the support of all parties and sections of the community? It is useless to speculate as to what might have been done. It is sufficient to say that means were found to insure to the minority in each province, the free exercise of its rights, and that means was to declare that in the provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, the rights of the minority, which were to be entrusted to the respective legislatures of these provinces, were to be above the control of the majority. Let me recall to the House the Quebec resolutions which were adopted and which were the basis and the charter under which the Canadian parliament now lives and the Canadian nation has been formed. Section 93 of the Quebec resolutions states as follows, and I pray you, Sir, mark the language :—

> The local legislatures shall have power to make laws respecting the following subjects :—
>
> 1. Direct taxation, and in New Brunswick the imposition of duties on the export of timber, logs, masts, spars, deals and sawn lumber ; and in Nova Scotia, of coals and other minerals.
>
> 2. Borrowing money on the credit of the province.
>
> 3. The establishment and tenure of local offices, and the appointment and payment of local officers.
>
> 4. Agriculture.
>
> 5. Immigration.
>
> 6. Education ; saving the rights and privileges which the Protestant or Catholic minority in both Canadas may possess as to their denominational schools at the time when the union goes into operation.

Again I say, mark the language. The

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

legislatures of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario were given the power to make laws for the following purposes :

> Direct taxation.
> Borrowing money.
> The establishment and tenure of local office.
> Agriculture and colonization.

Upon all these subjects their powers are unlimited and they can do as they please, without any check, except their responsibility to the people of their respective provinces. Then on the subject of education the legislatures of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick can do as they please and are not responsible to any one except to the people. But when we come to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, we find that the powers of these two provinces are limited as regards education. Neither the legislature of Ontario nor that of Quebec was given power to pass any law which might prejudicially affect the rights of the minority in either province. So long as this constitution endures the schools of the minority in Quebec and Ontario must likewise endure. Yet, remarkable as is this enactment, it is perhaps still more remarkable, if we remember that one of the men who assented to this limitation to the power of the province of Ontario was Mr. George Brown himself—Mr. George Brown who said again and again that he was opposed to separate schools, who had carried on a crusade of years against separate schools in his province. If you look only at the surface of things, without trying to find the inspiration, it is indeed remarkable that Mr. Brown, who, with Sir John Macdonald was the central figure, agreed that the powers of the legislature of his own province should be limited in that respect. We need not marvel if Mr. Brown was attacked and assailed for the action he then took. He was assailed perhaps by some of his own disciples whom he had taught to object to separate schools as strongly as he did himself. Mr. Brown defended his course in the confederation debate, or rather he explained his policy, because he was under no necessity to defend his course ; and I beg on this occasion to commend his language to those who to-day have forgotten confederation, when he came to discuss the 43rd resolution. He spoke as follows :—

> The people of Upper Canada will have another legislature for their local matters and will no longer have to betake themselves to Quebec for leave to open a road, to select a county town, or appoint a coroner. But I am told that to this general principle of placing all local matters under local control, an exception has been made in regard to the common schools. (Hear, hear.)
>
> The clause complained of is as follows :—
>
> 6. Education, saving the rights and privileges which the Protestant or Catholic minority in both Canadas may possess as to their denominational schools at the time when the union goes into operation.

Now, continued Mr. Brown :—

I need hardly remind the House that I have always opposed and continue to oppose the system of sectarian education, so far as the public chest is concerned. I have never had any hesitation on that point, I have never been able to see why all the people in the province, to whatever sect they may belong, should not send their children to the same schools to receive the ordinary branches of instruction. I regard the parent and the pastor as the best religious instructors—and so long as the religious faith of the children is not interfered with, and ample opportunity afforded to the clergy to give religious instruction to the children of their flocks, I cannot see any sound objection to mixed schools. But while in the conference and elsewhere I have always maintained this view, and always given my vote against sectarian public schools, I am bound to admit, as I have always admitted, that the sectarian system carried to the limited extent it has yet been in Upper Canada, and confined as it chiefly is to cities and towns, has not been a very great practical injury. The real cause of a line was that the admission of the sectarian principle was there, and that at any moment it might be extended to such a degree as to split up our school system altogether. There are about a hundred separate schools in Upper Canada, out of some 4,000, and all Roman Catholic. But if the Roman Catholics are entitled to separate schools and to go on extending their operations, so are the members of the Church of England, the Presbyterians, the Methodists, and all other sects. No candid Roman Catholic will deny this for a moment ; and there lays the great danger to our educational fabric, lest the separate system might gradually extend itself until the whole country was studded with nurseries of sectarianism, most hurtful to the best interests of the province and entailing an enormous expense to sustain the host of teachers that so prodigal a system of public instruction must inevitably entail. Now, it is known to every hon. member of this House that an Act was passed in 1863 as a final settlement of this sectarian controversy. I was not in Quebec at the time, but if I had been here, I would have voted against that Bill because it extended the facilities for establishing separate schools. It had, however, this good feature, that it was accepted by the Roman Catholic authorities and carried to parliament as a final compromise of the question in Upper Canada. When, therefore, it was proposed that a provision should be inserted in the confederation scheme to bind that contract of 1863 and declare it a final settlement, so that we should not be compelled, as we have been since 1849, to stand constantly to our arms, awaiting fresh attacks upon our common school system, the proposition seemed to me one that was not rashly to be rejected. (Hear, hear.) I admit that, from my point of view, this is a blot on the scheme before the House ; it is confessedly, one of the concessions from our side that had to be made to secure this great measure of reform. But assuredly, I, for one, have not the slightest hesitation in accepting it as a necessary condition of the scheme of union, and doubly acceptable must it be in the eyes of hon. gentlemen opposite, who were the authors of the Bill of 1863. (Cheers.) But it was urged that though this arrangement might perhaps be fair as regards Upper Canada, it was not so as regards Lower Canada, for there were matters of which the British population have long complained. and some amendments to the existing School Act were required to secure them equal justice. Well, when this point was raised, gentlemen of all parties in Lower Canada at once expressed themselves prepared to treat it in a frank and conciliatory manner, with a view to removing any injustice that might be shown to exist ; and on this understanding the educational clause was adopted by the conference.

Mr. T. C. WALLBRIDGE. That destroys the power of the local legislature to legislate upon the subject.

Hon. Mr. BROWN. I would like to know how much power the hon. gentleman has now to legislate upon it ? Let him introduce a Bill today to annul the contract of 1863 and repeal all the sectarian School Acts of Upper Canada, and how many votes would he get for it ? Would twenty members vote for it out of the 130 who compose this House ? If the hon. gentleman had been struggling for fifteen years, as I have been, to save the school system of Upper Canada from further extension of the sectarian element, he would have precious little diminution of power over it in this very moderate compromise. And what says the hon. gentleman to leaving the British population of Lower Canada in the unrestricted powers of the local legislature ? The common schools of Lower Canada are not as in Upper Canada—they are almost entirely non-sectarian, Roman Catholic schools. Does the hon. gentleman, then, desire to compel the Protestants of Lower Canada to avail themselves of Roman Catholic institutions or leave their children without instruction ?

Let us pause a moment to consider this language. Mr. Brown did not believe in separate schools. He had struggled all his life against that system. But a great object had to be achieved, a noble conception had to be realized, an inspiring idea had to be made a fact, and in order to reach that supreme goal, differences of opinion had to be reconciled, fears and apprehensions had to be removed, misgivings had to be alleviated, and above all the rights of conscience, the tender rights of conscience, had to be placed in as firm a position of security as they previously enjoyed, so that no one could object, and all, without regard to origin or creed, could give a cheerful and enthusiastic support to the new constitution.

Sir, Mr. Brown told his friends that he did not believe in separate schools ; but there were fellow-citizens of his in Ontario and in Quebec who believed in separate schools, and, in order to remove their objections and win their co-operation in the scheme which was the great work of his life, he agreed to make the sacrifice of his own convictions. In order to achieve the great object he had at heart, he agreed to fasten upon his own province a system in which he did not believe, but in which others did believe. Sir, for more than twenty years Mr. Brown has been in his grave ; but his memory is not dead. And if his teachings and his spirit be still alive, it is surely in the hearts of that staunch yeomanry of Ontario who gave him such constant support during the years of his political struggles. They followed him devot-

edly in his crusade against separate schools. They followed him even more devotedly, when he asked them to accept separate schools, to sacrifice their own opinions, and his own, upon the altar of the new country which it was his ambition to establish on this portion of the North American continent. If it were my privilege that my poor words might reach that staunch yeomanry of Ontario, I would remind them that the work of confederation is not yet finished; I would tell them that we are now engaged in advancing it; and I would ask them whether we are now to reverse our course, or whether we are not to continue to work it out to completion on the lines laid down by the great leader himself.

Now, Sir, such was the condition of things at the time of confederation. But I shall be told that this exception applies to Ontario and Quebec alone, and not to the other provinces. Sir, that is true. Amongst the four provinces then united, Ontario and Quebec alone had a system of separate schools. But I reminded the House a moment ago that it was not the intention of the fathers of confederation, it was not the intention of Sir John Macdonald or Mr. Brown to limit confederation to the narrow bounds it had in 1867. They had made provision in the very instrument of confederation, to extend it over the northern part of the continent; they had made provision to take in British Columbia, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island; they had made provision to take in also the Northwest Territories, which were then uninhabited, but which now have a teeming population and are at our doors asking admission. Is it reasonable to suppose, if the Confederation Act recognizes that other provinces were to come into confederation similarly situated to Ontario and Quebec, that the same privileges should not be given to the minority as were given to the minority in Ontario and Quebec? What would have been the value of the invitation to enter confederation, if the provinces invited to enter, had been told that the security to the minority given to Ontario and Quebec was a privilege which they need not expect from us? Section 43 of the Quebec resolutions has become section 93 of the British North America Act, and is no longer confined to Quebec and Ontario. Here it is:

> In and for each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provision:—
>
> 1. Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union.

So, Sir, now whenever a province comes here knocking at this door, asking to be admitted into confederation, if in that province there exists a system of separate schools, the British North America Act has provided that the same guarantee we give to the minority in Quebec and Ontario shall also be given to the minority in that province. Shortly after confederation had been established, that is, in the year 1870, the parliament of Canada had an opportunity of applying the doctrine contained in the British North America Act in the creation of the province of Manitoba. Until its admission into the Dominion, Manitoba had no regular government. It had been loosely administered by the Hudson Bay Company. There had been some schools in it, maintained by such authority as there was. There had been separate schools maintained by Roman Catholic missionaries. It was the intention of parliament to give the minority the system that they had before confederation; and, so marked was their intention, that instead of accepting without qualification the words of section 93 of the British North America Act, 'right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union,' they made it read 'by law or practice in the province at the union.' It turned out, as determined by judicial authority, that the province of Manitoba, when it entered confederation, had no system of schools either by law or practice. It followed, as a consequence, that the power of the province of Manitoba with regard to the subject of education was as complete as that of the province of Nova Scotia or the province of New Brunswick. This is a principle which was not understood at the time by hon. gentlemen opposite when they were on this side of the House. There was the fact, the positive fact—the power of the province of Manitoba with regard to education was as unshackled as that of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. In 1875, as I stated a moment ago, Mr. Mackenzie introduced an Act for the government of the Northwest Territories, and in this Act the parliament of Canada, which, at that time, had among its members some of the ablest men who ever sat in a Canadian parliament—Sir John Macdonald, Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Blake, Sir Charles Tupper and a score of others—unanimously, deliberately and with their eyes open, introduced into the Northwest Territories the system of separate schools. And not only that, but the parliament of Canada, four times successively—in 1880, in 1885, in 1886 and in 1898—deliberately and with their eyes open, ratified the system of separate schools in the Territories.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask here one question, if the right hon. gentleman will allow me?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. The right hon. gentleman gave the House to understand that Hon. George Brown supported the principle of separate schools. May I ask if it is not true that Mr. Brown, in 1875, op-

posed the principle of authorizing separate schools in the Territories, voted against it and gave his reasons ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am delighted that my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) has asked me that question. In 1875, when the Bill to which I have referred went through parliament, Mr. Brown who was a member of one branch of this parliament, opposed the introduction of the new clause in that Bill providing for separate schools. He opposed it with all his might. He told the House that he had not changed his mind upon the subject, but he told the House also that if the principle of separate schools was introduced, then, according to the terms of the constitution, it was introduced for all time to come. I am delighted that my hon. friend brought my attention to this, because really the whole subject is contained in the question of my hon. friend. We have to decide this problem upon the very terms of the legislation which was introduced in 1875. Let me give to my hon. friend all the information to which he is entitled, and which I fain would hope will fall upon favourable ground ; I will give him the whole history of that matter. Mr. Mackenzie himself introduced the Bill in 1875. The Bill as first introduced made no mention of separate schools ; but after he had sat down and when Sir John A. Macdonald had spoken on the subject, Mr. Blake rose and brought this very subject of separate schools to the attention of the House, and he did it with a height and breadth of thought which I hope will command the admiration of my hon. friend. This is what Mr. Blake said :

> The task which the ministry had set for itself was the most important it was possible to conceive. To found primary institutions under which we hope to see hundreds of thousands, and the more sanguine among us think millions of men and families settled and flourishing, was one of the noblest undertakings that could be entered upon by any legislative body, and it was no small indication of the power and true position of this Dominion that parliament should be engaged to-day in that important task. He agreed with the hon. member for Kingston that the task was one that required time, consideration and deliberation, and they must take care that no false steps were made in such work. He did not agree with that right hon. gentleman that the government ought to repeal his errors. The right hon. gentleman had tried the institutions for the Northwest Territories which he now asked the House to frame, and for the same reason as he had given to-day—that it would be better for the Dominion government to keep matters in their own hands and decide what was best for the future. He (Mr. Blake) believed that it was essential to our obtaining a large immigration to the Northwest that we should tell the people beforehand what those rights were to be in the country in which we invited them to settle. It was interesting to the people to know that at the very earliest moment there was a sufficient aggregate of population within a reasonable distance, that aggregation would have a voice in the self-government of the territories, and he believed the Dominion government was wise, (although the measure might be brought down very late this session and it might be found impossible to give it due consideration) in determining in advance of settlement what the character of the institutions of the country should be in which we invite people to settle.
>
> He regarded it as essential under the circumstances of the country, and in view of the deliberation during the last few days that a general principle should be laid down in the Bill with respect to public instruction. He did believe that we ought not to introduce into that territory the heart burnings and difficulties with which certain other portions of this Dominion and other countries had been afflicted. It seemed to him, having regard to the fact that, as far as we could expect at present, the general character of that population would be somewhat analogous to the population of Ontario, that there should be some provision in the constitution by which they should have conferred upon them the same rights and privileges in regard to religious instruction as those possessed by the people of the province of Ontario. The principles of local self-government and the settling of the question of public instruction, it seemed to him, ought to be the cardinal principles of the measure.

Now let me call renewed attention to these words of Mr. Blake : 'I regard it as essential under the circumstances of the country, and in view of the deliberation of the last few days.' What were the deliberations of those last few days in the House of Commons to which Mr. Blake alluded ? Why, Sir, it was a resolution on that very subject of separate schools, separate schools in the province of New Brunswick, where at that time, and by the constitution, the principle of separate schools was not adopted ; the minority was asking for separate schools, and came to this House for relief, but the House would not grant the relief because they would not invade the constitution. Mr. Blake said that instead of having such a state of things in the Northwest Territories it would be better to give to the people the religious instruction that all classes might want. Now what was Mr. Mackenzie's answer to this ?

> As to the subject of public instruction, it did not in the first place attract his attention, but when he came to the subject of local taxation he was reminded of it. Not having had time before to insert a clause on the subject, he proposed to do so when the Bill was in committee. The clause provided that the Lieutenant Governor by and with the consent of his council or assembly, as the case might be, should pass all necessary ordinances in respect of education, but it would be specially provided that the majority of the ratepayers might establish such schools and impose such necessary assessment as they might think fit ; and that the minority of the ratepayers, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, might establish separate schools ; and such ratepayers would be liable only to such educational assessments as they might impose upon themselves. This he

hoped would meet the objection offered by the hon. member for South Bruce. There might be some amendments found necessary in the Bill, but he thought it would be found generally speaking to meet the requirements of the country. However, the government would be very glad to avail themselves as far as possible of such suggestions as might be made to them.

When the Bill was in committee Mr. Mackenzie proposed this clause, which was inserted in the Bill, not one member objecting to it, neither Sir John A. Macdonald, nor Sir Charles Tupper, nor any member on the government side of the House :

When and so soon as any system of taxation shall be adopted in any district or portion of the Northwest Territories, the Lieutenant Governor and council or assembly, as the case may be, shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect of education, and it shall therein be always provided that a majority of ratepayers in any district may establish such schools therein as they may think fit, and make the necessary assessment and rates therefor, and further that the minority of ratepayers therein whether Protestant or Roman Catholics, may establish separate schools therein, and that in such case the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessment of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect therof.

Now this Bill went over to the other branch of the legislature, and there also I will give to my hon. friend who interrupted me a moment ago, the whole history of the debate upon this Bill. Mr. Aikens, who was then a prominent member of that body, moved to strike out the education clause altogether. He was answered by my hon. friend and colleague of to-day, the Secretary of State, who then as now was the leader of the Senate :

Any gentleman would have to admit that it was the greatest possible relief to the people of Ontario that this question was settled for them, and was not, as in some of the other provinces, a source of constant discord. He was one of those who maintained that parents had a right to educate their children as they pleased, and that they ought not to be taxed to maintain schools to which they could not conscientiously send their children. Our whole system of government was based upon that sound principle.

Now, Sir, I will give to my hon. friend the opinion of the Hon. Mr. Brown. But, before doing so, let me give him the opinion of a prominent member of his own party, Sir Alexander Campbell, who was then leader of the Conservative party in the Senate. Sir Alexander Campbell spoke as follows :—

It would be much to be regretted if the amendment passed. The object of the Bill was to establish and perpetuate in the Northwest Territories the same system as prevailed in Ontario and Quebec and which had worked so well in the interests of peace and harmony with the different populations of those provinces. He thought the fairer course, and the better one, for all races and creeds, was to adopt the suggestion of the government and enable people to establish separate schools in that territory and thus prevent the introduction of evils from which Ontario and Quebec had suffered, but had judiciously rid themselves.

I will now give to my hon. friend the language of Mr. Brown, this is it :

The safe way for us was to let each province suit itself in such matters. This country was filled by people of all classes and creeds, and there would be no end of confusion if each class had to have its own peculiar school system. It had been said this clause was put in for the protection of the Protestants against the Catholics, the latter being the most numerous. But he, speaking for the Protestants, was in a position to say that we did not want that protection.

Later on Mr. Brown spoke as follows :

Hon. Mr. Brown said he concurred with what had fallen from his hon. friends on the treasury benches, and from hon. gentlemen who had spoken on the amendment, with respect to the propriety of allowing separate schools. But the question was not whether those schools were right or wrong, good or bad, but as to whether it was wise for this country to deal with this question. He quite admitted the importance of the issue which had been raised—whether this matter should be referred to the province interested for settlement, or be brought to the Dominion legislature.

The moment——

——continued Mr. Brown——

——this Act passed and the Northwest became part of the union, they came under the Union Act, and under the provisions with regard to separate schools.

Sir, I commend this language to my hon. friend. I commend this language to every man in this House. There are to-day, as there were then, men in this House and out of it who do not believe in separate schools, but, as Mr. Brown said, the question is not whether that system is good or bad ; that is not the question to-day, that is not the question of which Senator Brown spoke, it is not the question with which we have to deal. But we have another duty to perform. Mr. Brown, on the floor of the other branch of the legislature, said that his opinions in regard to separate schools had not changed. He said practically this to the parliament of Canada : There is a new territory, there is virgin soil where there is no population. Do not introduce separate schools into it, do not introduce that burning question into it, but the moment you have introduced separate schools you have solved the question forever, it is part of the union and the minority will have its right to such schools.

Mr. SPROULE. The right hon. gentleman——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Now, we have introduced into this Bill—I beg my hon. friend's pardon.

Mr. SPROULE. I am only desirous of making one observation in regard to a part of Mr. Brown's speech which more directly refers to this subject and which the hon. gentleman has not quoted.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If that is the interruption of my hon. friend it was hardly worth while. I do not want to mislead the House. Can he find anything else than that Mr. Brown submitted the opinion that the moment separate schools were introduced they come under the Act of union, under clause 93 and that they were there to be maintained against the power of the legislature? Can he find anything else? Let him quote anything to the contrary.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Brown was arguing against the introduction of separate schools and he gives the following as his reasons:

He spoke in the interest of good feeling and harmony in the national councils. What else was the clause in the constitution empowering the provinces to settle the school question themselves inserted for, but to get quit of controversies like this in the Dominion, and to leave the schools to be managed according to the views of each locality? By this Bill they might raise the very serious issues in the Northwest which had proved so troublesome to Quebec and Ontario. No one would regret this more than he, and for this reason he would support the motion of the hon. member for Peel.

Which was that this clause should be dropped thus leaving it to the provinces.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is ever the old story—none so blind as those who will not see, none so deaf as those who will not hear. I repeat again that Mr. Brown, on the floor of the Senate, did not want this clause providing for separate schools to be introduced in the Act. He stated that it would be a mistake to introduce separate schools, he said that he was opposed to separate schools, but he said that if at that time separate schools were introduced they came under the Act of Union and they were there for all time. I do not want to be offensive, but if my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) is not blind he will understand the reasoning of Mr. Brown. That is the position that we have before us to-day. I am not here to advocate separate schools as an abstract proposition but we have introduced into this Bill the two propositions, that the minority shall have the power to establish their own schools and that they shall have the right to share in the public moneys. It is the law to-day. It is in accord with the constitution, with the British North America Act, and I commend it even to the biased judgment of my hon. friend. However, let me put a question to my hon. friend: If we were in the year 1867 and not in the year 1905, and, if we had to introduce into this Dominion the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, would my hon. friend tell me that these provinces would not have the same rights and privileges in regard to separate schools as were granted to Ontario and Quebec? Would he tell me that when you say to Ontario and Quebec: You shall have your separate schools, Alberta and Saskatchewan should be denied that privilege? The thing is preposterous. Let us rise above such considerations. In everything that I have said I have refrained from saying a single word upon the abstract principle of separate schools. I approach the question upon another and a broader ground, I approach the question not from the view of separate schools, but I approach it upon the higher ground of Canadian duty and Canadian patriotism. Having obtained the consent of the minority to this form of government, having obtained their consent to the giving up of their valued privileges, and their position of strength are we to tell them, now that confederation is established, that the principle upon which they consented to this arrangement, is to be laid aside and that we are to ride roughshod over them? I do not think that is a proposition which will be maintained in this House, nor do I believe it is the intention of the House. I offer at this moment no opinion at all upon separate schools as an abstract propostion, but I have no hesitation in saying that if I were to speak my mind upon separate schools, I would say that I never could understand what objection there could be to a system of schools wherein, after secular matters have been attended to, the tenets of the religion of Christ, even with the divisions which exist among His followers, are allowed to be taught. We live in a country wherein the seven provinces that constitute our nation, either by the will or by the tolerance of the people, in every school, Christian morals and Christian dogmas are taught to the youth of the country. We live by the side of a nation, a great nation, a nation for which I have the greatest admiration, but whose example I would not take in everything, in whose schools for fear that Christian dogmas in which all do not believe might be taught, Christian morals are not taught. When I compare these two countries, when I compare Canada with the United States, when I compare the status of the two nations, when I think upon their future, when I observe the social condition of civil society in each of them and when I observe in this country of ours, a total absence of lynchings and an almost total absence of divorces and murders, for my part, I thank heaven that we are living in a country where the young children of the land are taught Christian morals and Christian dogmas. Either the American system is right or the Canadian system is wrong. For my part I say this and I say it without hesitation. Time will show that we are in the right and in this instance as in many others, I

have an abiding faith in the institutions of my own country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) Mr. Speaker, it is obviously impossible for the House to discuss in an effective manner at the present stage the Bill which has been introduced by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I had hoped that I might have been put in possession of the Bill which has just been introduced, at a sufficiently early date to have enabled me to have made some remarks on it this afternoon, and I realize that one of the colleagues of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) had the intention to give me a copy of that Bill last evening. Owing doubtless, to circumstances over which he had no control, I did not receive it until a few minutes before the opening of the House this afternoon, and therefore I will not attempt any discussion of it to-day. Let me say, however, in the very few remarks that I propose to address to the House, that I congratulate the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) upon the change of heart which he has experienced during the past twelve months. Do I understand my right hon. friend to deny that there has been such a change. Let me say that I hold under my hand the 'Hansard' of September 24, 1903, a little more than a year ago, when the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in debate on this House, pressed upon the attention of the House many reasons, in his opinion very conclusive, why the granting of a provincial status to the Northwest Territories should be delayed for many years, and I am bound to say that every one of those reasons which at that time presented themselves to the right hon. gentleman as insuperable difficulties in the way of immediately granting provincial autonomy, exist to-day just as strongly as they did then. The view which I am presenting to the House at this moment was suggested by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) in these words :

> But the Prime Minister adduced arguments that were strong no doubt from this point of view that the Northwest Territories should not be granted local self-government for many years to come.

What was the right hon. gentleman's response to that ? Did he deny that that was his opinion at that time? No, he responded to the remarks of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) by ejaculating across the floor of the House 'hear, hear.' So therefore I have good reason to congratulate the right hon gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier upon his change of heart, because when I myself on October 14, 1903, moved in this House a resolution declaring that in the opinion of this House, the time had come when the government should take this question into immediate consideration, not one member of the government, not the right hon. gentleman himself, nor one of his colleagues ventured to say one single word upon this all-important subject. They put up in their place two or three gentlemen from the Northwest Territories of Canada to argue as strenuously as they could that the granting of a provincial status should not be accorded to these provinces in the immediate future. The resolution which I moved at that time, after reciting the unanimous resolutions passed by the legislature of the Northwest Territories set forth :

> That under the provisions of the British North America Act and amending Acts, the people of the several provinces of Canada enjoy large powers of local self-government committed to and exercised by the executive and legislature of each province.
>
> That the time has arrived when the same powers of local self-government should be granted to the people of the Northwest Territories of Canada and to this end the said representations and prayers contained in the said humble addresses should be taken into immediate consideration and acted upon forthwith.

The only answer from the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues at that time was the answer of contemptuous silence and the putting up, as I have said, of two or three gentlemen from the Northwest Territories to argue that the time had not yet arrived. Well, the right hon. gentleman Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and his colleagues required a certain stimulus and that came in due course. But one of the arguments, and perhaps as strong an argument as any that was presented to the House on that occasion, was the absence of the Minister of the Interior. It was said that it would be an injustice to the Northwest Territories of Canada to introduce or to attempt to pass through this House a measure of so great importance as that which has been introduced this afternoon unless the government and the House had the benefit of the advice, the experience and the intimate knowledge of that gentleman with regard to conditions in the Northwest Territories of Canada. We all very much regret the indisposition of the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton). It has unfortunately happened very often that he has been absent from sessions of this parliament, and we have endeavoured to facilitate the passage of his estimates through the House in his absence as much as possible. We all regret his indisposition I am sure, and we trust that in the early future and before any considerable progress is made with this Bill, we shall have in this House the presence of the hon. the Minister of the Interior and the benefit of his views with regard to the measure which has been presented by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

But I said that it required a certain stimulus to the right hon. gentleman to enable

him to appreciate the importance of this question. Letters were addressed to him and to members of his government, over and over again, by the Prime Minister of the Northwest Territories of Canada. To these letters an answer was sometimes deigned and sometimes no answer was given for months. Letters were written by the Prime Minister of the Northwest Territories, to the right hon. gentleman who leads the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), on May 19, 1904, and on June 1, 1904. This matter which has been presented to the House this afternoon as a matter of transcendent importance, not only to the Northwest of Canada, but to the people of this country from one end of it to the other, was so little regarded by the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues at that time, that the whole summer passed away without any answer having been vouchsafed to the Prime Minister of the Northwest Territories. It was only in the stress of an election campaign that the right hon. gentleman awoke to the fact that he had not answered those communications. They were written on May 19 and June 1; and it was on September 30, after parliament had been dissolved, and when a campaign was actually in progress, that the right hon. gentleman was good enough to remember that he had not given any answer to the Prime Minister of the Northwest Territories. Then the matter seemed to him to possess a little more importance than he had previously considered. I will not deal with his answer now; there will be a better opportunity later on for dealing with the subjects with which it is concerned. But he did say this

> In reference to your letter of the 1st of June, I do not think I need discuss at length the representations which it contains further than to intimate my opinion that circumstances have justified the wisdom of the course adopted by my government in declining to deal finally two years ago with the many important questions involved in the admission of the Northwest Territories into confederation as a province or provinces.

Did not the right hon. gentleman realize, when he wrote that letter, that it was not two years ago, but about 11 months before, that he himself had stood up in this House and voted against the proposal even to consider the question of the admission of the Northwest Territories into the confederation on a provincial basis? He went on:

> Rapid development has taken place in the Northwest Territories during the intervening period.

Does he not remember that in the course of the debate to which I have referred, we pointed out that that development was not only going on, but might be expected to continue in the near future at even a greater rate? However, I will not deal with that subject further than to repeat that, in view of what I have brought to the attention of the right hon. gentleman, and apparently what he himself had forgotten, there is evident in his remarks to-day a marked change from the opinion he expressed in this House on the occasion to which I have referred, when he voted against the proposal that the request, the unanimous request, of the representatives and the government of the Northwest Territories should be taken into immediate consideration.

Now, I do not propose to discuss the provisions of this Bill in detail to-day. Let me say, however, that I regret very much that the government have not seen fit to give to the people of the new provinces that control over the lands of the Northwest Territories which is enjoyed by all the other provinces of Canada. That is a subject which will bear fuller discussion later on, and I do not propose to weary the House with any extended remarks respecting it this afternoon. The only thing which could be called an argument made by the right hon. gentleman against that proposition was this: he said it might interfere with the operation of the policy of the government with respect to immigration. So far as the rest of his argument is concerned, it would have justified the retention by the Imperial government up to the present time of every acre of Crown lands in Canada; and I was somewhat astonished to hear from the right hon. gentleman, the advocate, in the past at least, of responsible government, the defender of the liberties of the people on some occasions, according to his own view at least, I was astonished to hear from him the views he put forth this afternoon as to the rights of the people of the Northwest Territories in respect of those lands. He knows something of the history of this question. We remember that there were statesmen in Great Britain not many years ago who thought that the public lands not only of Canada but of all the dependencies of the empire should be retained under the control of the home government, and administered not so much for the benefit of the dependency in which they were situate as for the benefit of the whole empire at large. But it was soon found, when it was attempted to put that view in practice, that it was absolutely impracticable—that to the people living in and developing any dependency must be entrusted, and might be safely entrusted, the entire control of the public lands within the dependency. The right hon. gentleman spoke of immigration. Does he not know that there is a new Quebec and a new Ontario? Does he not know that a tide of immigration may be expected to flow, and indeed, I suppose it is now flowing into these portions of eastern Canada? Will he venture to say that there has been any obstacle placed against the immigration policy of the government by the governments which administer those provinces? Is that the ground the right hon. gentleman takes? Does he speak from experience, or does he

speak from mere surmise? I venture to think that he spoke only from surmise this afternoon, and that if he had looked at this question in the light of experience, in the light of what is happening to-day in Quebec and Ontario, he might very well have modified the provisions of this Bill, and might very well have entrusted to the people of the Northwest Territories exactly the same control over their lands as is enjoyed by the people of the other provinces. I venture to say further that if he was not willing to trust the people, as I would be willing to trust the people, in this regard—if he regarded them as possibly improvident, as was suggested by the Minister of the Interior last session or the session before—if he feared the result, he might at least have given them the control of the public lands within their respective provinces, subject to some such restriction as that which he has proposed in regard to education. If the principle is good in the one case, I do not see why it should not work out fairly well in the other case.

There are other features of the Bill which will undoubtedly invite discussion. The subject which the right hon. gentleman mentioned last, on which he spoke with great eloquence, and in a spirit of forbearance and moderation, will undoubtedly invite discussion. I do not propose to discuss it this afternoon. There is just one thing, however, that I would like to say about it, and that is that I understand that up to the present time there has been really no school question, to use the common expression, in the Northwest Territories of Canada; and I sincerely trust that on both sides of the House we will not seek to make this a political question in any sense.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But at the same time let us beware lest any action of ours may create in the Northwest of Canada for all time to come that question which happily has been entirely absent there in the past. I am speaking in all sincerity in regard to this to my right hon. friend. He has quoted the debates which took place in parliament on this subject. He has laid special stress upon the opinion of Mr. Brown. I will not go over his remarks except to say that of course when Mr. Brown regarded this matter as having been settled for all time to come, he did not speak in an absolutely legal sense. I do not understand my right hon. friend to contend that he did. Does he take the position that that is correct in the legal sense?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I take the position that the constitution certainly makes it imperative for us to respect separate schools wherever they exist.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know that I yet quite seize exactly the meaning of my right hon. friend, but there will be opportunities later and better than the present to learn exactly his views on that point. Of course the constitutional view of the question—without touching for the moment the wisdom or propriety of what the right hon. gentleman suggests—the constitutional view of the question is perfectly plain. The parliament of Canada, so far as the Northwest Territories are concerned, can absolutely repeal or deal with in any way any provisions it makes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The parliament of Canada can repeal the Act regarding the Canadian Pacific Railway with respect to taxation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course it would be dealing there with vested rights, and my right hon. friend is very conservative in that respect. I am not discussing anything except the constitutional aspect, and vested rights are not touched in the matter I am presenting to the House at this moment. The right hon. gentleman knows that while the parliament of Canada can amend in any way it sees fit an Act with regard to the Territories, yet the position will be somewhat different after an Act such as the one now proposed has been passed. By the British North America Act of 1871 the parliament of Canada may from time to time establish new provinces. Section 2 of that Act provides:

> The parliament of Canada may from time to time establish new provinces in any territories forming for the time being part of the Dominion of Canada, but not included in any province thereof, and may, at the time of such establishment, make provision for the constitution and administration of any such province and for the passing of laws for the peace, order and good government of such province, and for its representation in the said parliament.

My right hon. friend has taken the ground, both in the letter to which I have referred, and in his speech in parliament, that the parliamentary representation of the new provinces under the Act I have mentioned, would be absolutely the results of the last census. I take issue with him on that point. I think he was mistaken absolutely when he placed that view before the premier of the Territories and advocated it in this House. The parliament of Canada may do what I have just referred to and what is set out in section 2 of the British North America Act of 1871. Then by section 3 of the same statue:

> The parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the legislature of any province of the said Dominion, increase, diminish or otherwise alter the limits of such province, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature.

Then by section 6 of the same Act it is provided:

> Except as provided by the third section of this Act, it shall not be competent for the par-

liament of Canada to alter the provisions of the last mentioned Act of the said parliament, in so far as it relates to the province of Manitoba, or of any other Act hereafter establishing new provinces in the said Dominion, subject always to the right of the legislature of the province of Manitoba to alter from time to time the provisions of any law respecting the qualification of electors and members of the legislative assembly, and to make laws respecting elections in the said province.

So that when we are framing this constitution for the new provinces of Canada, we are framing a constitution which in the future cannot be dealt with by this parliament except with the consent of the provincial legislature.

Just one word more. This Bill of course will have to be printed and we shall require some time to consider it and perhaps some further information will require to be brought down. I have made a note of what I think should be brought down for the information of the House before this Bill is further discussed. I would like to direct the attention of my right hon. friend to certain returns moved for on page 119 of the Votes and Proceedings, of which some have not been brought down. I am alluding of course only to those relating to the Northwest Territories. I would like also to have from the right hon. gentleman full information as to the centres of population in the new provinces and the course and tendency of immigration since the census of 1901. This is of importance in connection with the establishment of electoral divisions and also with regard to the boundaries of the two provinces. In the next place, I would like to know if possible the quantity of lands which have been patented in the two provinces for homestead purposes, the quantity granted to railway companies or which railway companies, under the terms of their charter, are entitled to select at present. Also what lands have been granted to railway companies, but which have not been earned or patented. And I would like a statement, if it is not already contained in the Bill or the speech of my right hon. friend, of what lands yet remain vested in the Crown. I would like also to know as to these lands, and especially in connection with the proposed boundaries of the two provinces, what proportion is more suitable for the growing of grain, and where it is situated, what proportion is more suitable for ranching or other description of farming and where it is situated, and what proportion is supposed to require irrigation and where situated. All this information will be of value to us in discussing the question of boundaries between the proposed provinces. It would be desirable also that on the second reading of the Bill some definite information should be given to us as to what is the practical condition of education in the Territories at present. I fully expected to have received that information this afternoon but was disappointed. Also information as to the systems of public schools which have been established there and under what ordinances, management and inspection they are carried on. What number of schools, public schools in the ordinary sense, are to be found there and what number of separate schools ? I think that all this information and other information of a kindred character should be placed before the House, and I am sure that upon this question, to which the right hon. gentleman has alluded with so much feeling, we shall all endeavour to meet him in the same spirit. I will not go over the past. I will not allude to the fact that possibly a somewhat different spirit was manifested some eight or nine years ago when a similar question arose. It has been asserted by some—with what truth I know not—that that question was deliberately brought into the political arena for the advantage it might give to hon. gentlemen on the other side. I will not do more than allude to that and express once more the hope that whatever may have been done in the past by hon. gentlemen opposite, which is not consistent with the lofty ideals my hon. friend has expressed this afternoon, we on this side at least shall not emulate that example, but shall deal with this question in a spirit of Christian charity and forbearance, realizing that on all such questions there are two sides and endeavouring each one of us too realize that we must consider the question presented to us not only from our own standpoint but also from the standpoint of those who differ from us in opinion. It is above all things desirable that these questions and considerations, touching sometimes upon differences of races and dealing with matters of dogma and creed, should not be introduced into the political arena more than is absolutely necessary. I know that the House will deal with this question in that spirit, and I trust and believe that we may find some solution of what has been presented to us this afternoon by the right hon. gentleman which will commend itself generally to the people of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not rise to continue the debate but merely to ask a couple of questions. Before doing so, however, I must congratulate the right hon. gentleman as the accoucher who has assisted in bringing into the family of the Dominion this healthy pair of provincial twins. They have certainly given evidence of life and activity, and I should hope he will not shackle their limbs in such a way as to prevent their development. This is an important Bill, and I only rise to ask that a large number of copies be printed as there are many applications for it. I would suggest that the second reading

might be delayed for some period until there has been an opportunity to hear from those who are most interested, the people of the Northwest. I think that the second reading should not take place earlier than three weeks or a month later.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 70) to establish and provide for the government of the province of Saskatchewan.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

CENSUS AND STATISTICS.

House in committee on Bill (No. 5) respecting the census and statistics.—Mr. Fisher.

On section 30—every person employed in the execution of this Act to take an oath of office—

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). When that section was previously before the committee, the suggestion was made that the getting of any information by an officer in addition to what was authorized in the schedules given him should be made an indictable offence. I promised to look into that and get the opinion of the law officers. I have done so, and am quite willing that this should be made an indictable offence, and I propose to introduce a new section, section 30 (a) next after this clause, to attain the object desired. I take it that the object of having the section stand has thus been met, and that the section may pass.

Mr. LENNOX. I desire to call the minister's attention to another point that was raised during the discussion of this section. I asked the minister to consider what officers would be included in the words of section 30—'every officer, census commissioner, enumerator, agent and other person employed in the execution of this Act,' and to say how his section would work in conjunction with section 17. I understood the minister then to say that probably the descriptive words in section 30 would include all the public officers described in section 17. I did not understand the minister to be positive on that point. It is a matter of some importance, and perhaps the minister will explain what conclusion he came to concerning it.

Mr. FISHER. I did not think it was necessary that officers employed by other authority, who furnish us information under this Act, should be called upon to take an oath under this Act. We would require them to say that the information furnished us was what they had collected. But I do not think we could do more than that. They are not acting as officers of the department in any way, except as they supply information to us. But I think when they supply information it should be under some form saying that this was the information they had collected.

Mr. LENNOX. I think the minister and the committee should carefully consider the effect of this legislation. As the minister says, some of the information that would be given by these officials would be given merely as information received from other sources, and they would not be able to pledge themselves to the accuracy of it as coming from original sources. But they will be bound, under this section, to swear to the faithful and exact discharge of the duties that are expected of them and to the secrecy of the statistics collected. And under section 31, it is provided that these officials, in case they make a false declaration, will be guilty of an indictable offence. I call the minister's attention again to the position we are taking in connection with sections 17 and 30 taken together. We have certain officials appointed by municipalities or by the provincial government and bound to carry out the instructions of the authority that appointed them. Almost inevitably, I fear, at some time, the duties prescribed by the federal government under this Act will conflict with the duties as defined by the local authorities. And it is a pretty drastic measure to provide that a neglect of duty required by this government on the part of an officer appointed by the local government will subject the officer not merely to a fine, but to being declared guilty of an indictable offence. I think we come dangerously near usurping the powers of the local governments; and, in that view, I think this is not a wise provision.

Mr. FISHER. Section 31 provides that every person employed in the execution of this Act 'who makes wilful default in any matter required of him by this Act, or wilfully makes any false declaration touching any such matter,' is guilty of an indictable offence. Of course, if he makes a return saying that it is information he has collected in his capacity as an officer of the local authority, and wilfully falsifies that return, I think he should be held guilty of an indictable offence. But if he transmits the information he collects, he would carry out the full spirit of the law.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not wish to put more difficulties in the way of the Bill than necessarily meet it. Of course, if one makes a false declaration, he is not much to be commiserated in any punishment. But there is another feature. Section 31 says ''who makes wilful default in any matter required of him by this Act.' There may be a bona

fide refusal to comply with this Act where it might be in conflict with the duties required of the officer by the power that appointed him. I think it is dangerous for us to say that we will assume authority to demand certain information of these officers and, even though the giving of it may be in direct conflict with the instructions of those who appointed them, and to declare that a refusal shall be an indictable offence. That is the matter that ought to be very fully considered.

Mr. FISHER. I will look into that and see if there is any difficulty. I would like to move the following as section 30 (a) :—

Every officer, census commissioner, enumerator, agent or other person employed in the execution of this Act who, in the pretended performance of his duty thereunder, obtains, or seeks to obtain, information which he is not by or under this Act duly authorized to obtain, is guilty of an indictable offence.

That is in exact concordance with existing provisions of clause 31.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Certainly it is a desirable provision to add. The particular occasion to which attention was directed in the House was one in which persons not employed in the execution of the Act had sought to obtain information.

Mr. FISHER. My deputy and the law officers looked into that point and they say that clause 61 of the Criminal Code covers that point. I may add that the clause I have just introduced makes this an offence, and then the Criminal Code makes it an offence to induce a person to commit the offence.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 33—penalty for refusal or neglect to fill up schedule, &c.

Mr. FISHER. In this case there is a difference in the fine. The fine is made $100 and not less than $10 in the present Act, this will make it uniform with some other provisions in other parts of the Act. In the old Act of 1858, the Census Act, the fine is $40 and not less than $1; but in the General Statistics Act and the Criminal Statistics Act it is $100 and $10. This makes the fine uniform.

On section 40,

Mr. FISHER. This is new, but it is simply carrying out the Act and is for the purpose of obtaining information by correspondence through the mail and not by personal application.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Both of the subsections of this section may be used a little oppressively. I do not suppose that any practical difficulty will result but they go rather far. Subsection 1 provides that :

The leaving, by an enumerator, at any house or part of a house, of any schedule purporting to be issued under this Act, and having thereon a notice requiring that it be filled up and signed within a stated time by the occupant of such house or part of a house, or in his absence by some other member of the family, shall, as against the occupant, be a sufficient requirement so to fill up and sign the schedule, though the occupant is not named in the notice, or personally served therewith.—R.S., c. 58, s. 23.

You might leave the notice in such a way that it will never come to his attention. You might leave it with some one who is absolutely unauthorized. The usual provision in legislation of this kind is that it shall be left with some adult person in the House for the person for whom it is intended and that is certain guarantee that it will in the end reach the person from whom it is intended. I am rather surprised to find that the legislation was passed originally in this form.

Mr. FISHER. That portion of the clause is exactly the same as section 23 of the Census Act, and subsection 2 is the same practically repeated to apply to correspondence. We propose to collect a great deal of information through the mails and we require power to act in the same way as if the schedules were left personally at the House. I do not think that in the practical working of it there will be any great difficulty. I can conceive that it might be used unfairly, but I take it that this power if given will be used properly and rightly by the government or the minister.

On section 41—remuneration of persons employed under this Act.

Mr. FISHER moved :

That section 41 be amended by inserting after the word 'shall' in the first line thereof the words 'subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.'

He said : I think this remuneration ought to be given by Order in Council and not by the minister.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 15—agricultural, commercial, criminal, educational, manufacturing and other statistics.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to go back to clause 15 which was held over for further consideration. I wish to add a provision to that clause in the sense of the suggestion that was brought forward here the other night so as to ensure that no individual or particular investigation shall be held into the details of the business of any individual concern. This is what the Department of Justice have drawn up to cover the point.

Provided that the Governor in Council shall not, nor shall the minister in the execution of the powers conferred by this section, discriminate between individuals or companies to the prejudice of such individual or company.

I may say that the remarks of the hon. gentleman who brought this matter up were carefully examined and looked into and in the opinion of the Department of Justice

this is the most practical and most effective way to cover the idea as expressed.

Mr. MACDONELL. What I would like to suggest to the hon. minister is that the addition of the words to the amendment 'either in the collection or publication of such information' is desirable. I think it would be well to introduce these words to actually express what the intention is. That was the objection that was raised on the occasion to which the hon minister refers.

Mr. FISHER. I think that is covered by the whole clause. This proviso covers the whole clause and the whole clause deals with the collection and publication of statistics. Therefore, I think this proviso applies to the point that my hon. friend alludes to.

Mr. MACDONELL. But I think it might or might not be construed as applying to the whole clause. It would put it beyond the realm of doubt if these words were inserted and it would round off the phrase and give it significance.

Section as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported, and amendments read the first and second times.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Trent canal, $300,000.

Mr. WARD. I would like to ask the Minister of Railways, if he were present, some questions about the surveys that are now being made with regard to the Trent Valley canal. In answer to some questions recently asked, the minister made reply that surveys were being made by way of Port Hope, Cobourg and Trenton. I was very anxious that the minister should be present in order to explain why a survey was being made by way of Cobourg and I would rather not go on with this item until the minister is here to make that explanation.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The Minister of Railways thought that supply would not be reached until nine o'clock and he will not be here until that hour.

Mr. WARD. Perhaps the Postmaster General can give the information.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I would not like to usurp my colleague's position, but if the hon. gentleman would like to have the item stand until the minister's arrival, perhaps it would be better.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. From a little experience which we had the other day I understand that the Postmaster General is about running a canal up the valley to Newmarket and Aurora. I think he might fill in the time until the arrival of the Minister of Railways and Canals by giving us a description of that canal and all the data in connection with it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There is a very large deputation in the interest of that enterprise in the city and they will set forth its merits before the government to-morrow at 10.30 o'clock. If my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) and others interested will come with them at that time they will obtain more detailed information. However, if the hon. gentlemen desire to have it stand, the Minister of Agriculture will proceed with his estimates.

Mr. COCHRANE. Have the surveyors made a report of that road into the riding of the Postmaster General?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am not able to answer any one of these questions.

Item allowed to stand.

Patent Record, $17,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these items covered by the portion of the Auditor General's Report which has been brought down ?

Mr. FISHER. I think the last volume of the Auditor General's Report was laid on the table of the House yesterday.

Mr. FISHER. This is the same item that we have had for several years back, though it has been increasing a little in amount. It is for the publication of the 'Patent Record,' which is published monthly, and which gives the patents issued, with a short outline of their character, and with a print which is supplied along with the application for the patent.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are these prints made ?

Mr. FISHER. In the Printing Bureau or through the Printing Bureau. I have nothing to do with that. We simply pay the bills which the Printing Bureau presents to us.

Mr. FOSTER. How is that work distributed ?

Mr. FISHER. It is sold to subscribers at the rate of twenty cents per number, it is sent regularly to members of the Senate and House of Commons, and it is distributed gratis to libraries and public institutions, and a large number are sent to Great Britain for distribution there to public libraries and other institutions.

Mr. FOSTER. What income do you derive from it ?

Mr. FISHER. I am informed that it amounts to some hundreds of dollars, but it is not a large amount. That goes to consolidated fund.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose it is carried on in exactly the same way as it was formerly ?

Mr. FISHER. Exactly as it has been since I have been in office, except that it is expanding with the larger number of patents issued from year to year.

Mr. BARKER. Would not the issue of this yearly or half-yearly answer every purpose ? Every member receives copies of this publication monthly. I look over them occasionally and try to distribute them, but they receive very little attention. It appears to me that a great deal of the expense, perhaps one-half or two-thirds, might be saved by issuing it quarterly, half-yearly or yearly. I dare say it may be interesting to designers. The illustrations in it are undoubtedly of a most interesting character, but it is a good deal of money to pay, and unless the minister knows that the country is getting value for it, I think it might be well to consider whether some change could not be made in the method of distribution.

Mr. FISHER. I may say that there is a demand on the part of those interested in patents that it should be issued weekly instead of monthly. In the United States the similar publication is issued weekly. It is true, my hon. friend or myself or others who are not specially interested in patent matters, do not require these publications very often ; but those who are taking out patents or have any intention of doing so, as well as patent solicitors and the large body of people who are interested in patents or own patents, and manufacturers who wish to make use of patents in their industries, watch it very closely. The pressure on the department is altogether in the opposite direction from what my hon. friend suggests. I do not think the difference in expense, from issuing it half yearly or monthly, would be very great, because the monthly issues are not bound, but only stitched, and the printing would have to be done whether they were issued monthly or half-yearly.

Mr. FOSTER. How many are issued ?

Mr. FISHER. I am informed that about 4,000 are printed. We always keep a number in reserve, because very frequently we have applications for back numbers.

Collection and compilation of criminal statistics, $2,000.

Mr. FISHER. These are collected in accordance with the Act requiring the collection of criminal statistics. The money is paid to the court officials all over the country, who are required by the Act to send in this information periodically.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose this will come under the new Act ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, the provisions of the new Act are practically the same as those of the old Act, all being consolidated.

Mr. FOSTER. Has any improvement been made in the classification or scope of these statistics ? Owing to their fragmentary character, one can scarcely trust himself to make a generalization from them.

Mr. FISHER. I am informed that there has not been any change. There is a demand for them on the part of lawyers and others who are interested in criminal work, and also by students, philanthropists and sociologists. We frequently get requests for this information from people in Great Britain and the United States. I will have the matter looked in order to see whether any change can be worked out to make them better. That is one of the objects of the new Act.

Mr. FOSTER. Fragmentary statistics are almost more dangerous than none.

Statistical Year-book, $6,000.

Mr. MONK. The hon. minister will remember that Mr. Ross, of Victoria, who used to take a warm interest in this item, generally laid on the table, when we were discussing it, the year-books of Australia, New Zealand, Natal and the Cape, and my hon. friend will no doubt remember that our own does not compare at all favourably with those issued by those colonies. Is there any prospect of any improvement and of our getting our year-book a little earlier than we have been in the habit of getting it in the past few years ? In the year-books of Australia and the other British dependencies, there are maps showing the lines of railways in those colonies and also other information not to be found in our book. My hon. friend will admit that the year-book comes out in Canada at a very late date. Would it not be possible to have it published a little earlier, which ought to be more easily done now that my hon. friend has established a bureau of statistics. I think also we might have a few more copies of the French translation and have them a little earlier. The French edition comes out very late indeed. The translation is not difficult. It mostly consists of a compilation of figures, and there is a very considerable demand in our own province and outside for a French edition. I do not think that a few copies more would make much difference in the cost of printing. How many copies will this sum of $6,000 give us?

Mr. FISHER. I have here the details for 1903. There were then 5,000 copies of the English paper edition and 2,000 bound ; 600 copies of the French paper edition and 300 bound. In that year we took a smaller vote than we did last year and are asking for this year. We are taking an additional $1,000, but the figures for 1903 are the re-

sult of a vote of $5,000. We are asking this year for $6,000, and that extra money will be spent in obtaining so many more copies.

Mr. BARR. How much per book ?

Mr. FISHER. It is pretty hard to figure that out. About 40 cents, but some are in paper and some bound. The bound ones cost a good deal more than the paper ones. I can assure my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier that I will do my best to have the book out earlier, but it must be borne in mind that the gentleman in charge of the work cannot begin until the reports of the different departments are finished. I am told that probably the book will be ready about May 10, this year. The translation requires to be done by an experienced man, and we have an officer who has been doing that work many years, but I would be very willing to have the work done more rapidly if that could be accomplished by additional assistance. But there is this difficulty always in the translation. The translators want to work from the proof sheets of the Printing Bureau instead of from the copies. They say that they can finish their work just as quickly in the end if they wait for the proofs as if they worked from the typewritten copies. I could never understand why you cannot translate typewritten copy as well as proof, but they insist that they cannot and insist on waiting until the galley proofs of the English edition are before them. I tried to argue the question with them but they said they knew their business better than I.

Mr. MONK. I would like my hon. friend to bear in mind what I said with regard to the maps. In the year-books of the other colonies there are maps showing the mineral areas, the agricultural areas, the forest areas and the principal railways. I do not know whether that would materially increase the cost, but it would certainly increase the interest of the work.

Mr. FISHER. I have taken a note of what my hon. friend says. Let me say that in preparing for the exhibitions, we have had a book compiled very largely from the year-book for distribution at these exhibitions. We have had some maps prepared, and I admit that it would be a good thing that we should have maps in the different year-books showing the railroads, forest, mineral areas and so on. Those maps are however, very expensive and would add materially to the cost of the book, and I might have to ask for an additional vote.

Mr. BARR. Of course, these statistics are useless when they grow old and musty. Though we have the promise that they are to be put out more promptly in the future, I find, on looking over the list for the last three years, that the publication has been growing later. If we go on in this way they will soon be over a year old before they are made public. In 1900 the publication was on June 22 ; in 1901, on May 15 ; in 1902, May 28 ; and in 1903, June 29. So far as the municipal authorities are concerned they responded promptly, proving that they are probably the best agency for gathering statistics.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are the government selling maps such as were distributed amongst members of the House last year ? A man was in my town recently selling them.

Mr. FISHER. No maps are issued by my department. I suppose the map the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Reid) refers to is one issued by the Department of the Interior a year and a half or two years ago. It was an excellent map and was issued in different sizes. But I do not think the department are selling them.

Mr. J. D. REID. They are very fine maps. I got fifty of them and distributed them through my riding. To my surprise a man was selling them around our town.

Mr. FISHER. I think he must have got them surreptitiously. I am sure the department could not countenance anything of that kind. I will call the attention of the Department of the Interior to what the hon. gentleman has said.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood the Minister of Agriculture to say on a reply to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that the cost of the statistical year-book was about 40 cents a copy.

Mr. FISHER. I said I thought that was about the cost.

Mr. TAYLOR. By the Auditor General's Report, page D—32, you will find that the year-book of 1902 was printed to the extent of 6,500 copies in English and 1,400 in French, at a cost of $5,129.17 paid to the King's Printer, or 66⅔ cents per volume. It seems to me that this is a pretty high price for printing a volume of this character and that the Minister's estimate of 40 cents per volume would be nearer the mark.

Mr. FISHER. I have no control over the cost of printing. The work is done by the Printing Bureau, and they send in their bill and we pay them.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to capital—Trent canal—construction, $300,000.

Mr. WARD. I would like to ask the minister how many mouths this Trent Valley canal is to have. Up to the time of the elections on November 3, last, I was under the impression that only two mouths were proposed—at Port Hope and Trenton respectively. But information was brought to me at that time that a survey was being made by way of Cobourg. In answer to a question the Minister of Railways and Canals stated

that the survey was actually being made by way of Cobourg. During the late elections, instead of being confronted by my good friend Mr. Robert Beith, who formally represented West Durham, I had a cabinet minister opposed to me, who took a great interest in the Trent Valley canal. During the course of the election a good deal of correspondence took place between the hon. minister—or proposed hon. minister—who was opposing me and the Prime Minister. I desire to read a letter written at that time, as I understand by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) at the head of the government to my opponent, Mr. Aylesworth. I am sorry that the right hon. gentleman is not in his place to-night, but now, when the item is before the committee, is the time for the discussion of this matter. The letter is as follows :

Toronto, Oct. 13.

My Dear Aylesworth,—In answer to your communication requesting that there be made without any delays a full and detailed survey and report showing in detail the work and the estimated cost of the proposed outlets of the Trent Valley canal at both Port Hope and Trenton, by competent, reliable and impartial engineers —such report and survey to include hydraulic lift locks and also locks of any other design which might be considered or adopted, also electrical power for mechanical and lighting purposes, buoys, cost of operation and maintenance, together with a report on the construction of any railway and highway bridges that may be necessary, also the damages resulting from obstruction of water, flooding of lands or injuring lands, on other properties on each route, and also including construction and maintenance of all necessary harbour facilities and lighthouses with respect to each route, I beg to say that this subject has already engaged the attention of the government which some time ago decided that such survey and report of estimated cost should be made. I regret to learn from your letter that the work in question is possibly not proceeding on a satisfactory basis, and beg to assure you that the government will with all possible speed cause the survey and report which you ask to be made. It is further intended to have such survey and report made with reference not only to a work of the depth and capacity of the completed portion of the Trent Valley canal, but also of a work of greater depth and capacity, and therefore the instructions to the engineers will be given in accordance with such intention. From memory I cannot go more fully into the details of the survey, plans and route. It is the intention of the government to have the most complete inquiries made as to the relative merits of the two routes in all their bearings, and therefore the survey and report in question will be sufficiently comprehensive, not merely to cover details above mentioned, but any other details, which it would be either proper or necessary to know before making the selection of an outlet. If the details of the respective surveys and reports fall short of what is necessary or advisable the government will be glad to supplement them in any manner that you recommend in order to have both the government and the country in full possession of all information touching the relative merits of the various routes before a selection is made.

Yours very truly,

WILFRID LAURIER.

To A. B. Aylesworth, Port Hope.

With regard to that letter I may say, Mr. Chairman, that some gentlemen in the town of Port Hope who heard that letter read on the occasion when my hon. friend the Postmaster General, I think, was present, were not quite satisfied with the terms of the letter, and subsequently another one a little stronger in its terms was sent by the right hon. gentleman at the head of the government, I think to Mr. Aylesworth, in which he made it quite clear that the surveys to be made of these two routes should be made on a basis of an 8 feet 4 depth of canal. Now the matter of surprise to me is this, that although at that election there were apparently two routes suggested, those by way of Port Hope and Trenton, now there crops up an additional route by way of Cobourg. I do not know on what ground the hon. minister is having a survey made by way of Cobourg, except that my hon. friend, whom I do not see in his seat this evening, the hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. McColl) managed to secure his election on that occasion, and naturally there might be some disposition on the part of the government to run a canal through a constituency which was successful in returning a supporter of the government. However that may be, I desire to call the attention of the minister to several facts in connection with the routes by Port Hope and Trenton—I cannot say one word about Cobourg, because I know nothing whatever about that route. But there is this to be said in addition to what I have already brought to the attention of the government on various occasions ; and I think that the right hon. premier of this government might have given me some credit for having brought this matter before the House on various occasions, and considered that I was perhaps a little more worthy of representing the county of Durham from residence reasons, if for no other, than the Hon. Mr. Aylesworth. However, in addition to what I have already brought to the attention of the government, I wish to mention this fact, that taking into consideration the buoying and the lighting of the canal for a distance of forty miles, the excess in length of the canal which would be necessary by way of Trenton, I am informed by gentlemen who have taken this matter into earnest consideration that the extra expense of running a canal by way of Trenton over and above what it would cost by way of Port Hope, would represent a capitalization of a million and a half dollars. I do not desire on this occasion to repeat the arguments that I have brought before the House before on three separate occasions ; but I do wish to impress upon the Minister of Railways and

Canals that no route should be adopted by the government until the most thorough inquiry and examination has taken place, not only by the engineers in charge of the work, but by the minister himself. I think the minister is capable of forming a judgment if he will only go over the ground, and if he does so he will find that the outlet by way of Port Hope is the proper outlet, not only by reason of the comparatively small expense that will be entailed in building the canal by that route, but for many other reasons which could be pointed out to him. I would like to ask the minister why this survey has been made by way of Cobourg, and why the other two routes by way of Trenton and Port Hope are ignored for the time being ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I may say to my hon. friend that the survey by way of Cobourg was not undertaken until about the 10th or 12th of December. The object of that survey is to get possession of all the facts relating to the lake entrance of the Trent valley waterway. I regret that it has not been my privilege to go over this waterway and to visit the different sections. I must, therefore, necessarily discuss the subject, if I undertook to discuss it at all, quite in the dark so far as any personal knowledge of the locality is concerned. I say I regret that I have not had an opportunity of visiting the locality, and I shall certainly avail myself of the earliest possible occasion to go over the entire route of these waterways. There are three possible outlets, one at Trenton, as I understand, where a survey has been made, and where one is now in progress ; another at Port Hope, and another at Cobourg, which was undertaken somewhere about the middle of December.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I hope the minister will not forget the one by Newmarket and Aurora.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is in another direction, I think. I find a difference of opinion exists as respects these different routes. My hon. friend from Durham (Mr. Ward) will recollect that I brought down and laid on the table of the House last session, I think it was, reports of the engineers with respect to the surveys which had been made in the previous year. He did not seem to be satisfied with those surveys, he thought it would be very much better to have a fuller survey made and more accurate information, from his standpoint. In deference to the views which he expressed at that time, and in deference to the views expressed by other members, the whole matter was gone into, and the question of surveys of these different routes was placed in charge of Mr. Walsh, a very eminent and competent engineer. I approach this subject with an entirely open mind, I have no preference for one route or the other and I trust that any arrangement that may be reached in the matter will be reached entirely upon the merits, because that after all is the important matter. There must be a correct route, or one of the routes must be better than the others. The point is to be able to find out exactly which is the most advantageous to the Trent valley waterway.

Mr. WARD. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals has referred to two previous surveys. Now, my whole objection to these surveys has been this, that they were not made of the two routes upon exactly the same basis. I pointed out last session and the session before, particularly last session, the discrepancies that existed in the survey of Mr. McLeod as to the route by Port Hope and by way of Trenton. It will not take a moment to instance two particular branches of the survey which differ entirely as far as the two routes are concerned. In the first place, there are the reaches of the river and the reaches generally of the canal. As my hon. friend will understand, there are nearly forty miles of reaches by the Trent route, between Rice lake and Trenton. If my hon. friend will examine the report of Mr. McLeod, the engineer who made these surveys, he will find that although estimates for 8 feet 4 inches in the canal were made, he states in another portion of his report that he only estimates for 6 feet in the reaches. He admits that in the canal proper every one of the excavations has to be made in limestone rock and that the excavations in the reaches are in limestone rock also. But there is not one dollar estimated for the excavation of the difference between 6 feet and 8 feet 4 inches in the reaches of the river or the canal. Therefore, there is a very large sum of money required for excavating these reaches of the river and the canal not included in the estimates of the cost as between Port Hope and Trenton. Another thing which I pointed out to the committee at the time was that there was not one dollar estimated for drowned land. It is well known that there are some 20,000 or 30,000 acres of drowned land already on the route of the canal, and it is intended to raise Chisholm's dam about two feet, which will drown about 10,000 acres more land. But there is not one dollar estimated for the drowning of this extra amount of land, and I say that unless we have an estimate of all these different things, as between the two routes, my hon. friend cannot possibly come to a just conclusion ; and until a satisfactory survey is made, it is utterly impossible, as far as the cost is concerned, to make a correct choice in the matter.

Mr. EMMERSON. The cost of drowned lands being a very important factor in the cost of the canal.

Mr. WARD. Certainly.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I shall not enter into the merits of the two routes further than to correct my hon. friend (Mr. Ward)

slightly in relation to the reaches. The plan is to dam the river and raise the water in that way—not to damn the canal, but to dam the river. A further point I want to lay before the committee is in relation to the dispute about where the entrance of this canal should be. My hon. friend ought to know why Port Hope cannot get the entrance of the canal. Durham is getting a town clock for the town of Bowmanville ; therefore, Durham cannot have the entrance to the canal. Lott got caught with the ballot boxes in West Hastings, and therefore West Hastings cannot get the entrance to the canal. West Northumberland returned a Liberal, and consequently West Northumberland is going to have the entrance to the canal.

Mr. EMMERSON. By the rule of three.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. By the rule of three. I was very sorry to note in the letter of the right hon. Prime Minister, about which there is no misunderstanding, a reference to impartial engineers. There has been a good deal of objection raised to the fact that Chief Engineer Rogers of the canal has been more or less connected with the surveys of this route, and he has been charged with favouritism for one route or the other. No matter what that officer's opinions may be, I wish to assure the hon. minister, and to state to the committee, what every one who knows that gentleman will bear me out in saying, that a more impartial or competent engineer cannot be found in the Dominion of Canada. I take this opportunity of impressing upon the hon. minister the fact that in so far as the success attending that great lift-lock at Peterborough is concerned, it is due almost entirely to the able and indefatigable work of Chief Engineer Rogers, and I was very sorry, at the opening of that great work, to find that when the hon. Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) and other ministers spoke, they were particular, for some cause or other, to deliberately omit giving that officer the credit due to him. I think this was an injustice to that gentleman, who has earned a reputation that he should not be depived of.

Mr. EMMERSON. I thought he was the central figure on that occasion.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If the hon. minister reads the report of the speeches made on that occasion, even that of the hon. minister's own speech, he will find that the name of Mr. Rogers was omitted from the references to those who had contributed to the success of the lock. All we want in our part of the country is that there shall be an outlet to the canal, whether at Port Hope, Cobourg or Trenton ; that the hon. minister will be good enough to determine where the outlet shall be, and press forward to that outlet with all available speed. I am delighted to hear the hon. minister say that he is going to do that. I presume he has the notes before him outlining the work under construction and now about completed and the work that is going on. I hope the hon. minister will be good enough to outline these proposed works to the committee. I shall not ask him to outline the branch to Newmarket and Aurora, as we would expect the hon. Postmaster General to give the details of that later on.

Mr. COCHRANE. Mr. Chairman, I want to correct the statement made by the two hon. gentlemen who have preceded me in reference to these stretches measuring from Rice lake. That water is navigable now to Heely's falls, and it must be ten or fifteen miles nearer the outlet than the rest of the lake. I am not going to tell the hon. minister what he should do in reference to it. He has engineers who, I suppose, will do their work honourably, and the outlet will no doubt be placed where nature designed it to be. I wish to draw the hon. minister's attention to the fact that there is another outlet which is suggested, and to which I had the honour of calling his attention on behalf of the council of the village of Brighton. There is no political significance in this, because it was a request that was made after the elections were over. The only objection that there might be to an outlet in that part of the riding is the fact that they returned the member who is now addressing the hon. minister. I know from his good nature generally manifested to me that he would not object to having the outlet at Presque Isle harbour, one of the best natural harbours on Lake Ontario, and which is at the mouth of the Murray canal. I think I can say, without fear of contradiction, that this is one of the best natural harbours on Lake Ontario. It is at the entrance to the Murray canal, which leads from Presque Isle harbour to the Bay of Quinte, and is on the direct route to Montreal and Quebec. I am not going to discuss the propriety of placing barges on Lake Ontario. I think, however, the idea will kill the outlet either at Cobourg or Port Hope, because these barges would not stand the severe storms to be encountered on Lake Ontario. My old home was on the shore of Lake Ontario, and I can tell hon. gentlemen who have not been on that stretch of lake in the fall of the year, when it would be used for carrying grain from the interior of Ontario to Montreal and Quebec, that my opinion is that a barge after it reached either harbour and got to Lake Ontario would not be above water very long. The engineers who are now surveying the route from Cobourg could survey the route from Brighton as well. I would be delighted, when the minister comes, if he would intimate to me when he will visit Brighton to see that outlet, to see that he is conveyed over that route in as comfortable a manner as can be.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is only within a week or so that the hon. gentleman (Mr.

Cochrane) furnished me with a copy of the resolution passed by the municipality to which he has made reference, and I have already submitted the question for the judgment of the engineer. The course to be pursued is under consideration. In reply to the hon. gentleman for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) I would say that of course this amount is very largely to complete certain works which have been undertaken. There is section 2, the Simcoe-Balsam Lake division, on which there is some work which requires to be completed. There is also section 3, a portion of the same division and then there is hydraulic lock No. 2, north of Kirkfield. I think the hon. member is familiar with all of these sections. The surveys that are to be made in that northerly direction relate to the reaching of Georgian bay, the connecting of Georgian bay with those water stretches at Lake Simcoe. There are two routes, one by Lake Couchiching and there is also the Severn river route. These surveys are being made with a view to determining the proper route to be followed in that section of the waterways. Some surveys have also been made on the Holland river section with a view to connecting certain sections of the country up there with this water-route, giving an outlet to a very rich and flourishing section of the country. All this involves a great deal of work. I think the engineers chosen go there with an open mind; the instructions given to the chief engineer simply involve directions to have complete and accurate surveys made of the different routes. He is to make his report upon the merits of the respective routes, to make his estimates full and complete in order that there may be placed before the department and before myself for consideration, ample information as to which route would cost the least which would be the most feasible and which would best serve the interests of the communities adjacent to and connected with the Trent Valley waters. More than this it is hardly necessary for me to say.

Mr. WARD. I desire to correct one statement made by the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane). The great bugbear with the gentlemen who oppose the Port Hope route is the stretch of open lake for twenty-six miles from Port Hope to Presque Isle harbour. I produced last session a statement signed by twenty-six or twenty-seven mariners, men who have sailed the lakes, some of them for thirty or forty years past, and they expressed the opinion with one accord that they prefer the Port Hope route to the Trenton route for the reason that they can never be sure of getting into Trenton harbour at night, whereas they can always get into Port Hope harbour at night, and they say that the open lake from Port Hope to Presque Isle was no objection as my hon. friend would make out to the committee. So far as that twenty-six miles of open lake is concerned, the committee must bear in mind that the prevailing winds in the fall are off that shore. These mariners who have sailed all their lives surely should know as much as the hon. gentleman.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am not saying what I know.

Mr. WARD. If you look at the map of Lake Simcoe you will find that there are thirteen miles of open lake there under the present scheme of canal, and the shore upon which the barges have to come down is absolutely exposed to the prevailing northerly winds. That is on the stretch from Orillia to Beaverton. The mariners whom I have consulted state that a barge that will weather that thirteen miles——

Mr. COCHRANE. In an inland lake.

Mr. WARD. In an inland lake it is quite true, but there are gentlemen who live on that inland lake who say that there are days and days in the fall when the vessels that ply that lake are unable to leave the harbour at all. The mariners state that a barge that is strong enough to sail the thirteen miles on Lake Simcoe with a prevailing wind on the shore on which they are sailing is perfectly safe on the twenty-six miles on Lake Ontario with the prevailing winds off shore. The open stretch on Lake Ontario is a bugbear that these gentlemen who favour the Trenton route are very prone to urge. I am sure if the minister will examine these different points for himself he will be able to form his own judgment and we are quite satisfied that when he forms his judgment his decision will be in the interest of the country.

Mr. COCHRANE. I do not want to debate this question at all, because I fancy it will not matter what the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Ward) or myself says in connection with it. I think when this question is settled it will be settled on the merits of the routes. I would wish to say a word or two with respect to the harbours of Trenton and Port Hope. Why was a million of money spent by the Dominion government to build the Murray canal? It was to let vessels get off Lake Ontario into Presque Isle harbour and thence into the inland waters of the Bay of Quinte. You can see that these mariners who knew so much do not take their vessels into the port of Trenton at all; because it is on the Bay of Quinte, all inland water; and the Dominion of Canada has spent several millions of dollars to open a waterway from the natural harbour of Presque Isle, through which vessels can pass from Lake Ontario to the inland waters and have quiet navigation all the way down to Kingston and Montreal.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister referred to the routes in the northerly direction about

which there does not seem to be the same amount of contention as there is about the southerly outlet. I want to direct his attention to one or two phases of that matter which probably have not been kept as prominently before his mind as they ought to have been. A year ago, when I spoke of this subject, I understood the minister to promise that he would set surveyors at work almost immediately to survey the line along the route which I was advocating, that is from the extreme west end of Kempenfeldt bay, which is a portion of Lake Simoce, to the Georgian bay. I think I had a letter from the minister after the session closed renewing his promise, and intimating that the surveyors would be shorty at work with a view to ascertaining whether that was the best scheme or not. That may be called the direct route. The other route proposed is by way of the Severn river. To my mind there can be no question which is the better course to take; but I regret that up to the present time there have been no surveyors on the ground.

Mr. EMMERSON. I thought the route to which my hon. friend made reference was the one via Silver creek and North river. Another is the one via the Severn river; and I understand that my hon. friend suggests a third, starting near Barrie.

Mr. LENNOX. I thought that the one I referred to was the second; I did not know there was any scheme for a route via Silver creek. Those we discussed last session were the two I have mentioned. The route by way of Barrie and Kempenfeldt bay would serve not only for the purposes of the Trent Valley canal, but, if constructed on a large and generous scale, would open up an important extension of the general system of navigation across the continent, particularly in connection with the scheme which has been referred to recently, and which will probably come before the House for discussion, now that the elections are over, for the extension to Schomberg and Aurora, practically bringing the commerce of the west down as far as the village of Aurora, from which there would be only a short passage by land to one of the great commercial centres of the province of Ontario, the city of Toronto, there again joining the great lake and river system of navigation. I hope that if the minister has not the opportunity of sending surveyors to investigate that route since last session, he will do so at once. While on my feet, I want to ask the minister whether the Trent Valley canal will be completed to Lake Simcoe this year.

Mr. EMMERSON. We expect to have it completed this season. I was under the impression that the surveyors were taking into consideration the very route to which my hon. friend made reference last session. His letter was submitted to the engineers, and all the information on the subject in the department was laid before the chief engineer with the view of his studying out the very best route, and I think the route to which the hon. gentleman made reference was particularly considered by the engineer in charge of the work.

Mr. LENNOX. That is not exactly what I meant. I understood that surveyors would be put upon that territory to make actual surveys and tests. Am I to understand from the minister that if they are not actually at work, they will be shortly?

Mr. EMMERSON. Oh, yes. The surveys are not completed.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I understood that surveys of that route were made several years ago. The Severn route is a long and circuitous route, and the route determined upon as the most feasible is by Lake Couchiching to Waubaushene. What I would like to know is whether the minister is going to put a sum in the estimates to complete the work this year. Then, the people would like to know this spring whether the southern outlet is going to be by Trenton or by Port Hope. These works have been under contract now for nearly eight years. Not one solitary contract has been let by this government since it came into power. The tenders were all advertised for before they came in. The lift locks were planned, and they had the giving of the contracts for them; and they had the privilege of letting the section between Kirkfield and Lake Simcoe.

The minister who has taken charge will, no doubt push this through, especially when he knows that his leader, the first minister, takes such an intense interest in the Trent canal and especially too, when he finds the Postmaster General—who, years ago in opposition filled page after page of 'Hansard' in denunciation of this scheme—wanting to run branch lines of that canal through all the villages in his own riding. We want to see this work carried to completion. We want the two ends completed—the Georgian bay end and the Trenton end. All along the route of that canal, at Barrie, Orillia, Lindsay, Beaverton and Peterborough, there are immense mills which bring in grain from the Northwest by train. If we had the canal built, they could bring that grain in by barge at much lower rates and would be better able to compete in the markets of the world. I am satisfied the minister will carry out his promise and put a substantial vote of a million or two in the estimates this year. We have plenty of money now, but may not be so flush when the Grand Trunk Pacific is under way. As the surveys have been made at the Georgian bay end and at the Trenton end all the minister has to do is to call for tenders. While on my feet, I will

call attention to a few points I want to bring to his notice. The system of valves in the locks and of opening and closing gates is not the most modern all along that route. At Fenelon Falls, a steamer will be delayed some 20 or 25 minutes by the slow operation of the locks when she should be able to get through in 10 minutes. Above Fenelon Falls, there is a railway swing bridge across the canal. There is quite a strong current there and steamers, running the regular route, will reach this bridge about the time the morning train is crossing and have to lie in the offing where, on a windy day, they cannot keep their position in the channel. I would suggest that a wharf should be built at government expense just above the swing bridge at Fenelon Falls.

Mr. EMMERSON. A wharf, or an extension of the pier ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. One is just as good as the other. Another thing to which I would call attention is the fact that all along these waterways there are great quantities of sawlogs floating down the stream. In windy weather the booms block the entire river and are a great obstruction to travel. I would like the minister to devise some plan for overcoming this difficulty. At present he has but one dredge belonging to his department on those waters and it is entirely inadequate for the work it has to do. I am satisfied if the minister looks into it, he will recommend the construction of another dredge. The hon. gentleman promised to explain the condition of lands in Verulam and Emily townships subject to the overflow of the canal. I would also draw his attention to the condition of Pigeon river, there is a great tract of country which could be served by that stream, which barges could navigate drawing 3 to 5 feet of water ; but the river needs to be cleaned out, and I would suggest to the hon. minister to have his engineer make a report, by another year be ready to have the passages opened up. There is another matter to which I would draw his attention. The modern system of transport proves that the locks should be longer, that long barges are the most profitable to handle, and that the locks to be constructed for the future should be longer. If we could possibly overcome the lift-lock at Peterboro, we should build longer locks than the present ones. There is just one more point I would mention. North of Balsam lake there are almost innumerable lakes forming beautiful reservoirs. I should have great pleasure in taking the minister for a trip through this chain of lakes. The scenery there is as fine as any in the world and they form magnificent reservoirs. The shores in many cases are rocky, the land as a rule valueless for farming purposes, the timber has been cleaned out from the shores, and these lakes could be made into reservoirs for storing water to meet the needs of the canal. Balsam lake has to serve both the Georgian bay and the Trent end of the canal. I see that the government propose taking over these waterways and carrying out the plan I recommended in 1890, and will control them as a Dominion work for the storage of water. That would be serviceable not only to navigation but to manufacturers along the line of the canal.

A manufacturing town brings population to the country and trade to the railways and canals. Will the minister be good enough to say what they have done in the way of taking over these waterways. There are thousands of settlers north of Cobokonk. I notice that in the province of Quebec, back of Buckingham and also in the western part of Ontario, the government has opened up navigation in inland lakes far away from the main avenues of trade. But the waterways that I speak of are connected with the main line of the Trent canal and so properly come under the head of Dominion works. A few years ago the people in both parties who supported this great route were sneered at, but, now the common sense men of the country are coming to see that, after all, we need waterways. We support the Welland canal and the Georgian bay canal, and we want to have this Trent canal supported also. And, instead of listening to the echoes of the old speeches of the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) in his days of opposition, we want to hear the speeches he is making to-day. He is a little late in giving his support, and, by his opposition he has delayed the work a good deal.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I never have said a word against it in my life.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. My ears must have deceived me. I used to think that the hon. gentleman joined with the present senator from Mount Forest, Hon. Mr. McMullen, in delaying this House day after day by talking against this route of which they knew nothing. Of course I take the hon. gentleman's (Sir William Mulock's) word for it, and am glad that he is backing the canal now at any rate. The ridges to which I have referred run northwesterly and southwesterly. There is only one road running far north and that is the Haliburton road. It runs up the valley of the Burnt river. Between that and the Gull river waters there is this barrier of hills, over which farmers have to haul timber and other produce. It is impossible to haul hard-wood timber more than six or seven miles over these ridges to the market at a profit. But with an expenditure of about $100,000 the Gull river waters could be opened up for a distance of from fifty to seventy-five miles. There is not a mile of cutting ; all that is required is to place dams at the lakes and locks between the lakes. This would afford means of navigation and would bring into use a vast area of country where birch and maple and other hardwoods which the market is now demanding, abound. It will benefit the thousands of

farmers living along these waters as well as the people of central Ontario generally, I speak this in all seriousness, and I know the minister will look at it in the same way. Of course, I do not expect the minister to decide the matter at once ; but I hope he will investigate it and next year put an item in the estimates to carry out this work. I would also impress upon him the necessity of vigorous work upon the two ends of this Trent system of waterways. Now that the Postmaster General has grown out of his age of criticism and reached the time of constructive statesmanship and doing good work in his own department, I hope he will use his influence to have this work pushed forward to completion by establishing a connection with Georgian bay and also completing the Lake Ontario outlet whether by Trenton or by Port Hope.

Mr. FOSTER. I have been out of the House for some years, and probably have not followed the fortunes of this Trent canal as some gentlemen have who have kept up a constant and close acquaintance with it. In 1904-5 there was a vote of $411,000 for this work, and now we are asked for $300,000 for 1905-6, a total of about three-quarters of a million dollars. I would be glad if the minister would state in a brief comprehensive way just how this waterway stands. By the courtesy of the minister I have a small plan of the work, and if he would give us an idea how far the improvements are made and what kind of navigation is afforded as to depth and width, but chiefly as to depth, I think it would be a good thing for the committee and for the public. When the public hears of this work it usually hears of it in sections, but I would like a comprehensive account of what has been done and what is necessary to be done and what navigation is now provided for. For instance, commencing at Georgian bay what is the state of navigation up to Lake Simcoe ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Nothing has been done there. The works now completed begin at Kirkfield and go down as far as Heely's Falls.

Mr. FOSTER. Going through Balsam lake past Fenelon Falls, through Sturgeon lake down to Pigeon lake——

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not recollect the various points, but I know the canal goes via Peterborough to Heely's Falls.

Mr. FOSTER. What navigation is provided for over the distance referred to by the minister ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Six-foot navigation.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it actual navigation ? Are they facilities that are being used ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Constantly used between these two points.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are the works now under construction ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Between Balsam lake and Lake Simcoe. When these works are completed we shall have a complete system of navigation from Lake Simcoe down to Heely's Falls.

Mr. FOSTER. What is necessary in order to complete the work between Kirkfield and Gamebridge ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is all under contract—sections 2 and 3. There is hydraulic lock No. 2, two miles north of Kirkfield. When the two sections which include the hydraulic lock, are completed; the navigation from Lake Simcoe to Heely's Falls will be completed with a six-foot depth of water.

Mr. FOSTER. Will that allow towing ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these votes here being expended upon those stretches ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. When will the work now in hand be completed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This season.

Mr. FOSTER. When you leave Heely's Falls, how is it from that to Trenton ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is the section about which there is a doubt as to the route to be adopted. There are two routes when you get to Lake Ontario, one is by way of Port Hope.

Mr. FOSTER. You want to get from Heely's Falls to Port Hope.

Mr. EMMERSON. One route is by way of Trenton and another by way of Port Hope. Another is suggested by way of Cobourg, and still another which has been brought to my attention within the last few weeks or days, by way of Presq'ile harbour.

Mr. FOSTER. Then nothing is done in the way of helping navigation from Heely's Falls down to Trenton ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have had the privilege of living along the route, and I am delighted to see that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House are taking an interest in this important waterway. I may inform the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that the Georgian bay is 580 feet above sea level. From Georgian bay to Lake Couchiching is about thirteen miles.

Mr. FOSTER. Why did you not go up by Severn river ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is a rocky country and would be quite circuitous. The recommendation I believe is in favour of the direct route across from Lake Couchiching and coming in by Waubaushene. Lake Couchiching is 719 feet above the level of the sea. Thence down Lake Simcoe to Gamebridge and then up Talbot river, there is

some cutting between Simcoe and Balsover. Then coming to Kirkfield there is a lock about 50 feet high. Balsam lake is 838 feet above sea level and is on the height of land. From Balsam lake you pass through Rosedale river into Cameron lake. There is a lock between Balsam lake and Cameron lake at Rosedale of three or four feet. From Cameron lake you pass into Sturgeon lake by two locks twenty-eight feet in height. From Sturgeon lake you pass into Pigeon lake by a lock at Bobcaygeon about six or seven feet high. From Pigeon lake it is a level sail to Buckhorn, where there is a lock. Then you pass into Deer and Lovesick lakes. At Burleigh Falls there are locks entering into Stony lake and Clear lake. Then by Clear lake you pass south to Lakefield and on to Peterborough where you reach the lift-lock From below the lift-lock at Peterboro' there is uninterrupted navigation down to Hastings at the foot of Rice lake, where there is a lock. From Hastings to Heely's Falls there is uninterrupted navigation. There may be some work to be done from Campbellford and Chisholm's Rapids down to Trenton, about nine and a half or ten miles, that can be overcome by damming the river. I may point out that at the present moment there is uninterrupted navigation from Kirkfield to Heely's Falls, at least in the summer time. As soon as the locks are completed at Kirkfield there will be uninterrupted navigation from Orillia to Heely's Falls, leaving only the two ends to be completed, and these are the pieces of work I am urging on the minister now to complete.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the mileage from Heely's Falls to Lakefield ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The entire mileage is nearly 200 miles. There is not one foot of cutting except at the western end. There will be no cutting whatever excepting it may be half a mile here and there. It is all the way natural shores where steamers can go full sail ahead.

Mr. FOSTER. I am obliged to the minister and to his efficient deputy head on this side of the House for the information.

Mr. WARD. I would like to ask the minister if it is intended to make any further surveys by way of Trenton before the terminus of the canal is decided upon?

Mr. EMMERSON. That matter has been brought to my notice so recently that I am not in a position to determine. I have placed the matter in the hands of the chief engineer, and we will have to inquire as to the possibility of that route. It is no use to have a survey there unless there is some prospect of making it available for the purposes of the canal. Of course there is a resolution of the municipalities favouring it.

Mr. FOSTER. What was it that caused the survey to be started by way of Cobourg?

Mr. EMMERSON. Instructions were given to the chief engineer to study out all these possible outlets of this waterway on Lake Ontario, and the engineer in charge determined that Cobourg was worthy of study.

Mr. FOSTER. That was the engineer's initiative.

Mr. WARD. I would like to mention to the minister that he is a little mistaken in saying that the survey by way of Cobourg was initiated in December. I heard towards the end of October that surveys were going on then at Cobourg.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is an error. I have a memorandum from the engineer about the commencement.

Mr. WARD. I heard during the election campaign that the very engineers that were engaged in the survey of the Port Hope route were at the same time making a survey by way of Cobourg. That was the first I heard of it.

Galops canal—to stop leak in bank, $25,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This was rendered necessary owing to leaks in the banks. During the construction years ago some cribs were left in the banks of the canal. Since the level has been raised increasing the pressure, the water has forced itself through and along the cribs. The work is done by contract and tender, Mr. O'Leary having the contract.

Mr. J. D. REID. I cannot understand exactly how this leak occurred. I remember that there used to be a small leak about that point some years ago, but I understand that that was provided for in the original contract, and that it was supposed to have been well taken care of by the contractors when they were doing that excavation work and strengthening the bank. That bank was raised some six feet all along there.

Mr. EMMERSON. That increased the pressure according to the report of the engineers and therefore increased the leak.

Mr. J. D. REID. Of course it increased the pressure, because there were six feet more of water in the canal, but then the contractors were supposed to put in rock and earth sufficient to strengthen the bank and the work could not have been done properly by the contractors when they built that part of the work.

Mr. EMMERSON. I know that is absolutely necessary and the chief engineer tells me that that was not the cause of the difficulty.

Mr. J. D. REID. I remember the work going on there at the time and it was sup-

posed to be to strengthen the bank in order to prevent a leak of any kind occurring. My opinion is that that work was not properly done when the contractors were filling in the canal bank.

Mr. EMMERSON. The chief engineer tells me that the work was properly done in the original construction as far as the making of the bank is concerned and that the leak was the result of the pressure on the renewed bank.

Mr. J. D. REID. How is that work to be done ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The crib is to be taken up. That is under contract now and the vote of $25,000 will certainly complete the work.

Mr. J. D. REID. I asked the hon. minister last year that he should do something with the view of having the bridge at Cardinal properly attended to. Here is the question I asked last year :

Mr. J. D. REID. Has the minister done anything about arranging to have the bridge at Cardinal swung by some other means than hand power ?
Mr. EMMERSON. That matter is receiving the attention of the department now.
Mr. J. D. REID. It was receiving it a year ago.
Mr. EMMERSON. I had the papers under consideration this morning, and some instructions were given with a view to having that work done at once, so that the bridge will be swung by electric power.

That is a year ago and still there has been nothing done.

Mr. EMMERSON. Arrangements were being entered into at that time with the Edwardsburg Starch Company with the view to having the bridge swung that way. That is being carried out and I am in hopes that it will be fully completed so that there will be no further difficulty in that directon.

Mr. J. D. REID. Will it be completed at an early date ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We expect it to be completed at a very early date.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has the contract been let to the Edwardsburg Starch Company ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There have been some differences between that company and the Department of Railways and Canals, but the whole matter is under negotiation now with the view of settling all these difficulties. They have agreed to do the work for a certain consideration and while the contract has not been actually signed and executed, yet I have no doubt but that it will be fully completed and carried out.

Mr. J. D. REID. Will the hon. minister state if the item of $26,500 for the Galops rapids will complete the work or will there be any further votes for that work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Nothing more for that.

Mr. J. D. REID. That finishes it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That finishes it.

Cornwall canal—to fill in space between old and new locks at foot of canal, $4,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that to be done by contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. $2,000 was voted last year. Has anything been done yet ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, nothing has been done. There was nothing voted last year.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, $2,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is an error.

Mr. J. D. REID. What is the intention of the government in so far as that lighting contract is concerned ? Is it the intention of the government to take over the lighting plant and work it themselves or allow it to be continued under the contract which exists ? The government have the power of expropriation. I think the question came up last year.

Mr. EMMERSON. There are no reasons which suggest themselves to me now why we should undertake to expropriate at this time.

Williamsburg canals—to purchase steam hoist and steam pump, $1,500.

Mr. J. D. REID. What about that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There has never been a steam hoist or a steam pump on the Williamsburg canals and for the heavy work now being done one is necessary.

Mr. J. D. REID. I think there was an item in the estimates last year for building a new gate lifter. What has been done in regard to that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is being built.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is the building being built by contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is being built by contract.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who has the contract?

Mr. EMMERSON. I really cannot recall.

Mr. J. D. REID. The reason I asked is that I have seen no advertisement for that.

Mr. EMMERSON. The engineer tells me there were advertisements.

Mr. J. D. REID. What is the minister going to do about that position of collector on the Wallaceburg canal ? I see here at Cardinal the collector got $1,051.51, and last year he did not collect a cent of canal tolls.

Mr. EMMERSON. Later on I will have an opportunity of discussing the matter of collectors. I shall probably be in a position to announce the policy of the government as to whether or not we will resume the collection of tolls.

Mr. FOWLER. In the meantime the minister might intimate what this $1,051 was paid for.

Mr. EMMERSON. That has been explained time and time again. The tolls were abolished for a period of two seasons, but it was necessary to continue the collectors to keep a record of all traffic over the canals with a view to determining the effect of making the canals free, to ascertain whether the traffic was increased by that or not, and generally to determine as to the effect of that policy. That has been in effect for two seasons.

Mr. FOWLER. How is the amount arrived at ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Collectors were paid stated salaries, and they were continued. If the canals are continued free, there will have to be a decision made with respect to these officials.

Murray canal, $18,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister might explain this.

Mr. EMMERSON. There are at each side of each end of this canal ten isolated wooden cribs, connected by four stringers and flooring. The cribs are 24 feet apart, making 20 cribs at each end. These cribs and flooring are almost entirely decayed, having been built about twenty years ago. It is proposed to build them of concrete from a height of one foot below low water mark, standing 8 feet above low water mark. The wall is to be 9 feet high, 25 feet 6 inches thick for 5 feet, then 2 feet thick for the balance. The size of the pier is 25 by 30 feet, making 100 yards in each pier. Two piers have already been built out of the appropriation for repairs. Eighteen remain to be done at each end. An appropriation will be asked next year to rebuild the western end in the same way. It seems to be in the interests of economy to have these cribs rebuilt in this way with concrete.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the minister state the volume of traffic passing through the Murray canal, and whether it is increasing or decreasing ?

Mr. EMMERSON. From memory, I would say that last year it was somewhat less than the previous year. There have been some fluctuations, but in the main there has been an increase.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister an idea of what tonnage goes through that canal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot give my hon. friend a statement of that ; I do not carry the figures in my mind. I had the general result before me not long since, but I cannot exactly recall it.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be interesting to know whether the trade through that canal has been increased by it.

Mr. EMMERSON. There has been an increase in the trade, but whether it is true to that canal I am hardly in a position to say.

Welland canal—chargeable to income, $85,000. Stone protection to banks of new canal, $10,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. There was a vote of $20,000 last year ; $10,000 only was expended, and we are asking for a revote of $10,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is any part of the next vote for $30,000 a revote ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No part of it is a revote. $30,000 was expended last year. This work has been going on from time to time, and it is being done by the canal staff. On the works at Port Dalhousie there was expended, up to December 31, 1904, $50,400, and there yet remains to be done $39,200. The total cost of this work was estimated at $89,600.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the income from the Welland canal last year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There was no income from the tolls.

Mr. FOSTER. Then how do you charge it to income ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a fiction ; there is a small income in connection with leases, I think.

Mr. HENDERSON. The minister says that this work is being done by the canal staff. Are we to understand that there is a regular staff of workmen at all times repairing the canal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. During the summer season. There are workshops at Port Dalhousie. That has been the system for years. They make the repairs to the gates, and when they have no repairs to do they make new gates to have them on hand.

Mr. HENDERSON. How many men of that class are regularly employed on the canal? It seems to me that work of this kind should be done in some other way.

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend were to visit the canal and become acquainted with the character of the work these men are doing, he would appreciate the fact that it is in the interest of the canals to have that work carried on in that way. Old gates which are partly decayed have to be renewed. This could not be done by contract. The material is purchased by tender, and is kept there properly housed and dried, so that the very best material

is used in repairing old gates and making new ones. Spare gates must necessarily be kept on hand in case of accidents, because accidents do occur. Vessels going through the canals sometimes run against gates and break them, and to avoid delays it is necessary to have gates on hand ready to be put in position.

Mr. HENDERSON. I suppose these men are discharged in the fall of the year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Very nice patronage for some members along the line of the Welland canal.

Mr. EMMERSON. I suppose that is a necessary incident of having them.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these men practically permanent temporaries—that is, the same skilled men kept on year after year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes. Many of them have been employed right along for years. Of course, at times, if there is a great rush, it is necessary to have additional ones.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister says that they not only repair gates but make new ones. In that way do they make all the gates we require, or does the government sometimes have to buy gates ?

Mr. GERMAN. The gates are all made by the employees on the canal.

Mr. J. D. REID. In purchasing supplies for the canals, I understood the minister to state that he always asked for tenders ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The iron work in connection with these very gates is done by contract. I am speaking of the Welland canal. I may say that the valves and the hanging gear, neither of which worked satisfactorily, are being changed. The chain valve is being replaced by what is known as the butterfly valve.

Mr. J. D. REID. What I cannot understand is that although these canals are all new, the cost of maintaining them has increased. On the Williamsburg canal the repairs last year cost $20,254, and the wages paid out amounted to $10,212. The expenditure on that canal is double what it was a few years ago when the canal was old and needed much greater repairs. Perhaps the minister can explain why the expenditure has increased so rapidly.

Mr. EMMERSON. A new canal is much more expensive than an old canal. The new banks are much more difficult to keep in repair than old banks, because the settlement caused by time makes the latter more impervious to water and less liable to be worn away. Then, there has been a substantial increase in the wages paid.

Mr. FOSTER. Do these repairs extend over the whole length of the Welland canal?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the length of the Welland canal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Twenty-seven miles.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a very large amount. There was spent last year on the Welland canal $85,000 or $86,000 for labour and materials. Who hires the men and sees that they do their work, and who purchases the supplies and sees that they are got at the proper rates ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This work is entirely in charge of the superintending engineer of the canal, J. L. Weller, a very competent man. With regard to the supplies, tenders are asked for annually for all the materials required, by public advertisement, and the tenders are submitted to the department here. They come under my personal supervision, and the contracts are awarded to the lowest tenderers. Everything that is used in connection with the canal, whether tools or materials, is the subject of tender and contract.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the area of these tenders? They must be merely local, are they not?

Mr. EMMERSON. The advertisements are quite general. Some of the successful tenderers are in St. Catharines, but parties at Hamilton, Toronto and other points also tender.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that the engineer employs them in connection with the Welland canal ? That is not in accord with the policy laid down by the hon. minister the other evening when he said he invariably consulted the sitting member. In this case is the sitting member not consulted?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think my hon. friend hears something said and then puts his own interpretation upon it. I made no such statement. What I said was that in so far as patronage was concerned, if it became a question to be decided by me, I would always consult my friends ? My hon. friend is welcome to any benefit he can get from that statement. But I have to-day been asked a question regarding this particular canal, and I have said that the appointment of the officials is made by the department, but that the employment of men from time to time is done by the superintending engineer. The selection of permanent men is submitted to the department. In some cases, where it is necessary, the appointments are made by Order in Council. In others they are made by the department.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not wish to misrepresent the hon. gentleman, and I am quite sure he does not wish to misquote me, but he has misquoted me none the less. I asked the other evening the same question, namely, what the policy of his department was in

respect to the employment of men, and he gave me a straight answer, which no one could misconstrue. His answer was that the policy of his department was to consult the sitting member in the county. My hon. friend shakes his head but 'Hansard' will prove that I am correct. The item was repairs to the Cornwall canal and the question was raised concerning the large number of men employed on that canal in election time. But this evening, in answer to the hon. member for North Toronto, (Mr. Foster) my hon. friend said that the employment of the men was in the hands of the engineer. I asked him if that was the policy of his department, and he said it was. I would like to know what is really the policy of the department in this matter.

Mr. EMMERSON. In cases where questions arise in my department concerning the employment of men and the names are submitted to me, I say frankly that if I have the opportunity, I consult the sitting member, provided he is friendly to me and the administration. But speaking now of what has transpired in connection with this canal, I repeat that the superintending engineer selects the temporary men, and where permanent men are required, those recommended by our friends and who are satisfactory in other respects get the appointments.

To build retaining wall in rock cut, Welland canal, $60,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has the government any policy as regards the deepening of the Welland canal to 20 feet ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That has not been determined.

Improvements, Trent canal, $17,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be done with that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. These improvements consist of the entrance pier at Lovesick, $2,000 ; Young's Point landing pier lower entrance, $3,000 ; Young's point new swing bridge, $3,500 ; removing shoal in river below Hastings, $2,000 ; removing shoals in river below Peterboro, $2,000 ; Young's point entrance to lock, $3,000 ; purchase of concrete mixture in connection with repairs to canal, $1,500.

St. Ours canal—new booms and pier, $7,300.

Mr. EMMERSON. The present conditions for mooring are quite insufficient. In order to remedy this condition, the piers are to be extended some 200 feet. I am advised by the engineers of the department that this is a very urgent improvement. It will cost $7,300.

Repairs to guide piers, Greece's Point, $4,660; building new lighthouse, $190 ; rebuilding Grenville wharf, $23,000.

Mr. PERLEY. What is this for ?

Mr. EMMERSON. These piers were built in 1880 and a portion of them require to be rebuilt. They also require a new lighthouse which will cost $190. Then the Grenville wharf will require to be rebuilt. We asked a vote of $23,000 last year but that was not expended and I am asking a revote.

Mr. FOSTER. That should be down as a revote.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a revote of $23,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister must have been very careless in framing his estimates —there are several of these errors.

Mr. EMMERSON. They were sent to the printer by the department in proper shape.

Mr. FOWLER. The proof-reading is bad ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It certainly is bad. I found a number of errors of this character.

Mr. LENNOX. Last year it was the same way.

Mr. EMMERSON. Special care was taken by the officials of the department in this matter this year because I found it very embarrassing last year on several occasions when there were revotes that were not so marked.

Mr. FOWLER. Who does the proof-reading ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know. I suppose it is done in the Printing Bureau.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you making a new wharf there ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There was a wharf there, and we are rebuilding. This is a revote from last year.

Mr. FOWLER. This is a large amount of money.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it for canal traffic ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It has always been used in connection with canal traffic.

Mr. FOSTER. Was this by contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, the contract was given to Messrs. Martineau & Son after public advertisement calling for tenders. The contract was made on December 5th ; no work has been done owing to the late date at which the contract was let.

Mr. FOWLER. Is the minister taking out the old wharf to put in the new one ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We take out the old wharf down to water-level.

Mr. FOWLER. What are the dimensions of the wharf ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is about 300 feet long. There is a large amount of concrete work in it.

Mr. PERLEY. This wharf is necessary. A wharf has been there ever since I can remember. I am glad the minister has given a contract for the work, because I see that last year, in building guide piers at the same place, the department paid for spruce and hemlock timber $30 a thousand feet, a larger sum than I have ever been able to get for it in my experience.

Mr. FOWLER. There was a guide-pier built last year. Can that be utilized in connection with the new work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The guide-pier is different from the wharf.

Mr. FOSTER. What has the minister to say about paying $30 a thousand for timber that a practical man says he never could get so high a price for ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Of course, this was a year previous to my incumbency in office. I am advised by the chief engineer that all the material was purchased by tender and contract.

Mr. FOSTER. But if tenders are called for and all of them seem high the minister is bound not to accept any of them.

Mr. EMMERSON. In any such cases coming under my own notice I certainly hesitate to accept any tender, and I am satisfied that is the course pursued by the department generally.

Mr. FOWLER. Was it because of extraordinary size of this timber that so high a rate was paid ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The chief engineer tells me that for the kind of timber purchased $30 a thousand was not out of the way. I cannot give dimensions but I can furnish a statement later on if the hon. gentlemen desire it.

Mr. FOWLER. This was spruce and hemlock timber and, it was charged for at this high rate. There could have been no justification except its size and quality.

Mr. GERMAN. And its length.

Mr. EMMERSON. The length I include in the size. It would need to be extraordinary in some way to be worth $30 a thousand.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand this would be the ordinary timber used in crib-work. I do not suppose there would be much difference between that and cribs constructed elsewhere. My recollection is that in my county where some work was done constructing a pier, hemlock timber was bought for about $17 a thousand from a mill on the Georgian bay, delivered on Lake Ontario. Certainly $30 a thousand seems to be an extraordinary price.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think I am right in stating that this timber was bought by competition, and that was the lowest tender for that class. It certainly could not be very much out of the way, because where there is competition the tenderers are not very apt to make the price unreasonably high if they have any hope of geting the contract.

Mr. FOWLER. Some departments have a peculiar way of bringing about competition. They invite two or three of their friends doing business to send in tenders.

Mr. EMMERSON. This was done by newspaper advertisement.

Mr. FOWLER. As I understand, this was piling, and piling is not usually bought by the thousand feet.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not referred to the Auditor General's account. Will the hon. gentleman state what kind of timber it was that we paid $30 for ?

Mr. PERLEY. Page 123—timber, spruce and hemlock, per thousand feet, $30. It does not say what size.

Mr. FOWLER. Surely the minister can tell what work was done there, whether it was piling or not.

Mr. PERLEY. I would call attention to this fact. The minister says he advertised for tenders. I would like to know how he managed it, because there is no newspaper in that county except one, and that is miles away from the spot. If tenders are asked for from private parties, as I understand is sometimes done, and people are asked to tender, that is one thing entirely different from asking for tenders in a large city where newspapers are numerous.

Mr. EMMERSON. Tenders were asked for by advertisement, as I am advised by the engineer, in the papers of Ottawa and Montreal, and in local papers if there are any in the county. That is the usual way. But it was all by newspaper advertisement.

Mr. FOWLER. If this was ordinary crib-work, it is the very roughest kind of timber that is used for that purpose, and the price charged here is at least double, no matter what the length, because knotty, rough timber is used generally for that purpose.

Mr. GERMAN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, it is usually the best timber that is used in crib-work, not rough timber. What makes the price of timber sometimes abnormally high is its length and the time of the year it has to be supplied. The time of the year it is supplied, the length of the timber, the quality of the timber, are all considerations which go to enhance the price, and it is a good quality of timber that is required for crib-work.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not profess to have any professional knowledge, but I understood from the minister that the work in question was the construction of a wharf on foundations that already existed there.

Therefore, I have no right to assume that the timber would be of any extraordinary length. I would assume that the timber was like that used in my own county. I find there was paid last year for 778 feet of hemlock $20.50, and to my mind the hemlock in the two cases would be very much similar. In one case it is $30 a thousand, in the other $20.50.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) says the season of the year at which the timber is procured would make a difference in the price. Granting that, it would show bad management on the part of the department if they did not procure this timber at a season of the year when it could be most cheaply procured. They waited until it could be procured only in the most expensive way. It was not a rush order. As to the length of the timber, we cannot get any information.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will explain why it could not be bought at the proper time. In the year previous the appropriations were abnormally late, and the department cannot undertake works unless parliament has appropriated the money.

Mr. FOWLER. You often do it.

Mr. EMMERSON. No. I want to say frankly to my hon. friend that we do not do it, and I have felt embarrassment on more than one occasion, and was delayed for some months in accepting tenders because the appropriations had not been voted.

Mr. PERLEY. I think the explanation of the minister is a lame one, because you can get timber in either winter or summer. I have bought a lot of timber and used it in building piers, both in winter and summer. The timber can be had on the spot about as cheap in one season as another.

Some resolutions reported.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. What work will be taken up to-morrow ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The Minister of Agriculture will take the third reading of the Census Bill. Then we will go into supply, and the Minister of Railways will finish canals, and the acting Minister of Public Works will proceed with his estimates ; if not, the Minister of Agriculture will proceed with his.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 22, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

Mr. HENDERSON.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 71) respecting the Great Northern Railway of Canada.—Mr. M. S. Schell —by Mr. Calvert.

QUESTIONS.

STEAMBOAT COMMUNICATION—ST. FRANCOIS AND QUEBEC.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. Has the government, or any department of the government, received a request for a subsidy for a steamboat, or for a line of steamboats intended to run between St. Francois, Island of Orleans, and Quebec ?
2. If so, by whom was the said request made, and what is the date thereof ?
3. Is it the intention of the government to grant such subsidy ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. Yes.
2. Request was made under date of October 13th, 1904.
3. The government has decided not to grant the subsidy requested.

WATER POWER FROM BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. From the 1st of January, 1901, to the 1st of January, 1905, has there been any correspondence between the Department of Railways and Canals, or any other department, and the mayor of the town of Beauharnois, or any other person representing the town of Beauharnois, regarding the obtaining of a water power at the fifth lock on the Beauharnois canal, or at any other lock on the said canal, for the purpose of procuring motive power for the manufactories and the electric light in the town of Beauharnois ?
2. If so, what is the nature of such negotiations, and what is the result thereof ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Yes.
2. The nature of the negotiations was for the obtaining of water with a view of establishing manufacturing industries.
3. No final conclusion yet reached.

REVENUE FROM OSHAWA HARBOUR.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

What amount in revenue has been received from the Oshawa harbour ?

Hon. R. PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). $804.69.

LOBSTER FISHING, N.B.

Mr. GANONG asked :

What was the open season for catching lobsters in district No. 1, New Brunswick, for the years 1903 and 1904 ; and what is the open season for 1905 ?

Hon. R. PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). In 1903 and 1904 the lobster fishing season was from the 6th January to the 29th June, both days inclusive. The lobster fishing season in Charlotte county in the year 1905 is from

the 15th December to the 30th May, both days inclusive.

COLD STORAGE PLANTS FOR BAIT.

Mr. GANONG asked :

1. How many cold storage plants for bait have been erected ?
2. What are their locations, and what is the respective cost to the government ?
3. What did each cost the government for maintenance in 1904 ?
4. What amount of bait was handled in each for 1904 ?
5. Are there any similar plants now under contract ? If so, where are they to be located, and what amount is to be contributed by the government respectively ?
6. Is it the intention of the government to have a cold storage plant for bait erected at any point on the Bay of Fundy this year ? If so, at what place ?

Hon. R. PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Twenty-nine.
2.

Location.	Province.	Cost to Government
		$ cts.
Frog Pond	P.E.I	580 09
Alberton	"	673 83
Miminegash	"	420 23
Souris	"	1,000 00
Ballentyne's Cove	N.S	861 04
Bayfield	"	952 94
Port Hood Island	"	656 80
Cheticamp Chapel	"	638 71
Eastern Harbour	"	745 51
Ingonish	"	797 16
Gabarouse	"	991 41
Petit de Grat	"	757 97
Whitehead	"	481 70
Port Beckerton	"	521 42
Sambro	"	1,000 00
Port la Tour	"	690 01
Clark's Harbour	"	601 44
Lower East Pubnico	"	1,000 00
Sandy Cove	"	713 67
Shediac	N.B	605 09
North Rustico	P.E.I	617 50
Westport	N.S	800 00
North Sydney	"	1,000 00
Ketch Harbour	"	700 94
Bonaventure River	Que	916 02
La Have	N.S	1,0 0 00
St. Peter's	"	1,000 00
Half Island Cove	"	908 43
Caplin	Que	439 69

3. All the accounts for the bonus on bait frozen for the year 1904 have not yet been received.

4. Frog Pond, 11,150 pounds; Miminegash, 40,000 pounds ; Alberton, 40,300 pounds ; North Rustico, 40,084 pounds ; Bayfield, 45,500 pounds ; Eastern Harbour, 43,200 pounds ; Ingonish Ferry, 42,200 pounds ; Petit de Grat, 40,000 pounds ; Whitehead, 41,000 pounds ; Port Beckerton, 34,000 pounds ; Shediac, 43,000 pounds ; Ketch Harbour, 42,000 pounds ; Half Island Cove, 45,000 pounds ; Sambro, 50,900 pounds ; Sandy Cove, 46,000 pounds ; La Have, 21,-000 pounds ; Westport, 44,190 pounds ; Clark's Harbour, 22,000 pounds ; Bonaventure River, 49,800 pounds ; Caplin, 38,800 pounds.

The reports from the other freezers do not specify the quantity of bait frozen during 1904.

5. Yes ; one at Anse à le Barbe, Gaspé, and another at Lockport, Nova Scotia.

Under the regulations covering the construction of these bait freezers the department pays half the cost of construction and equipment up to a sum of one thousand dollars.

6. The regulations provide that in any locality where twenty or more fishermen form themselves into an association, with a capital stock of not less than five hundred dollars, the department will give the assistance referred to in answer to question No. 5.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 5) respecting the Census and Statistics.—Mr. Fisher.

SUPPLY—MANITOBA ELECTION RETURNS.

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair, I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether or not he has an answer to the question which I put in his absence the day before yesterday in regard to the alleged non-performance by the deputy returning officers in Manitoba of the duties which are distinctly cast upon them under the terms of the Dominion Election Act of 1900. I do not know whether the attention of my right hon. friend has been directed to what I then mentioned or not. I gave a reference to the statute under which the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is obliged to provide lists for each of the polling sections as well as a reference to another section of the same statute under which the returning officers are bound to return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery certain documents and papers which have been used in the respective polling subdivisions. I pointed out also that these documents have not been returned to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, so that they cannot be made available in certain legal proceedings which are now pending in the province of Manitoba, and I would like to know whether or not the government is in possession of any information as to the conduct of these gentlemen who are officers of this House and whose conduct therefore is a legitimate subject of inquiry

in parliament and possibly of action by parliament.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I may inform my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) that I received to-day two memoranda from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on this subject, but I have not yet been able to look at them. I will be able to give him an answer to-morrow.

SEIZURE OF THE SCHOONER 'AGNES G. DONOHUE.'

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the government to a report that appears in the Halifax Morning Chronicle of the 17th inst., in reference to the schooner Agnes G. Donahue and her crew. This is a vessel that was owned in the city of Halifax and which some time in September last started on a sealing voyage down to the southern sealing grounds. While on her way down there she was captured by the government of Uruguay, one of the republics of South America. My information is that she was seized on November 11 last, and that the crew of nineteen men and the captain are still prisoners on board of the schooner, that they are not allowed to leave the vessel and that although a trial took place in the Supreme Court of that country, nothing whatever has been proven against the schooner. Still, she is in the hands of the government, the nineteen men with the officers are still prisoners on board the schooner and nobody is allowed to communicate with them. I am not sure whether this matter has been brought to the notice of the government or not, but I am sure that it is a question that shoud receive due consideration and immediate attention. I have been informed that some steps were being taken by the authorities to make good the damages to the owners of the vessel, but I am also informed that there is nothing in contemplation to be done for the men. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully urge that as provision is being made for the owners of the vessel who have lost the services of the schooner and the profits that they might have made out of the voyage, some consideration also should be shown to the men. The men were only working on shares. They had no fixed wages from the owners of the schooner. They were to receive so much for each skin that was caught. These nineteen men are thrown out of their employment and the loss entailed upon them by the three or four months idleness during which they are kept prisoners, and the time it will take them to return to their homes again is a very serious matter to them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the alleged cause of the seizure ?

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. It is alleged that they were poaching, but I am informed on what is considered good authority that there is no law or regulation in that country in respect to sealing, and that this vessel was four miles off the shore when she was captured and furthermore that although there was a trial nothing was proved against her. Although this case as an international question may be considered small, still to those who are particularly concerned it is a very big question, and I urge upon the government that if justice is to be done to these parties it should be done quickly. Where the home government has to deal with a matter of this kind progress is usually very slow. I hope that in dealing with this case there will not be a repetition of those slow methods if justice is to be done to those who are immediately concerned. I would respectfully commend this matter to the attention of the government.

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Mr. Speaker, the question is a new one to the House I am sure, but it is not new to the department. We had a complaint, I think, about a month ago about this act on the part of this southern republic, the seat of whose government is at Montevideo. We took the matter in hand at once and we entered into communication with the home government in order to secure the release of the men. After a couple of cables we were informed that the men had been discharged, but that the government at Montevideo intended to keep the captain in jail although there was no law to keep him in jail, but from the information we gathered they were preparing the law to meet the case. We, therefore, again put ourselves in communication with the home government and presented the facts as we were informed. We have received no reply yet to the last communication we have had with the home government on the question. I understand that the British consul at Montevideo is doing his best under the circumstances. It is one of these extraordinary cases that will happen now and then in these countries. The hon. gentleman may rest assured that we are not at all losing sight of the question and we are anxious for an early settlement so that justice may be done to a Canadian.

Mr. FOSTER. You are not sending the Canada down there.

Motion agreed to and House went into Committee of Supply.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to income—arbitrations and awards, $4,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is the usual vote.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister explain how that amount was expended last year?

Mr. EMMERSON. We only expended up to Jan. 31 $115.20 out of the $4,000. A vote of $4,000 is taken annually ; sometimes the full amount is expended, sometimes it is not.

Surveys and inspections—canals, $3,000.

Mr. PERLEY. Has the superintendent been appointed for the Carillon and Grenville canal, and if so, who?

Mr. EMMERSON. A gentleman was recommended to me whose name I think was McCoy.

Mr. PERLEY. Will the minister tell me what his experience consists of and what his previous business was?

Mr. EMMERSON. I will not be certain as to that. The name was submitted to the superintending engineer of the canal to inquire as to his qualifications; the chief engineer tells me that Mr. Marceau is quite satisfied with the qualifications and with the information which is secured with respect to the nominee or candidate for the position. My instructions were carried out and his appointment has been made.

Mr. PERLEY. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether he expects a man in this position to be really the superintendent of the canal, or whether he is appointed nominally for the sake of the salary; because I am given to understand that this man has been hitherto a marble cutter and manufacturer of tombstones?

Mr. EMMERSON. The superintending engineer is the man with the technical skill, while the superintendent or overseer is required to be simply a business man, with the ordinary tact and judgment that would be required for the carrying on of any business.

Mr. PERLEY. I thank the minister. I simply wanted to get that information, because on that basis the man is a good man.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the salary attached to the position?

Mr. EMMERSON. $1,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the duties such a man has to perform?

Mr. EMMERSON. He has the employment and direction of the men, the looking after the repairs, the direction of the traffic passing through the canal as respects the opening of gates and the order in which vessels shall be taken through, and generally the oversight of the canal.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister lay down the principle in employing men to be overseers of canals that it makes no difference at all whether they have had any previous experience in canal work—I mean the technical business details connected with the management of a canal? Certainly there would not be much that a man would gain in a tombstone business to fit him for that particular kind of work. Surely there ought to be some special qualification in the line of the work which he has to do to fit him for a position of that kind and to entitle him to his salary.

Mr. EMMERSON. On all these canals the work of construction is under the charge of the superintending engineer. The superintendent as such has nothing whatever to do with that. There are no men in training for positions as superintendents of canals. There are men employed as labourers, for the opening and closing of gates and the turning of bridges, but there are no men who are in a lower position and who climb up step by step to a higher. I have no doubt that occasionally there might be a man who commenced on the canal as a labourer and who would eventually reach a much higher position; but these are very few and far between, and the only thing that is left for the department to do is to select men with good business qualifications, with tact and judgment and some executive ability, because they have to carry on transactions on the canal in a business way with the public.

Mr. FOSTER. Such, for instance, as——

Mr. EMMERSON. Very largely in connection with differences arising between different transportation companies as to which shall have precedence, and so on; he has to do with directing the men, where material is to be taken, and he must see that the boats do not go through at a higher speed than is required by the regulations.

Mr. FOSTER. And all that would be excellently well understood by a tombstone maker.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, and a poet might do it.

Mr. FOSTER. A thousand dollar man to take charge of a canal under the superintending engineer, it seems to me, ought to be a man who would have some knowledge of transportation; at least, he should not be afraid of the water. He ought to know something about building, particularly that kind which goes on about a canal. The superintending engineer cannot be always on the works. He would lay out the works, as I understand, and the superintendent would see that they are completed according to his directions. It does not seem to me that a tombstone maker has any particular qualifications to entitle him to be chosen by a superintending engineer for this work. The minister says that there are no persons going up step by step. No, and there never will be any chance for them, so long as he goes outside to search for tombstone makers to make them superintendents of canals. Even though a man is a business man in a tombstone way, it does not follow that he would be a very capable man for this kind of work. He would always be looking forward to the future; the present would have no interest

for him. I would suppose that the experience acquired by a man engaged in tombstone work during the course of a long and mournful life would not be such as to qualify him for this class of work.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend will perhaps admit that a marble worker and even a carver of tombstones might be a good business man. A few years ago, when my hon. friend had some responsibility for the management of the canals, the superintendent of the Cornwall canal was a blacksmith, and I have not heard that that prevented his being a successful superintendent. In the Williamsburg canal the late government had a doctor as superintendent. I do not know what particular qualification a doctor might have for the work except that he might be a good bone setter and set a broken leg in case of accident. After all it simply resolves itself down to this, that the man who makes a successful superintendent must have a good business head and good executive ability.

Mr. PERLEY. I have listened attentively to what the hon. minister has said. But in the county I have the honour to represent, I find that the position is supposed to be a political appointment and that the appointee must be politically qualified, whatever qualification he may have in other respects. I hope the hon. minister does not make all his appointments on that basis. As regards the man in question, whose name is McCoy, he is a very respectable citizen and a very decent fellow. If the appointment is to be a political one, I have no objection to this particular nomination, but I do not think it is good for the service to have the impression generally created that when a position of that sort becomes vacant on a canal, it can only be filled by some one who has political pull.

Mr. EMMERSON. Before making this appointment, I had the qualifications of the applicant inquired into, and the superintending engineer, Mr. Marceau, reported that he was well qualified. I carried out Mr. Marceau's recommendation. The appointment was not strictly political. Mr. McCoy was appointed on the recommendation of the superintending engineer, who said he was well qualified, but in addition he was a friend of the administration, and of course, other things being equal, I would give our friends the preference. That is a necessary incident of party government, and the case in question is one to which exception would not be taken by any hon. member opposite. They have had their day and may have it again in the distant future. We have followed what has been the course since confederation and what I fancy will be the course so long as party government prevails in Canada and human nature is what it is.

Mr. COCHRANE. What salary has this gentleman and does he live near the canal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. A salary of $1,000 providing he attends to the duties of his position and regardless of where he lives.

Mr. COCHRANE. Does he get any pay for going to his work ? We have a superintendent on the Murray canal who gets $1,000 but who will not condescend to live near the canal. He lives in Brighton and is paid for 255 trips down to the canal at the rate of $1.50 a trip.

Mr. EMMERSON. He is not superintendent.

Mr. COCHRANE. He has charge of the canal and is called a superintendent with us. He gets $6 a month for his house and $6 a month for his office, but he has no other office than that which is in the government building. When he takes a trip down to Trenton he gets $3 a trip, and when he goes visiting his own home he charges the country $2 a trip. The hon. minister may laugh, but it is easy for him to laugh as he is not the one who pays.

Mr. EMMERSON. You should rebuke your own friends for laughing.

Mr. COCHRANE. The high school teacher in Brighton gets $1,000 a year and provides his own house. It is ridiculous to give this official $1,000 and then pay him for every day he goes down to his work. Every time the superintendent of the Murray canal goes from Brighton down to the canal he gets $1.50 a trip and the trips amounted to 255. He also gets $6 a month for his house allowance and $6 for the office, though he has no office except that built by the government. He gets paid for trips going down to Trenton, which is only a short distance from the eastern end of the canal, $3 a trip, and when he goes to the country to visit his friends he gets $2 a trip.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. This gentleman does not go to Brighton.

Mr. COCHRANE. You are chuck full of information. Does this gentleman get paid for going to his work on the canal in addition to his salary and does he get any allowance for house and rent ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The superintendent of this canal lives right on the spot. With respect to the Murray canal, my hon. friend knows, because he was familiar with the canals in that section in bygone days, that the gentleman now occupying the position of superintendent is paid just in the same way as was his predecessor. His predecessor under the former government was paid a salary and given so much allowance for driving to the canal. It appears that has been continued. I am glad my hon. friend has brought the matter to my notice. I shall inquire into it. But I am advised that it has been the course of the department since long before the present government came into power. I will get the exact facts

as to the expenses charged, and learn whether these expenses are properly chargeable to the canal.

Mr. COCHRANE. Here is another case of 'You did the same.' We have heard that until it has become stale; and, to my mind, even when it was fresh it was no justification for extravagance on the part of this government. When in opposition they charged the government of that time with extravagance and promised to do better. And now the minister tries to defend what he must know to be dishonest so far as this superintendent is concerned by saying that the same was done in previous years. The former superintendent was dismissed, and the cause of his dismissal was that he made these charges. Yet, to-day, the salary paid to the present officer is justified on the ground that it was paid to the previous occupant of the office. That is no justification. The only way to justify it is to show that the man is entitled to it. The minister says he will inquire into the matter. We have the Auditor General's Report for the facts, and if that is not enough, I do not know to whom the minister will apply. I never was more disgusted in my life than when I travelled over that canal during the last election, and found that the office occupied by this official was built at the public expense, and yet he was getting $6 a month for office rent. The minister says that the position of superintendent of the canal does not call for special qualifications, but that a marble cutter can fill the office. I do not know what officer can require special qualifications if this one does not. Does the minister mean to tell me that the engineer in charge of the canal is there all the time to see to it that the public money is not wasted? If, when the frost comes out of the ground in the spring a part of the embankment slides down into the canal, is it not clear that a man of brain power and business capacity is needed to handle the men to make the repairs? If men have been put into such positions simply because they are good party men, and regardless of their qualifications for the duties expected of them, it is time to call a halt. Here is a man receiving $1,000 a year, when the high school teachers in the same section receive no more, and then he gets an allowance for an office rent when the government itself has provided the office.

Mr. LEWIS. Is it not possible and advisable to fill these positions in connection with the canals and lighthouses from the ranks of men who are acquainted with navigation matters. We have now a considerable commercial navy, and the men engaged in it have not many positions ashore open to them. Would it not be wise for the minister to fill such places as this with men, even his own party friends who are familiar with vessel transportation and the use of the canals? I would strongly urge this course.

Mr. EMMERSON. I presume you will find many men of that class with the necessary ability. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asked a question last night with regard to the timber for the guide-piers on the Carillon and Grenville canal. Of course, that was for last year, and is not involved in this vote, but I desire to explain the matter. This timber was supplied under a contract which was entered into after tenders had been called for by newspaper advertisement. The contract was based on schedule rates. The lowest tender, that of Martineau, Son & Lemoine, was accepted. In the Auditor General's Report I find that the total cost was $19,788.55—that being the result of the final adjustment between the chief engineer and the contractor. The price of the spruce and hemlock was $30 per thousand as stated last night, pine timber being $35 and tamarack plank also $35. We have here also the concrete, the stone filling and all the other items entering into the construction of this guide-pier. The best criterion by which to judge whether the prices were reasonable or not is found in the fact that there was open competition and that six tenders were received.

Mr. PERLEY. The explanation of the minister is satisfactory, so far as it goes. But he must have had a very unfortunate experience with the people who tendered, because, while $35 per thousand for pine, is fair enough, yet $30 for spruce and hemlock in that locality where the timber is grown and made is out of all reason. I have never known such prices to be paid, and I have bought and sold a great deal of these woods.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have already stated that this was a competitive price, but I should also call the attention of the committee to the fact that this price is for the timber in the work, with all the labour upon it employed in putting it there. If the hon. gentleman will consult the Auditor General's Report, he will find that there is nothing there for labour, except an item for taking down certain work as ordered,—a special matter. But all these items are computed at a certain price, with the labour included, that is to say, the timber used is measured after it has become a part and parcel of the whole and completed work. I think that is an element which would affect the judgment of my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley).

Mr. BLAIN. Is that the customary way in his department of measuring timber? If it is not, why was there an exception in this case?

Mr. EMMERSON. The engineer says that is the customary way in making up the final estimates of the department where it is by schedule rate; because concrete must mean concrete completed and placed

in the work where it is required, and where the specifications design it should be; and timber must mean the timber as a part of the completed work placed in the position where the requirements of the specifications designed.

Mr. BLAIN. Am I to understand that in every case the contractor who does this work supplies the timber?

Mr. EMMERSON. That depends upon the call for tenders, that is always specified. In some instances the department would furnish the material, and then it would be a tender for doing the work and putting it in place. It depends upon how the call for tenders goes forward. If you are simply asking for tenders for timber, then of course it would mean the measurements before it became a part of any work. But where you are asking for tenders for the construction of a guide pier, then the schedule prices would mean timber or concrete as part of the completed work.

Mr. LALOR. What is the length of this timber? That makes a considerable difference.

Mr. EMMERSON. The timber was from 20 to 25 feet in length.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the nature of the work?

Mr. EMMERSON. Cribwork and concrete.

Mr. LALOR. $30 would be a pretty steep price for hemlock timber. I have taken contracts where I got it at a much better price than that.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend must bear in mind this fact, that we invited tenders, and there were six tenders, of which we chose the lowest. The whole public of Canada had an opportunity to tender, what more could be done? No exception can be taken to the action of the department. Of course it may be said, oh, this could be done for less. The opportunity was open to the hon. gentleman himself to tender.

Mr. LALOR. Did you advertise for these tenders?

Mr. EMMERSON. I stated time and again that we advertised in the newspapers of Ottawa and Montreal, and at points between.

Mr. MONK. The grievance to which I wish to call my hon. friend's attention is one which we suffer from at Côte St. Paul. I endeavoured to obtain a redress of that grievance by writing to the employees of the department on the canal at Côte St. Paul. Last year I had some communication with the minister; but I think it is absolutely necessary to bring the matter before the House, and I would ask my hon. friend to give a strict order that the proper remedies be applied to that grievance. As the hon. gentleman is probably aware, on the Lachine canal at Côte St. Paul, there are a certain number of manufacturers who use the water-power from the canal. They depend upon that water-power to a very large extent in carrying on their manufacturing business. The complaint which I urged last year on their behalf and brought to the notice of my hon. friend, was that the water levels during the winter months are not properly kept up on all parts of the canal. There is a part of the canal below Côte St. Paul which, according to the complaints that have been made to me, is kept abundantly supplied with water, or at any rate receives a larger portion of water than the part at Côte St. Paul itself. This grievance only appears in the winter, because in the winter the supply of water in the canal for the purpose of manufacturing is not as regular as in the summer, because as is contended, the levels vary in the lake, and perhaps on account of the ice also. I will read to the House a letter I have received in connection with this matter, and then I will send to my hon. friend at his department a tabulated statement of the variations of the levels, which would be too long to read here. I really believe, after the efforts I have made to secure from the employees of the canal proper attention to this matter, that it has been neglected, and that by bringing it to the notice of the department a word from the minister will probably suffice to procure the necessary degree of vigilance. These manufacturers suffer a great deal of annoyance, and some loss, which could be avoided if proper care were taken. This is the letter I have received from one of the manufacturers:

Dear Sir,—Attached is a copy of a letter written yesterday to Mr. O'Brien——

Mr. O'Brien is one of the chief employees on the canal.

——which is largely self-explanatory. We are also returning his letter of the 11th instant, as sent you, having carefully noted his contentions.

If our trouble was caused entirely by low water in Lake St. Louis, as he contends, our demands would be unreasonable to say the least. We have asked nothing unreasonable, however. What we have all along held is that the level below is kept up regardless of any and all conditions, while our supply level is continually fluctuating. The figures we give him in the letter attached show our position. On Monday the level below was 14 feet 4 inches, the level above was so low as to be entirely useless. No doubt some shortage at Lachine is a frequent occurrence at this season of the year, but we only ask a fair division of such shortage. Surely there is nothing unfair or unreasonable in our asking that the other users of the water bear their proportionate burden of existing conditions rather than have it all fall upon us as at present.

You will also observe the fact of the fluctuation in our supply level. One day it is up, the next it is down. Some days it is up in the

morning and down again in the afternoon. Now if the whole cause was a shortage at Lachine, would there be this rapid fluctuation ? Would there not be a low level of more permanency than this ? We think so. The difficulty is simply that the man at St. Paul locks is instructed to keep the level below at some 14 feet 4 inches, and he does it regardless of whether we have an inch of head left or not.

Last year the trouble started in December, 1903, but this year we did not feel it until January. It always lasts until the canal is emptied, so that our period of difficulty is somewhat lengthier than the two months which Mr. O'Brien speaks of, being more like four months.

Now instead of complaining of this, which I think amounts to neglect and carelessness, at the beginning of the session when this trouble recurred, I wrote to the employees of the canal. I wrote particularly to Mr. O'Brien in regard to this. I do not think Mr. O'Brien is at fault, but I think there are some men in charge of the regulation of the levels who require to be informed by the department that they must more carefully attend to their duties. If the hon. minister will be kind enough to give such an order, I think that fact, with the fact that the matter has been discussed publicly, will bring some relief to these manufacturers who are certainly entitled to it. There is just one other point to which I wish to call the hon. minister's attention while I am on my feet. As the hon. gentleman is aware there is going to be a bridge built at Atwater avenue this spring. I have no doubt that the bridge is at present ready, that all the structural pieces have been completed, and I have no doubt whatever that if the pieces were brought upon the ground, all the work along the canal done and everything ready it would not be necessary to take the water out of the canal for more than three weeks. That is not the opinion of an expert which I express, but it is an opinion which I have arrived at from what I have been told by builders and contractors. There is a question this spring of drawing off the water from the Lachine canal for six weeks and the opinion of the superintendent of the canal in Montreal is that it will be necessary to remove the water from the canal from March 15 until May 1, even though day and night work is resorted to.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is always required.

Mr. MONK. I do not think so.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think that is part of the contract.

Mr. MONK. No, I do not think there can be any such stipulation in the contract. I do not know what this contract is, but I do know that there is no clause in the contract which provides that the water shall be drawn off from the 15th March to the 1st of May ; in fact I am morally sure there is no such clause.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a clause requiring them to work day and night.

Mr. MONK. No doubt, and no doubt there is a stipulation on behalf of the contractor that the water shall be drawn off for a sufficient time to allow him to perform his contract. I believe that if the contractor is told that he will be kept strictly to his contract it is possible to put that bridge across the canal in less time than six weeks. I am sure it is possible and I would invite my hon. friend to endeavour to secure from the contractor an undertaking that the day the water is drawn off he will be ready to go to work, put on day and night shifts of workmen and endeavour to complete that work in a shorter time than six weeks. As my hon. friend can readily imagine it is a severe privation for the manufacturers who use the waters of the canal to be deprived of water during such a long period as six weeks. They are obliged to have recourse to electricity or steam power, and it is a serious interruption to their work and it is a serious loss not only for themselves but for the men whom they employ. I think if my hon. friend will give instructions to the superintendent of the canal at Montreal to endeavour to secure the performance of this work in a shorter time than six weeks he will undoubtedly succeed and will deserve the gratitude of the people interested.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would inform my hon. friend that the department has already taken the steps to which he makes reference. If we only had the Atwater avenue bridge to build we might complete that within a certain time, but there are other works which necessitate the removal of the water from the canal. There is a retaining wall that has to be rebuilt and there is some stone lining that is absolutely necessary and the canal will have to be dewatered to provide for these. As respects the complaint of those who utilize the water power on that canal if it is due to the negligence or inattention of any of the officials of the canal I shall certainly see that it is remedied. If by any precautionary measures, the officials can prevent the difficulty complained of, it is certainly the duty of the department to have it done. There is, however, a question whether the cause is due particularly to any want of care on the part of the officials. The question of ice is one that has arisen in connection with the Cornwall water-powers, and the department has contended that the remedy should be applied by those who use the water-powers. Those who use the water think that the expense should be borne by the department. Of course, many of these water-powers, as my hon. friend knows, are leased for practically a nominal sum. Years ago the rental was fixed at a very low rate and it has continued necessarily because the leases were for long

periods. The department does not operate the canals simply to develop water-power, That is only an incident. The department is not, I think, justified in expending large sums or any sum with the view of developing water-power. I think it very properly leases these water-powers where they do not interfere with navigation, but I doubt whether the department is justified in making expenditures or going to any expense to provide water-powers. That should be borne by those wishing to develop and utilize these water-powers.

Mr. MONK. I do not think the ice has anything to do with the shortage of water. It is possible—I do not know very much about the matter myself—but I do not think so because it has never been mentioned by any of the parties interested. In regard to what my hon. friend says about the government not being bound to furnish water-power or to make any expenditure in that connection, and in regard to what my hon. friend has said as to the advisability of manufacturers securing power elsewhere if they are not satisfied——

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not make that statement.

Mr. MONK. Well, my hon. friend said that it was an incident of the canal that water-power is furnished and that if it caused inconvenience to these gentlemen they might secure their power elsewhere. That is what I understood the hon. gentleman's statement to be.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, I do not think I made that statement nor did I make any insinuation of that kind. I said it was only an incident and that the department was not justified in making expenditures with a view to developing water-power.

Mr. MONK. That is the point I am coming to. The department is justified in seeing that its servants do their work properly. We have men there who are paid to look after the levels. The work which they have to do is to see that the proper level is kept up in the canal. If these water-powers did not exist on the line of the canal it would not be necessary to keep the staff which we have there, but being paid to do that work all we ask is that they shall do it properly. As I stated to my hon. friend a moment ago I would not have brought the matter up here ; I fancied that I could secure vigilance in the performance of their duty from these men, whoever they are—I do not know them—by correspondence with themselves, but my efforts have proved fruitless. I do not blame the government for this state of affairs. If there is anybody to blame it is these men who are not under the continual superintendence of the minister, but I know perfectly well that if the minister give them a warning that this matter is being closely watched and that being paid to do this work of watching these levels they must see that the water which is there, whatever may be its quantity, is supplied evenly to those who use it, I know that will be more effectual than anything I can do.

Now, in regard to the bridge. Of course, if my hon. friend is right in saying that a contractor cannot be expected to do this work in less than six weeks, there is an end to the matter. But I am not aware that there are other bridges to be put on the canal, nor am I aware that this particular contractor, whose name I forget for the moment, has any other work to do on the Lachine canal than the erection of this bridge. If that is the case, and if my information is well founded that the bridge itself can be set in position in half the time, in three weeks or even in four weeks, why should the manufacturers who happen to be there be deprived of the use of this water which is so essential to them for the carrying on of their industry? If my hon. friend will ask the superintendent in Montreal to give his special attention to this question of time he will find that within the period of four weeks he could have the bridge erected and the work which my hon. friend mentioned, which is to be done on other parts of the canal, not so considerable as the erection of the bridge, all complete with a very great saving of time.

Surveys and inspection—railways, $18,000.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister passed an item the other evening of $20,000 for a special survey of the Welland canal. I would ask the minister how much money was expended last year for surveys of all the different canals of Canada?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is for surveys and inspection of railways. Every railway to which is granted a charter and a subsidy given has to be inspected and for this purpose we have to send out engineers all over the country. The usual vote has been $18,000 per annum. Last year up to the 31st of January, 1905, we expended about $7,650 on the inspection of railways.

Mr. BLAIN. That is not the survey and inspection of canals, which is the item under discussion. The railway item comes next.

Mr. EMMERSON. We have passed that, we are at the $18,000 item. Reverting to that I would say that this is in connection with the inspection by our officers of the canals, especially in relation to the granting of water-powers. The hydraulic engineer from time to time goes out and visits the several canals when applications come in asking for powers. He makes a report to the department and it is upon those reports that I am able to determine whether these applications shall or shall not be granted. The amount expended from July 1st last to Jan. 31st was a shade over $1,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the minister give the different canals which have been inspected since last year?

Mr. EMMERSON. The hydraulic engineer went to the Welland canal, the Cornwall canal, the canal at Morrisburg, and the Trent canal. We are constantly receiving applications for the granting of water-powers and I find it necessary to spend a sum of money in connection with the reports and surveys of the different canals.

Mr. INGRAM. Do I understand that all these were surveyed last year?

Mr. EMMERSON. Since the 1st of July we have expended $1,036.94 on this work up to Jan. 1.

Mr. INGRAM. I am not complaining of the amount of money that has been expended in that way; all I want to get is the number of inspections that have been made since last session or during the past year.

Mr. EMMERSON. I speak from memory as to the inspections. There is an annual vote, and has been for years, of $3,000 to meet that contingency.

Railway statistics, including clerical assistance, &c., $2,500.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is the usual vote in connection with extra work during the session.

Salaries—extra clerks, copyists and messengers, &c., $4,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This has been increased on account of the employment of two additional assistants.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask who they are and why they are exempted from the provisions of the Civil Service Act?

Mr. EMMERSON. Miss Helmer and Miss Mahon. It was found necessary to have them.

Salaries of engineers, draughtsmen, extra clerks and messengers, &c., $31,500.

Mr. FOSTER. Why is the increase asked for?

Mr. EMMERSON. I can give it in detail.

Mr. FOSTER. You have $1,000 more.

Mr. EMMERSON. In the first place the inspecting engineer received an increase of $200, that is Mr. E. B. Johnston. He was receiving $2,400 which has been increased to $2,600. Mr. Alward, assistant law clerk, has been increased from $1,200 to $1,400. These two items account for an increase of $400. Miss Graham received an increase of $50, from $650 to $700, and 12 received increases of $50 each. There was an extra clerk, translator, put on, M. J. Lyons, $500. That accounts for the $1,500 increase.

Costs of litigation in connection with Railways and Canals, $6,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What was spent on that last year?

Mr. EMMERSON. From the 1st of July to the 1st of January, $2,639.78. The amounts paid were: E. H. McAlpine, in connection with the Canada Eastern Railway, for services in connection with the searching of the title, $1,162.54; S. A. Mackay, in connection with the Culbute canal claims, $1,000; Arthur Lisle, in connection with the Calumet claims, $1,000; Deland & Brassard, in connection with the claims for the Chambly flooding, $218; and mis cellaneous items, $59.24.

Mr. HAGGART. I thought the Culbute claims were all settled long ago?

Mr. EMMERSON. These are flooding claims that were continued up to early last spring, while the canal was really in commission, though not in use. About the only use that was made of it was made by the lumbermen. I had the question of the legal status of the department and the responsibility of the government in connection with that canal inquired into, and I was advised by the Department of Justice that it would be necessary to abolish it legally by a proclamation in the 'Canada Gazette,' in order to put it out of commission. This was done; but it does not seem to have annihilated the claims for damages. This year, quite recently, the usual claims have been coming in. But it is not a canal, and it is not maintained by the government as one.

Mr. HAGGART. If I remember rightly, the dam which caused these damages was removed altogether by the government. First of all, the damages done by the dam were assessed, and I think they were paid by the government two or three times over. Then the government removed the dam altogether, so that no damages could accrue from the government work.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a question whether the government in starting to remove the dam did not recognize the liability. But, apart from that, the government did not remove the dam. They started to do it, but the transportation people and the lumbermen entered a protest against its removal, claiming that it was a vested right, that it had been in use by them, and that its removal would cause very serious disaster to the navigation of the Ottawa waters in the way of bringing down lumber.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. McAlpine seems to be fortunate in having pretty constant employment by one or other of the ministers.

Mr. EMMERSON. Let me explain to my hon. friend that Mr. McAlpine has been the agent of the Minister of Justice at St. John for the province of New Brunswick or a portion of the province, and that when the legal matters go from the several departments to the Department of Justice, the Department of Justice employs its agent

at the particular point where the work is to be done.

Mr. FOSTER. What I wanted to call the attention of the House to was this, that Mr. McAlpine seems to be badly treated by the Justice Department, or else that he places a large estimate on his legal services. For instance, I find that last year he rendered a bill for $900 for services in connection with the purchase of the Canada Eastern Railway, and that when that came before the Justice Department, which has never been accused of illiberality, I think, but which pays its agents generously——

Mr. EMMERSON. They tax all the bills.

Mr. FOSTER. From the bill of $900 the sum of $540 was taxed off, bringing it to the more respectable dimensions of $360. I can imagine what a sad disappointment there was; but, all the same, it would seem as if, in the cases in which this taxing arrangement is not carried out, the department would be paying almost too much for the services of Mr. McAlpine. He seems to have a high estimate of the value of his services as compared with the Justice Department.

Mr. HAGGART. Why was any amount paid to Mr. McAlpine at all in connection with the purchase of the Canada Eastern Railway? I thought the rule was that the expenses of verifying the titles are paid by the seller.

Mr. EMMERSON. That cannot be the rule either in this or any other country. Suppose that we had purchased the Canada Eastern without having the title thoroughly inquired into, suppose that the department depended upon the word of the vendor, and afterwards it turned out that this whole railway was encumbered, do you think the department would not be held responsible for not having had its own legal adviser go through the title.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no difference with us on that point, but I say that the seller furnishes an abstract of the title and the purchaser sees if that abstract is correct, but as a general rule the seller pays for the search.

Mr. BLAIN. On the question of damages to pay for property flooded, the minister says that that account is closed, but that notwithstanding claims are coming in from time to time. Does his department intend to pay these claims in the future?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Nothing more will be paid?

Mr. EMMERSON. Not a cent.

Mr TAYLOR. Is any portion of this $6,000 to pay for expenses in connection with litigation concerning the extension of the Rideau canal and is he proceeding with that extension?

Mr. EMMERSON. I explained, when my hon. friend was absent, that we had run against quite a barrier in this matter. A question arose regarding interference with a mill property, and the owners, Messrs. Tett Bros., asked what seems to me a very exorbitant sum, and certainly until I can be satisfied that the property can be secured at a reasonable price, I would not be inclined to move further in the matter.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Last night the hon. minister promised to give details of the agreement between the Dominion and the provincial authorities of Ontario regarding the taking over of the waterways north of Balsam Lake.

Mr. EMMERSON. I said I would explain the position in which the matter was. The negotiations are not quite complete. The officers of my department met the officers of the Crown Lands Department of Ontario at Toronto and arranged on a certain basis on which we would take over these works which had been constructed by the province and free the province from any future expenditure on their maintenance. The waterworks we would have charge of, and we would have a dam built. That has been made the subject matter of a report to Council, which is submitted to the provincial government at Toronto, and we hope to have the matter carried out because the negotiations were practically concluded but were not put in the shape of an Order in Council on behalf of either government.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What need is there for this work if you are not going to complete the two ends of the canal?

Mr. EMMERSON. Why does my hon. friend assume that we are not going to complete the two ends of the canal?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I see nothing in the main estimates. However, we live in hope, and I hope there will be an amount of two million or three million dollars in the supplementaries.

Mr. EMMERSON. We could not spend that much this year.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. But you could let contracts for the whole work as used to be done formerly and the work would be done much more expeditiously if that plan were followed.

Mr. EMMERSON. Why did you not come to that delegation this morning?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I had every faith that the Postmaster General, would bring that canal up to Aurora.

Maintenance and operation of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, $60,000.

Mr. KEMP. Is that the whole cost for the year?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, there is $30,000 provided by statute in addition to this.

Mr. KEMP. Are the appointments of the Railway Commission subject to the approval of any department of the government?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, they are subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, being brought to the notice of the Council by the Minister of Railways under recommendation or report.

Mr. KEMP. Then the appointments have to go to the Department of Railways and Canals?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is simply the avenue by which the Board of Railway Commissioners reach the Governor in Council.

Mr. KEMP. The Department of Railways and Canals, I presume are notified from time to time as to the rulings and decisions of the Commission?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, that has not been so far the case. The rulings are not sent through the department. As to their expenditures, they simply send in their recommendations for accounts, and payments of accounts and auditing are the work of the Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. KEMP. Is the Minister of Railways and Canals, or is any other minister, prepared to make an explanation of the revision of freight and passenger tolls which the Commission authorized, as published in the 'Canada Gazette' in December last? The maximum passenger rates in that schedule are higher than those that have been in effect heretofore as authorized by the Railway Commission of the Privy Council. And, the same is true of the freight rates. There has been a good deal of discussion of this subject in the press, and it would be interesting if the minister could give us the reasons for these advances. There has been an agitation in the country for lower freight rates upon certain roads and in certain sections, and I have not found in the press any articles justifying these increases. And the public are not able to ascertain from anything that comes from the Railway Commission why these advances were made.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Department of Railways and Canals is in no way consulted with respect to these matters, nor has it more knowledge concerning rates fixed by the Commission that any hon. member of this House has. Speaking under correction, I believe the law provides that every railway in the country shall file with the Railway Commission a statement of the rates it intends to put in force. That statement must be published in the 'Canada Gazette.' But, before it can be enforced, it must be passed upon by the Railway Commission and must receive their approval. The publication in the 'Gazette' is to give the public notice of what the railways propose to do. I think it is proposed that this shall be done annually some time near the close of the calendar year. Copies of these proposed tariffs are not filed with the Department of Railways and Canals. That is about all the information I can give the hon. gentleman.

Mr. KEMP. As I understand it under the old regime, if any new rates were decided upon by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, it would have been proper and right for any member of the House to inquire why these changes had been made, and it would be the duty of the government to make such an explanation. Do I understand that, under the Railway Act and under the Railway Commission, the public are unable to get such information as they were able to get in this way in times gone by?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think any member of this House can move for a return of the rates fixed and of the judgments delivered by the Board of Railway Commissioners in connection with rates;—for in each case, there is an application, and there must be a determination, a judgment. The commission is supposed to be entirely independent politically and free from governmental action. Bnt, of course, it is subject to the order of this parliament for returns, and I am sure it is quite open for the hon. member (Mr. Kemp) to secure the information he desires in the way I have indicated.

Mr. KEMP. It is not necessary to move for such a return, because the information to which I refer is already published in the 'Canada Gazette.'

Mr. EMMERSON. Is not that merely a notice of what they intended to apply for?

Mr. KEMP. No. I presume it is a notice——

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend will pardon me; I tried to make myself clear. The publication in the 'Gazette' would be a notification to the public that they sought to have certain rates in force. A certain time must elapse before the commissioners determine the question, and when it was determined, there would be a publication in the 'Gazette' of the judgment of the commission. That is as I understand the law, it is a question of law.

Mr. KEMP. That may be correct, and no doubt it is. But as a matter of fact, these tables are very complicated, they take up a great many pages of the 'Canada Gazette,' and it is very difficult to fathom them. The ordinary merchant of the country is unable to do it. He does not see the 'Canada Gazette,' he does not know that such rates have been published, or that the railways are asking for these changes. What the hon. gentleman refers to is probably the order

putting the rates into effect, it amounts to that. The point I wish to make is this: Supposing that, for any reason which is known to the Railway Commission, they see fit to adopt the policy of advancing rates or of reducing them; supposing the members of this House representing the people desire to know what reason has moved the commissioners in the course they have taken, how are they to get that information? The 'Canada Gazette' contains the bald notice, there is no explanation of policy; and it seems to me that it should be the duty of the Minister of Railways, as his department is responsible, as he has said, for the operation of the commission, to some extent, to show why the Railway Commission have effected radical changes.

Mr. EMMERSON. Of course the commission are operating under a statute, and of course the Minister of Railways or any officer of the department would have no more power, unless it is given by that statute, to go in and get that information than would my hon. friend. I have no doubt that if my hon. friend went into the Department of the Railway Commissioners he could get the information which he seeks. I, probably, could get it, or any member of this House. But there is no provision, as I understand, in the Act enabling or requiring the department to do that, and to disseminate that information.

Mr. KEMP. Then it is an oversight in framing the Act. Are not the public to be as well protected under the new Railway Act as they were under the old regime of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council who controlled these matters, and is it not possible that the minister may have overlooked some clause in the Act by which this information may be obtained and published, through this House, so that such matters may be discussed on the floor of the House? I would like particularly to call the attention of the minister to the fact that in December last there were a great number of tables published in the 'Gazette,' both in respect to freight and passenger rates, and some of these were advanced, that is to say, maximum rates in both cases were advanced. Now why was that advance made? How are the people to know that such an advance is necessary?

Mr. EMMERSON. There was no advance made, it was only a proposal by the railway companies to advance; but as I understand it, the advance has not been approved or sanctioned by the Railway Commission, and therefore is not in force.

Mr. KEMP. Well, I am glad for that much information on this subject. Is it going to be approved by the Railway Commission? A long time has elapsed.

Mr. EMMERSON. Now you have me.

Mr. KEMP. Well, will the Minister of Railways do this, will he inquire into the matter and tell us at some future time, when these estimates are going through, what is going to be done, and will he give us some information on this matter I have referred to?

Mr. EMMERSON. I will inquire into it.

Mr. INGRAM. More than that, I see nothing in the railway report, nothing has been submitted to parliament showing the amount of work the commission has done since these appointments and changes were made, or anything concerning the Railway Commission. We are in no position to judge as to whether they perform good work or bad. Moreover, the Railway Commission has already called in certain interested parties who are concerned in certain cases, and it is known that they have been deliberated upon, and now these same parties who had to appear before are obliged to appear again in order to have their cases tried over again. We have no information at all in regard to that. From time to time we get letters from correspondents who are interested in these cases, asking us for the information, and when we apply to the Railway Commission for the information, it is a long time before we can accomplish anything. I say that some kind of report should be made to parliament each session giving some details of the wrok of that commission. It is a very important body, and the public are much interested in what they are doing.

Mr. LENNOX. This is a new matter, and I want to get some information from the minister, and it is well that we should begin correctly. There is a good deal of information that the minister certainly can give us. This department, I understand, is under the control of the Minister of Railways, am I right in that?

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, no, it is not. I have stated with some particularity the connection between the Department of Railways and Canals and the Board of Railway Commissioners. But in a sense it is not under the control of the department. I am merely the avenue, they address me, because I happen to be the Minister of Railways, about certain matters, and I bring them to the notice of the Council. As to the appointments, that is a matter provided for by statute. But in other respects I have no control over or connection with that department. It is non-political entirely, and not departmental.

Mr. LENNOX. I paid a great deal of attention to what the minister was saying in replying to my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Kemp), and I think I understood what he said, although there is a good deal of noise by talking in the House. But I understand that as regards the decisions come to by that tribunal and the reasons therefor, the Minister of Railways has nothing particularly to do with them.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not advised of them.

Mr. LENNOX. Exactly, he does not supervise it in any way, and for the reason that they are virtually in the position of judges, and like any other judges they do not come under any particular department except that we can appeal to the Minister of Justice with regard to judges generally. But there is another branch that I think remains strictly under the control of the Minister of Railways, and that is the matter of expenditure, the composition of the tribunal, the salaries, the number of officials employed in connection with it, the general establishment, such as offices and office equipment, provisions made for transportation by cars and otherwise—all that would come under the control of the Minister of Railways. Am I right in that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Measurably that is so. The appointments are made by the commissioners, appointments for clerical assistance and all that. They select their men. I could not on my own recommendation appoint any one to that commission, the Governor in Council could not. The appointments must be made on the nomination of the commissioners, first had and obtained, before the Governor in Council can take any action in the matter.

Mr. HAGGART. Nonsense.

Mr. EMMERSON. Look at the law.

Mr. INGRAM. Here is subsection 2 of section 48 :

> The minister may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, appoint and direct any person to inquire into and report upon any matter or thing which the minister is authorized to deal with under this or the Special Act.

Mr. EMMERSON. Get the provision in regard to appointments to their staff. It is not necessary to have any excitement over the matter. I am only speaking of the way I read the law and of the contention of the commissioners. If my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram), whom I regret to have interrupted, will look at the provision of the statute relating to the appointments to the staff of that commission he will see where the power is given them to nominate and upon their nomination, and only upon their nomination, can the Governor in Council act.

Mr. INGRAM. Then, the clause following that is section 49, dealing with the powers respecting inquiry, entry, inspection, attendance of witnesses and so on. Any information that the hon. minister desires to obtain in connection with the Railway Commission may be obtained by order of the Governor in Council. Surely that is plain.

Mr. LENNOX. In reference to this matter we may as well understand where we are at. We have certain gentlemen who are appointed by the Governor in Council as a commission and who are officers of the administration. That office involves the expenditure of a large sum of money, the property of the people of Canada. It must be under the control of some department of government. I naturally thought upon looking up the statute that it would be under the control of the Department of Railways and Canals. I find in the estimates this item :

> 114. Railway Commission—maintenance and operation of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, $60,000.

If the hon. minister is the member of the government who has the control and management of that department, it is from him I wish to get the information. If the hon. minister is not the gentleman who has control of that matter then I know he will give me the information as to what member of the government has control of it. I am not asking any returns as to the decisions made by that tribunal. That is a matter which, if we inquired for it, would perhaps come from the hon. Minister of Justice, but the management of the board which we created, the expense attending that board, the general operations of that board and the way in which it is working are matters, if I understand it properly, that are within the control and general direction of the Minister of Railways and Canals. If not so, it ought to be so. If not so it is contrary to the understanding on which that board was created.

Mr. EMMERSON. Will my hon. friend pardon me ? I just want to call his attention to one point. The point is this : Can the Department of Railways or any other department of the government control the movements of the board ?

Mr. LENNOX. In some ways they can.

Mr. INGRAM. In what direction ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Have we power to direct where they shall hold their meetings or under what circumstances they shall hold them ?

Mr LENNOX. If it were necessary to discuss that question I would go into a discussion of it, but I do not think it is necessary at this time. I do not think they can control them in the way the hon. minister suggests. But, we are not pursuing that inquiry at the present time, This board of commissioners was appointed during the time that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals was in office, but we have as yet had no information as to the expense incurred, as to the extent of the staff, as to the particulars of the offices that they fill, as to the mode of their travelling about the country or as to any investigation they have made. No information is given to the public to enable the

public to determine whether it is a successful institution or otherwise. It is right that the hon. minister should tell us now in a general way by a general introduction, by a speech of a quarter of an hour what this commission has done and if a quarter of an hour does not give us the information, by a speech of half an hour, or an hour, or by a speech of sufficient length in the same way as he has on former occasions introduced to the House the subject of railways. He should make a concise statement of how this commission has been working up to the present time. When we created this tribunal it was created with the understanding that it should be responsible to parliament and immediately under the control of the Minister of Railways and Canals. If I am wrong in that, it is all the more reason why we should have a clear statement. This being a portion of his department we should have a concise statement from the hon. minister verbally now, but we should also have a concise report in printing or in writing laid before parliament so that we could intelligently discuss this matter and intelligently ascertain whether this tribunal had been successful or not.

Mr. INGRAM. Surely there can be no question about the power of the Governor in Council to demand that kind of a report. Again I wish to call the attention of the hon. minister to section 45 which reads as follows :

> The Governor in Council may at any time refer to the board for a report, or other action, any question, matter or thing arising, or required to be done, under this Act, or the Special Act, and the board shall without delay comply therewith.

Suppose the Governor in Council desires a report from the Railway Commission as to what they have done from the time of their appointment up to the present moment for the purpose of submitting it to parliament, surely that section alone gives the Governor in Council power to get a report of that kind. It seems to me to be a very peculiar state of affairs, that parliament having created a railway commission, the chairman of which cannot be removed without the consent of the House of Commons and the Senate, we are to be called upon to vote $60,000 or $90,000 a year for their sustenance and we are not to have any report from the board which we have created to show what they have done during the past year. It would be a remarkable state of affairs and I do not think that this Act ever intended to do anything of the kind. The Act, it seems to me, has provided ways and means by which parliament may be supplied with the information that it may desire in connection with the working of this commission.

Mr. LENNOX.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I would like to ask the hon. minister a question in reference to other matters connected with the Railway Commission. I would like to know whether these commissioners have power to regulate freight tariffs on the government railways and also if they have power to regulate the tariffs of subsidized steamers, or whether that is a matter which is in the hands of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I know that there is a good deal of dissatisfaction in reference to the rates which are charged on subsidized steamers, and it seems to me that there is no regulation at all and that the steamers can charge what they please. I think that if this Act does not cover this ground an amendment should be made in order that all these tariff matters should be under one head.

Mr. EMMERSON. The commission has no control over the government railways of Canada, nor has it any jurisdiction in respect to steamships or the rates charged by steamships. I am not disputing or contending that such and such things should not be. I am only endeavouring to point out what I consider to be the law. I am quite free to admit that there should be a report from the commission. I am quite in accord with what has been stated in that regard and I think that the commissioners should make a report from time to time to the Governor in Council through the Department of Railways and Canals, for, as my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) says, if this commission is not in any way connected with the government through the Department of Railways and Canals, he cannot see any other department by which it would be thus connected. I quite agree with him that the natural avenue and channel between that board and the government is through the Department of Railways and Canals, but it does not seem to me that the Act makes proper provision for that.

Mr. KEMP. The hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) has read the clause in the Act providing for that.

Mr. EMMERSON. Section 45 which was read does not apply at all. That is qualified ; it says :

> The Governor in Council may at any time refer to the board for a report, or other action, any question, matter or thing arising, or required to be done, under this Act, or the Special Act.

The Act must require the thing to be done before the board can be required to do it. In the same way if my hon. friend refers to section 48, subsection 2, he will find :

> The minister may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, appoint and direct any person to inquire into and report upon any matter or thing which the minister is autho-

rized to deal with under this Act or the Special Act.

There is a qualified authority, but if there is any section in the Act which gives authority over the board, commanding them and giving them authority to report I have failed to see it, and if there is any section which places the board in any sense under the direction and control of the Department of Railways and Canals, I would like to have it pointed out to me, because I can quite understand and fully appreciate all that has been stated with respect to the defects in that respect.

Mr. HAGGART. Now that the minister's attention has been drawn to the subject I think his interpretation is correct. It is only when a special subject is referred to them that they are to report. There should be a clause inserted in the Act which would compel them to report to the House.

Mr. EMMERSON. I agree entirely.

Mr. HAGGART. They seem to be in a peculiar constitutional position, totally independent of the government and parliament. There is a clause in the Act which I think ought to be amended as it confers an extraordinary power to give to any railway commission.

There shall be attached to the board, such officers, clerks, stenographers and messengers as the board, with the approval of the Governor in Council, from time to time appoints.

What business have they appointing any officers at all ? That is a prerogative of the Crown. The appointment of officers of that kind should be done on the responsibility of ministers who are accountable to this parliament. The section proceeds.

The board may and will dismiss any employees.

Another power is given to them ; they can make a check upon the funds belonging to the Dominion for the purpose of paying these officers. I never heard of any such powers being granted to any commission under the sun. The principle of the constitution is the responsibility of ministers of parliament for appointments ; the prerogative and honour of appointment belongs nominally to the Crown, really to the Crown on the recommendation of his advisers. That is changed altogether. I suppose it is a nominal privilege and that the board do not consult even the Minister of Railways in reference to any appointment. They send in the name and you are obliged to approve it or otherwise the board will say : We cannot get along without these parties and if the minister refuses to appoint them there is an end of the commission. The commission should be a part and portion of the Railway Department, responsible, as every other branch of the service is, to the Crown and parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. The position certainly has developed differently from what I thought it could possibly do, and as the Prime Minister is now in his seat I shall state what has occurred. We have here in vote 114 an item for the maintenance and operation of the Board of Railway Commissioners and the House is asked to vote them $60,000. We come to the Minister of Railways who is putting the vote through, and in accordance with our rights the House does not propose to vote any money unless it knows in the first place what it is wanted for, and, in the second place, if it is a continuing service what they did with the vote that we last gave them. When we asked the Minister of Railways about this he says : I have no report from the commission, nor has the House any report from the commission, and now it appears, when we look into the Act as my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) has said, that there is no provision in the Act by which they are compelled each year to report to parliament what they, as the servants of parliament and the servants of the country, have done with the money which has been given them by the parliament the preceding year, and no method at all of communication between them and the public through the medium of parliament. The House is entirely within its rights in saying that it cannot vote $60,000 in addition to the vote of last year for the commission unless it has a report from the commission as to what it did with the money last year. It has been stated very clearly by several members that the House and the country have a right to know by yearly report just what the commission has done, just as the railway or any other department furnishes a report. When you come to the question of the appointment of staff, there again, as my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) has stated, an anomalous position is created. It is possible that if the commission says: We want such and such persons at a such and such salaries, the Governor in Council may say : We do not approve of it. Then the commission will say to the government and will appeal to the country : Here are absolutely necessary officers that we want for the doing of our work and the Governor in Council has refused to appoint them. That is, there is no place where you can apportion the responsibility. These men act entirely by themselves and we cannot call them to account nor can we call anybody to account under this law for full information as to the disposition of public moneys with reference to the operation and maintenance, of the board including the hiring of clerks, &c. Evidently there is a screw loose somewhere that ought to be put into the machine.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I must say that I have a confession to make to the House and a confession that is not pleasant to me. I did not know that the com-

mission was not only not empowered but not obliged to make a report. I have always understood that it was part of the duty of the commission to make a yearly report of their operations ; not only of the money which we gave them to spend as to how they have expended it—and for this we are responsible to parliament—but also of their operations, what they have done, what cases they have decided, so that the public could know exactly what has taken place. We have a right to that information and if it is found after a conference with the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Railways, who is more familiar than I am with the Act, that the commission is not bound to make such a report I think we should enact legislation this very session to have such a report from the commission. I shall at once call the attention of the Minister of Justice to this. If the commission is not under obligation to make such a report it is due to parliament that it should be at once put under such an obligation. With regard to the appointment of the staff of the commission there must be something more in the Act than what has been read by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart). I know that we have had recommendations from the commissioners for appointments to the staff. Sometimes we agree to them and sometimes we disagree. Sometimes we take their recommendation and sometimes we do not ; and I am more than surprised to hear my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways say that the commission have power to make any appointment without any reference at all to the Governor in Council.

Mr. HAGGART. I did not say that.

Mr. LENNOX. In section 21, subsection 2 it is provided :

> There shall be attached to the board such officers, clerks, stenographers and messengers, as the board, with the approval of the Governor in Council, from time to time appoints, at such salaries or remunerations as are recommended by the board and approved by Governor in Council. The board may, at will, dismiss any such employee.

Mr. HAGGART. That is extraordinary power—the power of dismissing and appointing. The Governor in Council has only the approval.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. As we have read the statute and acted upon it, we have received recommendations from the board, and have given our approval or our disapproval, as in our judgment the circumstances justified. As I understand, the government has not the power of initiating appointments. These have to be made on a report of the commissioners; but the commissioners cannot make any appointment of themselves. As I read the statute, the government has power to appoint on the recommendation of the board. I gave the House some time ago a list of the appointments which have been made, and which now constitute the staff of the board.

Mr. LENNOX. I hope the right hon. gentleman does not understand that I thought otherwise. I simply called his attention to the provision, so that he would see that it was as he suggested.

Mr. KEMP. I suppose that as a matter of courtesy the Minister of Railways and Canals, until the law is amended, can from time to time get such information from the commission as the members of the House desire in regard to such matters as those I have referred to, and I hope he will try to get the information as soon as possible.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would suppose that even if the law were silent on this point, the commissioners themselves would make a report. If they failed to do so, the law could be amended, even in this very session.

Mr. FOSTER. Although the law may have to be amended, and that will take some time, I think that if the proper minister suggested to the commissioners that they should make a report as soon as possible, they would do so, even though no law required it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. INGRAM. I think that report should include both the cases that have been decided and those that are still pending before the commission. I have had a number of inquiries in regard to such cases. There have been long and unsatisfactory delays, and certain municipalities are anxious to get this information in order to know where they stand.

Mr. LENNOX. I would call the attention of the right hon. gentleman to another view of the matter. Aside from the fact that we have no means of compelling a report, I apprehended that the Minister of Railways and Canals could give us general information as to the expenditures that had been incurred in connection with the commission up to the end of the last fiscal year. That information has not been given as yet, but I presume the minster is ready to give it.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can give that to my hon. friend. During the past year, from July 1 to January 1, there was expended $20,906.49 for maintenance and operation and $14,416.56 for salaries.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the minister inform us whether any new appointments have been made to that commission lately, or whether any names for appointment have been submitted for the consideration of the Governor in Council, whose approval I take it is necessary?

Mr. EMMERSON. There have been no appointments made lately, but there have

been recommendations which have not yet been acted upon.

Mr. SPROULE. Have the names of the following gentlemen, or any of them, been submitted: James Clark, who is, I believe, a conductor on the Canada Atlantic Railway; D. J. McQuaig, who is at present a foreman on that railway; and P. Roy, at present an engineer on the same railway? I want merely to say that these men were found to be very active partisans in the late elections, and they gave it to be understood by their friends that they were promised positions on this commission. My curiosity is aroused to know whether the government have fulfilled that promise, if such was made, or, if not, whether they intend to do so at an early date?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have never heard any of the names mentioned by the hon. gentleman in connection with the Railway Commission in any way.

Mr. BLAIN. In the expenditure for last year I see an item of $1,250 for the services of one of the members of the commission prior to its inauguration. One of the gentlemen mentioned for the chairmanship was sent to the United States at an expenditure of $1,250 to make a report to the government as to the working of the United States Commission. I suppose there will be a report from that gentleman, and possibly the hon. minister can lay it on the table.

Mr. EMMERSON. The gentleman who became chairman of the commission was employed in that work. The Act was not brought into force in time to have him appointed, and it was necessary that he should confer with a similar board that had some experience in the United States. He was employed for that purpose, and his expenses were paid.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not wish to question the amount, which is not large. But this gentleman was paid $50 a day. And the minister will bear in mind that this was spent before the inauguration of the board. I suppose this gentleman was not sent to the United States without the authority of some one, and I suppose it was by the authority of the Department of Railways and Canals. Here is an officer sent to the United States at an expense of $1,250 to investigate something—to find out about the workings of the railway commissions of that country, with a view to the organization of a commission here. Surely the minister would not say this officer was to make this investigation and return, and yet not report to anybody.

Mr. EMMERSON. Whatever report he gave he gave to his fellow commissioners, I think.

Mr. BLAIN. They were not then appointed.

Mr. EMMERSON. They were appointed immediately on his return. He utilized, in the organization of the board, the information that he had collected. There has been no report, so far as I know. I was not connected with the department at that time, so cannot speak from personal knowledge.

Mr. INGRAM. What did the minister say was the cost of the car for the use of the commission?

Mr. EMMERSON. About $20,000.

Mr. INGRAM. That was included in the $60,000 last year, yet the hon. gentleman is asking as large a vote this year. He does not expect to buy another car, I suppose?

Mr. EMMERSON. The amount voted last year was $100,000.

Mr. INGRAM. But the hon. minister must recollect the facts. The sum of $100,000 was put in the estimates of 1903-4 by the gentleman, then Minister of Railways, who afterwards became chairman of the commission.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) will find that there was an item of $40,000 and also an item of $60,00, and out of this came the cost of the car.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. minister is asking for $60,000, and also for $29,000 in addition.

Mr. EMMERSON. That $29,000 is by statute, and the $60,000 is to pay for the staff and expenses that I have given.

Mr. INGRAM. And the same items were to be paid with the estimates voted last year. The minister has a total of $89,000 to pay these expenses. On that calculation there is a reduction of $11,000. Yet, out of the vote of $100,000 last year, $20,000 was paid for the car. That means that there is an increase of about $9,000 this year.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is only within the year that the staff has been organized, and that explains the difference.

Mr. BLAIN. It is expected that $100,000 annually will be about the total charge upon the country for the commission?

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) will probably recollect that Mr. Blair stated, when the Railway Act was going through parliament, that the commission created by that Act would cost about $100,000 a year.

Mr. BLAIN. I recollect that. But, now that the commission has been organized and commenced work, does the minister think that $100,000 will be sufficient to meet the expense?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think that $100,000 will more than meet the expenses that are

now being incurred, or that may be anticipated in connection with the board.

Mr. MACLAREN. Is it the intention of the government to add two others to the commission, making five instead of three ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think there is any such expectation. Such a matter has not been the subject of consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. Did I understand the minister to say that there had been no report by Mr. Blair of the preliminary examination he made in the United States ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I said I assumed that he had reported to his board, and utilized the information he got in organizing the commission, but that he had not made any report to the government or to the Department of Railways on the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest that we ought to have the report Mr. Blair made to the authorities to whom he reported, whoever they were. He was sent there to get preliminary knowledge and assistance in constituting the board and laying out its plans. It is important that the House should have that report, so that we could see what was done in the United States. No doubt it would be a pretty exhaustive report. The cost was $1,250, and we ought to know whether we received the benefit of our money. As I understand it, this $60,000 takes in everything except the statutory salaries of the commissioners themselves and the secretary.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is by statute.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the particular services given by the staff ? Does the minister know anything about that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I can give some idea of the work done.

Mr. FOSTER. I have here a return in answer to the order of the House giving the names of officials and employees of the board. It might be as well to read it, so that 'Hansard' may have it :

Officials, clerks and employees on pay-roll of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada on first of January, 1905, with the amount or salary in each case :—

	Per annum.
Hon. M. E. Bernier, deputy chief commissioner	$8,000 00
James Mills, commissioner	8,000 00
A. D. Cartwright, secretary	3,000 00
George A. Mountain, engineer	4,800 00
James Hardwell, chief traffic expert	3,500 00
A. G. Blair, jr., law clerk	2,500 00
J. E. Duval, inspector of accidents	2,200 00
G. A. Brown, chief clerk, traffic department	2,000 00
E. C. Lalonde, inspector of accidents	2,200 00
E. A. Pruneau, registrar and accountant	1,800 00
J. H. Dessier, assistant engineer	1,800 00
T. E. Simmonds, assistant engineer	1,800 00
H. W. Messenger, clerk	900 00
Norman Ham, clerk, traffic department	900 00
B. Chevrier, clerk and stenographer	800 00
F. C. McGee, clerk and stenographer	800 00
C. E. MacManus, clerk and stenographer	800 00
John W. Thompson, clerk, record department	800 00
T. Chandler, chief messenger and court usher	700 00
L. J. Lewis, clerk and stenographer	600 00
L. N. Cameron, clerk and stenographer	550 00
D. Langelier, messenger	500 00
William Woodruff, cook on official car,	$60 per month.

These are in addition to the salary of the gentleman who takes Mr. Blair's place, Judge Killam, and who gets $10 000 per year. That will make altogether for salaries of the staff, as it was constituted on the 1st January, 1905, and the new chief commissioner's salary, an expenditure of about $59,000 per year—say $60 000 per year on that board alone. Besides that, we have to add the car which gives them transport and its maintenance. Then, does the minister know the amount that is expended for quarters for this commission ?

Mr. EMMERSON. About $1 230 a year—cook and chief and quarters.

Mr. FOSTER. I mean the housing of the commission. I suppose rentals have to be paid ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is in the Public Works Department.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not included in this vote, but I wanted to get at the total cost of this commission when fully formed.

Mr. EMMERSON. I hope it is fully formed now.

Mr. FOSTER. It may be; but it is an infant yet, compared with what it will be. I see there is a law clerk employed. Do the board depend for legal instruction on their law clerk ? I would suppose that, two of these gentlemen being lawyers—one a very eminent lawyer, the chief commissioner—it would not be necessary to employ a legal man to advise them. Is that the office of the law clerk, or does he simply look after things under their direction ?

Mr. EMMERSON. His work is more of a solicitor's, going through documents, which would hardly be a part of the duty of the chief commissioner.

Mr. FOSTER. That is, the law clerk is not a counsellor, but a clerk with a knowledge of the law ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is as I understand it. I purpose asking the commissioners for a full report, and will lay it on the table as soon as I get it.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister get the report made by Mr. Blair ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I will have a full report. I was wondering whether that was in writing.

Mr. FOSTER. I have noticed that there was a certain line of economy at certain times in the correspondence of the late chief commissioner with the government. There is not very much of that observable when examinations are being carried on and the expenses piled up. But when it comes to the writing of a letter or a long telegram, he drew the line at that very sharply.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 42) respecting the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 64) respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—Mr. Stewart.

Bill (No. 65) respecting the James Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Watson.

Bill (No. 68) respecting a Patent of the Paper Goods Company, Limited.—Mr. Macdonell.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Maintenance and operation of Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, $60,000.

Mr. LENNOX. I think this item had better stand, because I do not think we can discuss it profitably at the present time. I do not think the committee feels like letting it pass as it stands, until we get the information which the minister proposes to bring down, then we might consider it again.

Mr. FOSTER. It may be some time before it can be brought down. If it causes any inconvenience to the minister, it might be passed with the admission that we can take it up at any time the minister is in his estimates, and discuss it further.

Mr. LENNOX. I have no objection to that. In the meantime I wish to call attention to another matter before we pass away from this subject. I noticed in a statement furnished this afternoon and which was read by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Kemp), that there are three items of $800 each for stenographers. This, I understand, is one for each of the members of the commission. If the minister is not prepared to explain it now, I hope he will be able to explain it definitely when we come to this item again; we want to know why that expenditure is necessary. It is not a very large item, but it appears to me unnecessary. I think the matter has been up for discussion to some extent by members of the government to whose attention it has been drawn.

Mr. KEMP. I would like to ask the minister how long he thinks it will take to produce the information promised on the question as to whether there was an attempt made to advance the passengers and freight rates. The general impression in respect to this matter is that the rates have actually been advanced. The minister was under the impression this afternoon that the rates were merely published, but that they had not been advanced.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is the impression I gathered.

Mr. KEMP. The impression I gathered from the press reports was that the rates are actually advanced and in effect at the present time.

Mr. FOSTER. Will they appear in the 'Gazette'?

Mr. KEMP. The explanation of the hon. minister in regard to that was that it was a notice that appeared in the 'Gazette.' The impression which the newspapers have in regard to the question is that the rates are actually in effect. How long does the hon. minister think it will take him to get the information and make a statement in regard to this question?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think that the chairman of the commission and his colleagues are up in Ontario at the present moment, but immediately on their return I will personally see the chairman and ask him for a report. I may say that the department has already called the attention of the commission—I learned this since the matter was up for discussion before recess—to the fact that a report from them as to their work would be desirable. That has not yet been received. That was at a time when the commission was without a chairman. Now that it has been fully reorganized, I shall have an opportunity of conferring with the chairman of the commission, and I trust that such a report as will meet the requirements of the House will at once be brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the hon. minister able to give the expense incurred on account of rentals yet?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not had an opportunity of getting that information.

Mr. HYMAN. That item will likely be up to-night. I will have the information. I do not remember the exact amount, but I think it is about $5,000.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. minister's attention was probably diverted from the matter to which I alluded a moment ago. I do not know whether he proposes to

answer the question that I asked as to the stenographers.

Mr. EMMERSON. There were three stenographers asked for. One was a general stenographer for the work of the department. Another was a French stenographer, who understood French, and who could write shorthand and typewrite in French. Another of the commissioners had a stenographer to do the work in his particular branch.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the hon. minister understand that it is necessary to maintain a staff of three stenographers ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They stated that they required three stenographers. That was the recommendation of the full board. They nominated their stenographers, and said that the work could not well go on unless they were provided with these stenographic clerks. They were appointed in view of the strong representations which the board made. You can very well understand how difficult it is for objection to be made when they say that they require certain officers in order to do the work expeditiously and efficiently. To raise any bar or objection to the appointments simply places them on the defensive, and they say : Well, we cannot do this work ; it is impossible for us to carry on the affairs of the commission unless we have these officials. That is practically the condition of affairs when any question arises as respects the appointment of officials to their staff.

Mr. LENNOX. I want to be perfectly candid with the hon. minister, and probably that will enable us to get back to the point. What I am told is that originally it was not contemplated to have three stenographers, but that one of the commissioners, who for the present, I need not name, insisted upon having one appropriated to himself, and that occasioned a deadlock. That commissioner went on strike because that request was not complied with.

Mr. FOSTER. Went on strike ?

Mr. LENNOX. Went on strike, and would not join with the chairman of the board in discharging the duties of the board until that request was complied with. I am told that the ministry did not at once see the necessity of complying with the demand, and that occasioned a prolonged strike. I am not sure of the number of days. I think it has been mentioned as fifteen. It is also stated that finally, not the commissioners but the government, capitulated and this extra stenographer was appointed. I believe there were other officials appointed in the same way, but I got my information as to this more directly. The hon. minister, as a member of the government, will know whether this is correct or not. It is not a question of the amount involved, although the total is very large, but it is the principle that I am directing my attention to.

Mr. LENNOX.

Mr. EMMERSON. All I can say to my hon. friend is that I know nothing of any internal——

Mr. LENNOX. Or infernal——

Mr. EMMERSON—arrangements of the commissioners as to whether they were on strike or disputing amongst themselves. The recommendation was signed by the full board, and it was placed in my hands.

Mr. FOSTER. Did that come after the strike or before ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot tell whether there was a strike. If my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) says there was, I cannot question his statement, and I have no wish to ; but if there was a strike, it was not brought to my notice by any one of the commissioners.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. minister know whether there was any stoppage of pay for the fifteen days ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No ; the pay has gone on, as far as I know. But I may say very frankly that when this recommendation came into my hands, I arranged for a conference with the commissioners as to the necessity of the appointment of the officials. It is very natural that we should have a full explanation as to the requirements. The view of the commission was that they needed these officials, and I am not sufficiently familiar with the work of their department to be in a position to state that they were actually wrong in the matter. I must submit to their judgment as respects that.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood the hon. minister to say, in reply to my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Kemp), that the new tariffs adopted by the railways and approved by the commission did not increase the freight rates. I know as a shipper——

Mr. EMMERSON. Let me correct my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor). The statement I made to the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Kemp) was that the new tariff that was advertised in the 'Gazette' was not an approved tariff, but was simply a notice under the Act of tariff rates that had been filed for approval, and they were published in the 'Gazette' with the view of giving notice to the public of the proposals of these several railways. They were then subject to the approval of the board, but since that date they have not been passed upon very largely, I think, because there was no chairman of the commission. That is my understanding of it. I am not going to say that I am correct ; I am only speaking of my understanding of the situation with respect to these freight tariffs. Whether they have been since approved of, and whether or not they are in force to-day, I cannot say.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know as a matter of fact that whether approved of or not the railways have put them in force, and I

know that the rates have increased from the old tariff in some cases nearly 50 per cent. The railways companies are acting on it and charging the increased tariff rates and I understand they are doing so with the approval of the commission.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I may say that so far as the rates on grain and flour are concerned, the railway companies did advance the rates, but on account of the commission not approving of the new tariff they were obliged to abandon it. The advanced rate, I think, was enforced for only four or five days after which they returned to the old rate and the shippers are all putting in claims to the railways for rebates of the extra amounts collected during the four or five days. At the present time, so far as flour and grain is concerned, there is no difference from the rate that was in force early in the season.

Mr. TAYLOR. It would be well for shippers throughout the country to know that. In some lines they have been paying the advanced rate from the time it was enforced and they are doing that to-day.

Mr. LENNOX. At the time this matter was under discussion in the newspapers it was first announced that a rate had been fixed by the Railway Commission by which people would have to pay a larger sum. A day or two afterwards it came out that this was a maximum rate and being only a maximum rate it would not necessarily affect the public or compel them to pay increased rates. It seemed to be admitted by the newspapers—and this was stated on the authority of some official in one or two newspapers—that it was necessary in order that the railways should be able to collect a toll that they should have the approval of the board within a certain time. They had gone to the Railway Board under that law which compelled them to get the approval of the board within a certain time, and it was stated that the board had formally approved of the maximum rates without considering the merits of the matter and that afterwards within the proper time the board would consider the question of what the actual rate should be. I do not know if this statement is correct; I only mention it to the minister on the chance that it may recall something to his mind.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is not my understanding of it, although my friend may be correct. I have very simply stated my impression to the committee and I have assured the committee that I will lay upon the table of the House a full report in connection with the whole matter so that the committee can fully understand the exact situation.

Mr. FOSTER. While the minister is doing that, if he will be kind enough to inform himself as to the special duties of these special men, and on what ground they were appointed to these special positions, I would be very much obliged.

Canals staff and repairs, $803,039.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is less than the item of last year, by $30,000. On the Lachine canal last year we asked for $133,265; this year we are asking for $133,030. On the Soulanges canal the expenditure has been lessened from $52,850 to $41,730. That was largely due to a lessening in the cost of the staff and also in the cost of repairs. There has been generally a lessening in the repairs at the different canals.

Mr. FOSTER. What change is made by the fact that the government is not now collecting tolls? Is not a large amount of the office work and staff work which would otherwise be necessary avoided by the fact that you do not now have to collect tolls? What is the amount of that reduction?

Mr. EMMERSON. The next item is the one that covers that, salaries and contingencies in collector's offices. I may say with respect to the question that has been raised that I intimated yesterday that before I had concluded with my estimates I would be in a position to announce to the House the policy of the government with respect to the continuing of the non-collection of tolls. That has not yet reached a point where I could make an announcement. Should it be determined to discontinue the collection of tolls on the canals, we shall of necessity dispense with the services of a large number of officials. I cannot say that they have less work in a sense. They do not collect, but their time has to be given to the work. They have to keep a correct record of everything that goes through the canals; the only difference is that the parties are not called on to pay the money. That record is furnished to the department. That has been done to learn whether there has been any appreciable effect on the traffic from the abolition of canal tolls.

Mr. FOSTER. How many years has the freedom of the canals been in operation?

Mr. EMMERSON. For two seasons.

Mr. FOSTER. And for those two seasons you have been keeping a complete record of everything passing each way?

Mr. EMMERSON. Just the same as if tolls had been collected.

Mr. FOSTER. The only thing you are not doing is taking the money?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is all.

Mr. BLAIN. What was the total revenue per annum from the canal?

Mr. EMMERSON. The year preceding the last season it would have been $325,000, and last season it would have been $288,000; I am speaking from memory. There was

a decrease last year as compared with the preceding year, that was largely in excess of the year 1902-3, and both years, 1902-3 and 1903-4. were largely in excess of the preceding year.

Mr. BLAIN. How does that compare with say ten years ago?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think that for a number of years the revenue was practically stationary. Many years ago it was larger. As my hon. friend knows, transportation by water-routes is less now than it was twenty-five years ago.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you mean absolutely or comparatively?

Mr. EMMERSON. Comparatively. There was a larger proportion of the traffic of the country carried by water.

Mr. KEMP. There is more tonnage to-day than there was at that period?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, there is more tonnage.

Additional to persons employed permanently in the public service, and remuneration to any other persons for services rendered for and in connection with passing vessels through the canals of the government of Canada, from midnight on Saturday to midnight on Sunday, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $20,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. I may say that this is in excess of the vote of last year. We have found during the last two years that the annual vote of $18,000 has been too little. We are paying larger wages to the men, and there is more night work and Sunday work. At certain seasons of the year certain canals are open on Sunday towards the close of navigation, and there is more night work necessary for the traffic which requires expedition and speed. So that instead of asking for an annual vote of $18,000 and a supplementary vote, I thought, on the advice of the officials, that it was better to ask for the $20,000 and be done with it.

Belleville armoury, $30,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is a revote from last year. A site has been given by the town, but there is some dissatisfaction with it, and the department is at present in communication with the authorities of the town with regard to a change of the site. Immediately after the site is settled on, the building will be proceeded with. It will be practically the same as the Chatham building, the total cost of which is about $65,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister know what the policy of the government is in reference to armouries? Are they going on putting up now one and now another without any fixed policy?

Mr. HYMAN. There is quite a large town there, the town of Belleville, and a regiment of eight companies, which has no armoury. It is the policy of the government where there are regiments of that size to provide armouries, but of course the whole of Canada cannot be provided for in one year.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the minimum force that must be in a place to entitle it to an armoury ?

Mr. HYMAN. Where there is a country battalion, there should be an armoury, not a large armoury, but some place where the arms can be stored and which may be used as headquarters.

Mr. FOSTER. In such a small place what would be the cost of a respectable armoury ?

Mr. HYMAN. That would depend on the unit of the battalion. The cost runs all the way down to $5,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course the hon. minister has nothing to do with this except to put up the armouries decided upon by the Militia Department. In cases of this kind it would certainly be a great advantage to have the other ministers interested present. The Minister of Public Works is not supposed to understand thoroughly the policy of the Militia Department with regard to armouries and cannot give the explanations which the committee requires. One easily sees that if the Militia Department is going on some fixed principle as to armouries, we are entering upon a course which involves large obligations. It would be interesting to know how many of these armouries we have already built and how they square with the numbers of the militia in each place. Then we should know what is the minimum of the force which could reasonably expect to have an armoury. Then we should have the number and distribution of these armouries throughout the Dominion, because if the policy be a good one it will have to be applied not only to Belleville and the smaller places but generally. Quite true it is impossible to build them all in one year ; but if we start on a common policy, we should have the basis on which such expenditure is to be made. We cannot have that information to-night because the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) is not here. I do not want to be carping but ministers seem to think they are not interested when the estimates are going through outside of their own. But in all these matters, especially Public Works, where that department builds for many different departments, it is important that the ministers of the other departments should be here while the estimates are going through. I do not think that is making too harsh a criticism. It may be all very well for our ministers to dine out and enjoy social festivities, but they should be here to attend to business. It is very nice to throw off dull care and get out of the atmosphere of the House when estimates, in which you are not directly interested, are on, but that is

not treating the House properly. The Solicitor General is here, showing a very good spirit of attention to business, and so is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I believe. We miss his presence very often and he is not here any too much. Then we have the Postmaster General—his interesting figure is generally here. But where are all the rest and where particularly to-night is the Minister of Militia and Defence when these estimates on armouries are being put through ? He ought to be here.

Mr. HYMAN. Unfortunately he had an engagement to-night which renders it impossible for him to be here.

Mr. FOSTER. But these engagements should not be the rule.

Mr. HYMAN. If the committee finds any objections, I am sure the Minister of Militia will be glad to add to the explanations I have given. It is almost impossible to lay down a rule which can be followed in all circumstances. There are so many things to be considered even beyond the unit of the militia. A drill shed may be required in a place where there are but 500 men—one that will suit the wants of that district. And if a small place has no provision of any kind for the militia, it may be necessary to build the armoury in that place before going on with a larger one. It will be impossible to lay down a rule which could be adhered to under any circumstances. Hamilton has a drill hall, but a new regiment is raised there, and it is incumbent on the department to provide facilities for the housing of that regiment. That is something which could not be well foreseen and I do not know that any rule can be laid down which would not be departed from in many instances.

Mr. FOSTER. There could be a general policy.

Mr. HYMAN. You must have headquarters for every corps where they can have storage for their arms. That is being proceeded with and will be completed as soon as possible, always remembering not to have too large an expenditure in one year.

Bowmanville public building, $7,200.

Mr. HYMAN. The total expenditure is $32,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The department bought the site I suppose?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population of Bowmanville?

Mr. HYMAN. When the building started it was 3,377.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the revenues ?

Mr. HYMAN. Postal, $4,736 and customs, $11,000.

Brantford drill hall—additions and alterations, $25,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This work is under contract and the vote now asked will practically complete the work. There was a question raised by the hon. gentleman for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) the other day as to whether a bowling alley should be put in the building.

Mr. FOSTER. A bowling alley ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, all the larger armouries are provided with bowling alleys for the recreation of the men.

Mr. FOSTER. This is for additions and alterations. Does it make practically a new building?

Mr. HYMAN. Not exactly, but it is a very large extention of the old building.

Mr. FOSTER. What will be the total cost?

Mr. HYMAN. It is estimated in the neighbourhood of $45,000.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Is there more than one regiment in Brantford?

Mr. HYMAN. Only one regiment.

Bridgeburg public building, $16,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The need for this building is not to be estimated by the size of the place alone. Bridgeburg is a small place, of only 1,356 people. But it is a border town, just opposite Buffalo, and there is a large number of customs officers there doing inspection work, and there are other special reasons for the building.

Mr. FOSTER. What county is it in?

Mr. HYMAN. Welland.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the revenues ?

Mr. HYMAN. Postal, $13,661.

Mr. FOSTER. What makes it that size ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is a border town, and, I believe there is a great race-track in the vicinity which attracts an immense number of people from Buffalo.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the customs revenue?

Mr. HYMAN. This is part of Fort Erie and the customs revenue is $519,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Is the building located at the end of the International bridge ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. Where the customs officers had their quarters before?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes. This public building has been asked rather by the department than by the people. It is a great manifesting point, just opposite Buffalo. Our documents were kept in a little room in the Michigan Central station which was entirely unsafe. This is a permanent building and absolutely needed in the public interest.

Mr. FOSTER. Had you rented quarters before?

Mr. PATERSON. So far as the Customs Department were concerned, the railway furnished us with a room, a place in their freight shed, but with no safe and no proper place for storing documents. We have a large transfer business, and a great accumulation of papers. It would have been very serious if a fire had taken place. The construction of this building was urged upon me by the inspectors and I am probably mainly responsible for the Department of Public Works taking it up.

Mr. FOSTER. What will be the total cost, and how divided?

Mr. HYMAN. In the neighbourhood of $25,000, made up of: contract, $15,000; heating, $2,000; wiring, $500; fittings, furniture, letter-box fronts, $3,000; sidewalk damages if necessary, $500, and contingencies to make up $25,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What did the site cost?

Mr. HYMAN. It cost $707.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a rather expensive building in which to store records.

Mr. HYMAN. There is the post office in addition, of course.

Mr. INGRAM. The land, no doubt, is rather high. But the building is necessary. They have a considerable staff of customs officers there. This is, no doubt, an important point.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the contractor?

Mr. HYMAN. The contractors are J. E. Cutler and M. Vanderburg, of Welland.

Mr. FOSTER. Tenders were called for, I suppose?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the building made of ?

Mr. HYMAN. Brick, with a stone foundation.

Mr. FOSTER. What rentals were paid before?

Mr. HYMAN. Post office, $120 and customs house, $124.

Chatham armoury, $55,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is to complete building. The work is under contract. The site belonged to the government, but, as it was low, the foundation had to be heightened, which will increase the cost of the building $4,000 or $5,000 over what such a building would cost under ordinary circumstances. The total cost will be $65,000.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I must congratulate the government upon building this armoury for it is very much needed. I will ask the minister to see to it that it is completed as soon as possible. We have a very worthy regiment, who are much in need of proper quarters, the present quarters being very bad.

Mr. PRINGLE. I would ask the Minister of Public Works upon what principle the armouries are decided upon. I find in the estimates provision for armouries in a large number of places in Ontario and other provinces. We, in Cornwall, have been promised an armoury for some time. We are not so ambitious there as some other places are; we do not want a very extravagant building. But we have one of the finest battalions in eastern Ontario and they have no place whatever to store their arms. If the government could see their way to a reasonable expenditure, even an expenditure of $8.000 or $10,000, I think we could make it meet our requirements.

Some two years ago the then Minister of Public Works visited the town of Cornwall, looked at the different sites that were proposed, and gave every assurance that the armoury would be erected in a very short time. Since then we have heard nothing whatever about it. The town of Cornwall is the centre of three counties. Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, and I understand from the military men that it is absolutely necessary that they should have a proper building for the storing of their arms. As I say, we are not so ambitious as Brockville, Belleville. Cobourg, London and a dozen other places in Ontario, we will be satisfied with a reasonable amount, $8.000 or $10,000 for an armoury will meet the requirements. But I feel a little sore that the town of Cornwall should be ignored completely, especially as two years ago the matter was taken into consideration by the Minister of Militia and also by the Minister of Public Works, and a definite promise, I understand, was made to the military men that we would have at least an armoury in that town.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. member will understand that the initiation of such a building does not come from the Public Works Department, but from the Militia Department. I have no doubt that if the hon. gentleman makes as strong a case with the Minister of Militia as he has made here to-night, the Minister of Militia will give him every consideration. If the Militia Department asks for an armoury at that place, the Public Works Department will endeavour to make one which will be a credit to the department. I do not, of course, know the situation there, but I have no doubt in the world that Cornwall's time will come, and I am sure the Minister of Militia will be glad to listen to any representations that may be made.

Mr. PRINGLE. I waited on the Minister of Militia some two years ago with a deputation from the town of Cornwall, and also on the Minister of Public Works. The

Minister of Militia was not very definite in his promise, but the Minister of Public Works was very definite, and gave us very positive assurances that it would be only a short time before an armoury would be erected. Subsequently the Minister of Public Works, while passing over the Cornwall canal, visited the town and was shown the different sites that were suitable for an armoury, and he expressed a very strong opinion in favour of one of them, and gave us every assurance that the building would be erected. Now we are put off again.

Mr. HYMAN. It will come.

Mr. PRINGLE. If it will come, I am quite satisfied. Might I ask the minister when it is likely to come ?

Mr. HYMAN. Surely the hon. gentleman does not want me to make a definite pledge after a predecessor of mine has made a pledge which the hon. gentleman says he has not carried out.

Mr. PRINGLE. I should think the hon. gentleman would carry out the pledges made by his predecessor.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would like to ask whether the city of Chatham furnished a site for this armoury, or did the Crown purchase it ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is being erected on ground which belongs to the government.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. How many men are going to use it ?

Mr. HYMAN. One regiment.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I desire to ask the hon. gentleman if any provision will be made in the city of Brantford for a parade ground. The building there is undergoing considerable alterations. I regret I was not in when they were under discussion, but I may take advantage of this item to remind the minister that we have very little ground there indeed, in fact no ground upon which a regiment can form up. The building itself is not large enough to accommodate the whole of the regiment, so that they can form up. The men of the regiment desire to know whether or not it will be possible in the near future to provide some ground in the vicinity that will be suitable for a parade ground. The hon. gentleman visited the city a short time ago, I believe, and he will know that what I ask for is a necessary adjunct to the building. I do not desire to criticise the item with regard to the armoury at Brantford at all, as I think the expenditure has been a wise one, and was necessary in the interest of the regiment. The regiment is now increasing its strength, I think two more companies are being raised at the present time, and this parade ground will be a very suitable adjunct to the present alterations that are going on. If the minister can see his way to provide a little territory there, near at hand, I think it can be procured for a reasonable price, it would be much appreciated by the regiment. I would also like to ask if it is likely that the improvements now going on will be completed in the near future. They have been under way for a considerable length of time. There is a little complaint about the dilatory way in which the contract is being carried on. I think the work is very good, but the progress is not all that could be desired. I would like to be able to give our friends an assurance that it will be pressed with all possible speed, and that this parade ground will come in the near future.

Mr. HYMAN. With regard to the work that is being done on the drill hall, the time for the completion of the contract expires on the 6th of October, and the department will endeavour to see that the work is completed by that time. Of course it will be impossible to have it completed before then. In regard to the question of procuring some extra ground in connection with the building, I think that Brantford has a right to it and it will be necessary for the government to procure a small piece of ground in addition to that which we have. From the present moment I contemplate being able to purchase that ground, provided the price is satisfactory. I think the city of Brantford has done a great deal towards the erection of this armoury in providing the site. It is a beautiful site, and I think there should be some additional ground, and I hope to provide that out of the present vote without asking the House for any further sum.

Cobourg armoury, $14,500.

Mr. BLAIN. On the question of armouries, I may say that I brought the attention of the Minister of Militia to the condition of the 36th Peel Battalion two or three years ago. There was a promise given at that time that the matter would be taken up and considered. We have a public building in the town of Brampton at the present time and a post office in an adjoining building. With a small expenditure, provision could be made in that same building for taking care of the arms of the 36th Peel Battalion. Some objection was raised to that proposition on the ground that the Public Works Department were unwilling to allow arms to be stored in the post office building. May I ask the minister if there is any such policy on the part of the department ?

Mr. HYMAN. Of course, so far as I am concerned, and the department is concerned, I can see no objections to storing the arms in the public building. I shall be glad if the hon. gentleman will let me have exact details of what he wishes to be done, and I shall be glad to discuss the matter with the Minister of Militia at the first opportunity.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the town of Cobourg furnish the site for the armoury, or did the Crown purchase it ?

Mr. HYMAN. The government bought the site.

Mr. LANCASTER. What was the cost of the site ?

Mr. HYMAN. $6,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be the cost of the building ?

Mr. HYMAN. $48,000.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Is that for the accommodation of more than one regiment ?

Mr. HYMAN. In Cobourg there is the 4th Midland field battery and the 40th Northumberland regiment.

Guelph armoury, $40,000.

Mr. HYMAN. Guelph is the centre of military district No. 1 and is the headquarters of a number of corps. The estimated cost of the building is $125,000. The reason that the cost is larger than that of some other buildings of a similar character is on account of the large number of guns. The battery is to be doubled up and it will have twice the number of guns.

Mr. FOSTER. What has prevented the work from going on ? I see that this is a rebate.

Mr. HYMAN. We have just got the site. We have not made any expenditure. The plans and specifications are being prepared.

Mr. INGRAM. Where is the Guelph armoury to be located ?

Mr. HYMAN. On the fair grounds facing Huskisson Street—178 feet on Huskisson Street, 467 feet on Farquhar Street and 385 feet on Freshfield Street.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the hon. gentleman know the location himself ?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not. I never was in Guelph but once in my life.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it on what is called the market square ?

Mr. HYMAN. I am informed by the officer of the department that it is near the market square.

Mr. INGRAM. Does it take up all the ground they call the fair ground ?

Mr. HYMAN. I am unable to give the hon. gentleman that information.

Mr. INGRAM. I see the architect there and I presume he would know.

Mr. HYMAN. It is bounded by three streets and I presume that it will naturally take in all of the ground within these three streets.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand that the hon. gentleman will erect the armoury beside the parade ground where the men collect for drill. In some places the selection of the parade ground has been made at a considerable distance from the heart of the town or city and by reason of the long distance from the centre of the town regiments have not done well because you cannot get young men to attend drill when the parade ground is far from the centre of the town. I am glad to know that in the city of Guelph that difficulty does not present itself. In my own city, I know, it has been the means of the regiment being disbanded. The distance to the parade ground was so great that the men would not go. They have reorganized the regiment again, but I do not know whether they are going to make any greater success of it than they did before or not. They have made a mistake in that case which I hope will not occur again.

Mr. HYMAN. Wherever possible the armoury ought to be accessible to the town. But, a difficulty in regard to procuring parade grounds in close proximity to the armoury presents itself when we consider the cost of land in the centre of a city.

Mr. INGRAM. In the city of London you have made an improvement in your armoury by having it more centrally located.

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, but the old armoury was not out of the way.

Mr. INGRAM. Where do you have your drill ground ?

Mr. HYMAN. They use the park.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I am glad to see that the hon. minister approves of having the drill hall near the parade ground. I think it is a very wise plan indeed, because if a drill hall is half a mile or so away from the parade ground it is a great inconvenience, especially to city corps, with whom most of the drill is done at night. Probably the men cannot get together before seven o'clock, and if they have to assemble at the armoury and walk half a mile to the parade ground it takes up half of the evening before they get down to drill. I think the question of having the drill shed at or in the vicinity of the parade ground is one that should commend itself to the hon. minister.

Mr. HYMAN. It is impossible to carry out both of the hon. gentleman's ideas. If you were to have both the parade ground and drill shed in the centre of the city I am afraid the cost would be such that the committee would never allow the department to commit itself to the expenditure of such a large amount of money. In London there is no drill ground attached to the armoury but there is a park two or three blocks

away from the armoury and the regiments march to the park and drill there. It is not expected that the department shall always provide a drill ground. It is only done where the cost is sufficiently reasonable to enable the department to do so.

Mr. BLAIN. On this question of the Guelph armoury the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made a rather extended tour in Ontario during the last election, and I noticed very many references in the daily newspapers of the time to statements made by hon. gentlemen representing constituencies and sitting on that side of the House. For instance, the former member for West Kent made the statement that he had fulfilled all the promises he had made because he had got so many thousand dollars expended in his county. On the question of the Guelph armoury I would like to draw the hon. minister's attention to this statement by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) as published in the 'Globe' of October 13, 1904:

> Mr. Guthrie said he had promised on his election to have the Guelph post office renovated and enlarged.

That was the promise, and to quote again:

> A third promise of his had been that he would secure armouries for Guelph, and he was glad to say that he had secured them at last and the plans were in the city now.

I wish to draw the hon. minister's attention to the fact. Perhaps he could state how hon. members on this side of the House could reach the government. That is the way hon. gentlemen opposite representing these constituencies reach the government and I thought perhaps there was a policy by which we could reach them. It seemed to be a general topic of discussion during the right hon. gentleman's tour through the province of Ontario. Whenever he went to a town an armoury was required, and the hon. gentleman representing the county, or the candidate, would stand up and say that he would get an armoury for that town if the constituency would support the present administration. I am supposing there are no politics in the hon. gentleman's department.

Mr. HYMAN. This is the first time I ever heard it suggested.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose the hon. gentleman will repudiate the statement of the hon. member who represents South Wellington. That hon. gentleman made three promises to his electors: First, that he would get the post office renovated, and he was very glad that he had got the government to renovate it. The third was that he would secure armouries and he was glad to state to the electors that he had secured a promise from the government to erect armouries. I call the attention of the minister to the fact and I hope he will not allow this political warfare to creep into the administration of his department.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman himself within the last ten minutes has asked the department to spend $10,000 on a building in his constituency. What is to be thought of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain)? Is it that he is trying to bribe his constituents by asking what is an unnecessary expenditure? I assume that hon. gentlemen on either side have a perfect right to look after the interests of their constituencies, and to make representations to the government in regard to the interests of their own districts. I promised to the hon. gentleman in regard to the matter which he brought up, a very sympathetic ear, and I shall be glad indeed if I am able to carry out his wishes in the matter. All ministers and all departments, I presume, are always open to have any member of the House make such representations on behalf of their constituents as they desire to make. I am always glad to hear from members on either side of the House.

Mr. PRINGLE. In reference to the armoury of which I was speaking a few moments ago, I find in the estimates of this year that provision is made for armouries at Belleville, Chatham, Cobourg, Guelph, Hamilton, Peterborough, St. Catharines, Stratford and Woodstock.

Mr. HYMAN. These are not initiatory votes for any of these works. Some of them have been there for two or three years.

Mr. PRINGLE. Some are no doubt for the completion of buildings already started. Two or three years ago we had estimates for Brockville, St. Thomas, Barrie and a number of other towns. I wish to impress on the hon. gentleman that the most important town in eastern Ontario, a town in the centre of three very important counties, has been neglected for many years notwithstanding that the military authorities interested have come here and presented the matter to the government, I think in an absolutely fair light, and have received assurances from the government that something would be done, at any rate, in the way of erecting a building in which they could store their arms; but nothing has been done. I am glad to hear the hon. minister say that it will come in due time. I would like a little more definite promise; I would like to see it come at once.

Mr. HYMAN. While you live?

Mr. PRINGLE. While I live. It has been hanging fire a good many years and I would like to see an item in the estimates for this year. As I said before we are not extravagant in our ideas. We simply want a good and substantial building suitable to meet the requirements there. I am not in

a position to say just what the requirements are as well as the officers of the battalion, who have come here on several occasions. I might say to the hon. gentleman that the officers of the 59th Battalion are not by any means all Conservatives. Those who are at the head of the battalion are very strong supporters of this government and they feel very grieved that they can get no satisfactory answer from this government as to what they are going to do in regard to an armoury there. As I said two years ago they were directed to select a site; they selected a site and submitted it to the government but the matter hung fire and they got promise after promise. Immediately prior to the election of last November it was stated without any question that the armoury would be erected at once and still I see nothing in these estimates for it. I, of course, expected that there would be something for the Cornwall drill hall and I have no doubt it will be in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman will understand that it is not the custom of any government to put initiatory expenditures in the main estimates. The hon. gentleman, like every one else, will have to abide in patience until the supplementaries are out. I shall be glad to listen to any representations of any hon. gentleman in reference to the matter.

Hamilton drill hall—addition, $50,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The item of $50,000 for the Hamilton drill hall does not cover the total expenditure that it will be necessary to make in the city of Hamilton. I know that a new regiment, a Highland regiment, has been lately formed in Hamilton, and although they have a very fair drill hall there the number of corps using that hall so crowd it that it will be necessary to make a new provision for Hamilton. I have not been able to reach the exact amount of expenditure that will be necessary because there will be some question as to whether it will be necessary to build an entirely new hall or whether a part of the old hall can be used. For that reason I am not able to give the exact expenditure, but I should say that the expenditure necessary to provide accommodation will be in the neighbourhood of $125,000 or $150,000. The matter has been carefully gone into; we have had several plans made but I have not been able to satisfy myself as yet as to the plan to be adopted. In this case I shall have to ask the House to pass the vote without any exact estimates, for the reason that I cannot tell how much of the old building we will be able to use.

Mr. INGRAM. I wish to read some quotations from a paper about promises by members.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman is not surely going to read any promises made by the hon. member for Hamilton?

Mr. PRINGLE.

Mr. INGRAM. I am going to perhaps a higher authority.

Mr. HYMAN. There could be no higher authority.

Mr. INGRAM. When the premier was in South Wellington he assured the electors that the government had joined the government of Mexico in subsidizing a steamship line to that country which would afford a market for their manufactured goods. I have been wondering since this matter was discussed in the House whether that was correct or not. The other night when the estimates went through there was no line subsidized.

Mr. HYMAN. I do know, as a matter of fact, that although the bargain may not have been entirely consummated, the government are in negotiation with the Mexican government for the establishment of a line, not only on the Atlantic but on the Pacific.

Mr. INGRAM. If my hon. friend on your right (Mr. Paterson) will make that statement I will be glad, but he would not venture to do it when the estimates were up in the House.

Hawkesbury public building, $13,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How much will this cost?

Mr. HYMAN. This is just for completion. The estimate for the building complete is $18,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population of Hawkesbury?

Mr. HYMAN. 4,150.

Mr. FOSTER. And the postal customs revenue?

Mr. HYMAN. The postal revenue is $2,944. They are making application for a customs office there; it is not established yet.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the rentals of the present accommodation?

Mr. HYMAN. $120 per annum.

Kingston military buildings—barracks, Royal Canadian Field Artillery, $20,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is a revote. There has been no use made of it as yet, for the reason that it is not the intention of the Militia Department to proceed with the construction of these barracks until they are able to dispose of the land on which the old barracks are erected.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Have the old barracks been condemned as being unsanitary?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not know that they have been condemned, but there have been protests with regard to them.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Have there been any reports from medical boards as to the unsanitary condition of the buildings?

Mr. HYMAN. I think there has. I think the attention of the department has been called to their unsanitary condition.

Kingston military buildings—stable accommodation for field battery, $5,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is in place of the building that was burned. This amount will nearly cover the cost.

Kingston Royal Military College—addition to drill hall, $6,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is for the purpose of providing a drill hall and also a building which can be used in the winter as a skating rink for the Royal Military College. Plans and specifications were prepared, but the estimate was so large that we gave instructions to have new plans made. We hope to keep the cost within $12,000 or $15,000.

Kingston Royal Military College—servants' quarters, $8,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be the cost of that building ?

Mr. HYMAN. If the hon. gentleman will allow the vote to pass, I shall be very glad to send him an estimate. As a matter of fact, I spent two hours to-day in consultation with the architect of the Militia Department, and this is one of the items on which they have not the full particulars. My recollection is that the cost will be in the neighbourhood of $15,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Two years ago I had the pleasure of riding up past Kingston with the Minister of the Interior, and I drew his attention to the fact that in the neighbourhood of the military properties at Kingston there are two or three martello towers, which were erected there many years ago. The masonry is all in first-class condition, but during a heavy gale two or three years ago they were unroofed, and they have been left in that dilapidated condition. I think the department ought to spend a few hundred dollars in having these old land marks preserved. The Minister of the Interior fully agreed with me when I drew his attention to them.

Mr. HYMAN. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has brought this matter to my attention. The committee understands that the care of the military buildings is not vested in the Public Works Department, but in the Militia Department. I have asked the deputy to take a memorandum, and I will have the attention of the militia authorities called to the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

Kingston Royal Military College—stable, $5,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be the full cost of that ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is a stable for the permanent corps, and it is to include quarters for the grooms. The cost will be in the neighbourhood of $18,000. I understand that these stables are built in accordance with the regulations, which require a certain space for so many horses and so many grooms.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is this stable being built inside or outside the grounds of the college ? I am told that objections have been raised on account of these stables being built too near the officers' quarters.

Mr. HYMAN. There has been no request made to the Public Works Department for any expenditure for a site, and, therefore, I presume that it must be the intention of the Militia Department to have the stables placed on the grounds owned by the department.

Mr. TAYLOR. The department owns about a thousand acres of land there.

London military buildings—magazine, $3,000.

Mr. KEMP. Where is that situated ?

Mr. HYMAN. The magazine has not yet been built. This vote is for the purpose of building one for the permanent corps of London. It is also intended to erect one at Winnipeg, one at Toronto and one at Montreal.

London military buildings—new stores building, $10,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is also a vote which appears in the estimates for Toronto, Montreal, London and Winnipeg. It is for the purpose of providing a building at each of the different headquarters wherein material for the department can be stored.

Mr. FOSTER. What kind of stores are they ?

Mr. HYMAN. All kinds of camp stores. The ammunition will be kept in the magazine. These buildings are to be practically fire-proof buildings, and about 65 by 48 feet in area. Each will cost in the neighbourhood of $40,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Where will the London building be located ?

Mr. HYMAN. It will be on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, at the edge of the government property, near the ground where a corps is stationed.

Mr. KEMP. Will the work be gone on with at an early date ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes. The specifications are made for some of the buildings, and we are going to build them on the same plan.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Before this military item is passed, I would like to call the attention of the minister to the condition of the drill hall, or, to speak more accurately, the drill shed at Summerside.

Mr. HYMAN. When we come to the items for Prince Edward Island that will be in order.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I do not see any item for Prince Edward Island, and that is the reason I put in a plea here. The drill shed at Summerside is not fit for the accommodation of the military men. It is an old building, standing on a public square. There is no floor in it, and it is absolutely impossible to use it in winter. I took occasion several times last session to talk privately to the Minister of Militia on this matter, and he promised that it would receive some attention. I think he said he would send a man down to investigate. I do not know whether he has brought the matter to the attention of the Minister of Public Works or not. If not, I would like to take this occasion to call his attention to it, in the hope that he will put a sum in the supplementary estimates to put the building into proper condition to be used or to erect a new building. We would prefer to have $10,000 voted to erect a permanent building, for the policy of the government is to erect permanent buildings for the accommodation of the militia throughout Canada.

Mr. HYMAN. I have explained to the hon. gentleman that the care of these buildings is not vested in the Public Works Department but in the Militia Department. I have asked the deputy minister to take a memorandum.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be a good idea to let the items that have to do with militia buildings stand and go on with the others. It is utterly absurd to take up these items and have the minister tell us that he will take notes and get from the Minister of Militia the information required.

Mr. HYMAN. This is the first one in which I have taken such notes. If my hon. friend will consent, I should be very glad to leave one item on which we could have a general discussion when the Minister of Militia is here.

Mr. FOSTER. Leave one or two.

London post office—addition to building and improvements, $20,000.

Mr. ELSON. What are these improvements?

Mr. HYMAN. It is intended to raise the back part of the west side of the office up to the full height of the building and to take in the balance of the ground which belongs to the department at the back end of the post office. It is intended to enlarge the working rooms down stairs and move those working downstairs to the story above.

North Bay public building, $15,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The customs revenue is $29,329, and the population 2,530, the cost will be about $40,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What justification is there for putting up a building of that size?

Mr. HYMAN. The population is increasing there very rapidly and it would not be wise to put up a building only suitable to the present requirements. In a growing town such as that, the department will be justified in looking to the future.

Mr. FOSTER. This is at the junction of the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Oshawa public building, $21,500.

Mr. HYMAN. There will be another vote required to complete this.

Mr. FOSTER. What will that cost?

Mr. HYMAN. A total of $31,000, including the furniture and letter boxes, &c. The postal revenue is $8,329, the custom duties $37,458, and the population, 3,494.

Ottawa departmental buildings—steel drawers and roller shelves, &c., $25,000.

Mr. HYMAN. That is the usual vote for the replacing of the old wooden drawers gradually with steel drawers, so as to make the buildings as fireproof as possible.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Are tenders called for?

Mr. HYMAN. There are only four or five firms making them and they are all asked to tender.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who is supplying these?

Mr. HYMAN. The Eclipse Furniture Company of Ottawa, the Office Specialty Company, the Cabinet Company of Gananoque and a firm in Montreal.

Mr. KEMP. What is the advantage in this?

Mr. HYMAN. As the old wooden shelving becomes worn out we are putting in model shelving and drawers.

Mr. KEMP. They are not fireproof?

Mr. HYMAN. No doubt, but they are very much less liable to combustion than the wooden ones.

Mr. FOSTER. How much was spent on that last year?

Mr. HYMAN. From 1st of July to 31st of December, $31,000

Mr. FOSTER. To whom was it paid?

Mr. HYMAN. I have not the details, but it was distributed among these four firms.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any difference in their prices?

Mr. HYMAN. I am advised that the prices are virtually the same for similar articles.

Ottawa public building—new coal shed, $10,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is that to be situated ?

Mr. HYMAN. No decision has been reached yet. We have now the coal-shed on the Canal basin, but the Department of Railways and Canals, who control that basin are continually asking the department for the removal of the building. It has storage room of only 2,500 tons. We rent another shed which holds 3,000 tons. It is not easy to find a site for a coal-shed near at hand, and we do not want to go too far on account of the cost of haulage.

Mr. INGRAM. From whom does the department rent this coal-shed, and for what rental ?

Mr. HYMAN. From Mr. C. C. Ray, at $400.

Ottawa public buildings—improvements in main entrance hall, renewal of sky-lights, windows, &c., $10,000.

Mr. KEMP. What are these improvements ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is intended to replace the present banisters in the main lobby with granite and to renew the risers. Then there will be the dressing down and re-rubbing of the stone work of the lobby. The skylights will be repaired, a certain amount of painting done and the leaded windows in different parts of the House will be repaired.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Might I suggest to the minister, at the same time, to investigate the ventilation of this chamber and lobbies. I believe it would be wonderfully improved if proper men took it in hand.

Mr. HYMAN. I have heard no serious complaint. Of course, the building not being exactly modern in construction, it is somewhat difficult to ventilate it properly. Any suggestions that the hon. gentleman can give me, I shall be glad to receive.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If the hon. minister will talk the matter over with members on either side of the House, I think he will understand that the ventilation is not what it ought to be. And if he will further investigate the conduits through which, as I understand, air is brought in from the side of the hill and that are covered with moss, and I might say filth, I think he will find it necessary to make some improvements.

Mr. HYMAN. I understood that the air came from the top of the building and reached us as pure as possible.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am very glad that we have not had so much ventilation as we had last session. I was almost obliged to threaten some officials of the House with dire punishment if they did not cease opening the ventilators behind us, almost destroying our health by subjecting us to draughts. I say, I am glad that has not been done, and I warn the minister that I will not submit to it and that there will be a rebellion——

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Order.

Mr. HENDERSON——if it is attempted ; and the hon. gentleman who called 'order' may as well understand that we will rule the ventilators on this side, and they can do as they like about those on that side.

Mr. HYMAN. I shall be glad to carry out the ideas of the hon. gentleman as far as possible. But it will be easily understood that when some gentlemen come to me and complain that the room is too warm and others a moment later complain that it is too cold, it is somewhat difficult to manage the ventilators to suit all.

Mr. HENDERSON. No doubt we have to submit to some extra heat, but I prefer that to having the windows thrown open, perhaps without a moment's warning, letting in a draught that cannot but injure the health of those in the chamber. This used to occur at six o'clock, and, if a member remained in his place a few minutes after six, he was subjected to a draught which would give him a severe cold in a minute or two. I trust that the officers have learned a better way to ventilate the House, or that they will at least warn the members to retire before they open the windows.

Mr. HYMAN. Of course, the ventilation is more pressing during the warmer weather. And, of course, advantage is taken of the recess at six o'clock to ventilate the chamber. But the officials should at least wait a few minutes until members have left the chamber before they open the ventilators. If the hon. gentleman will call my attention to any difficulty that may arise, I shall be glad to remedy it if I can.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Does the minister think that the amount here asked for is sufficient to do the work about this building that should be done in the near future. It seems to me to have become pretty dreary along these corridors. I used to think of the House of Commons as one of the places we read about—a sort of earthly paradise. But, walking along these corridors, I find the place not at all what I expected to find it. For my part, I would like to see it brushed up to a considerable extent in the near future. This estimate appears to me to be small in comparison with other votes that are being passed. It seems to me that there is room for a good deal of improvement. While I am on my feet, I desire to say a word—I do not know that it will be strictly in order in the discussion of this item—as to the accommodation afforded to members to carry on their corespondence. The desks in this chamber are narrow, and some of us have no place to write our let-

ters but at the desks. Those who have the advantage of private rooms, of course, are all right, but any one with considerable correspondence finds it difficult to carry it on in the House. There seems to be no quarters where quiet prevails.

I do not know whether this is the proper place to bring it up, but while these estimates are under consideration I think perhaps the hon. gentleman would consider a more comprehensive plan whereby a little additional room might be obtained where the members could have occasionally the use of a room for half an hour or an hour a day, where they can retire and do a little correspondence without being disturbed, as we are in the House or in the general committee room. The item he asks for is a very small one, and I think members on both sides of the House would join in advocating a sufficient vote to put the affairs of the House in a satisfactory condition. I understand that the legislative buildings in Toronto furnish to the members vastly better accommodation than is furnished to members in this House. If that is the case, it appears to me the minister might ask for a more liberal allowance in order to make the members a little more comfortable than they are. It strikes me as reasonabe that when members are spending so large a portion of their lives here it is but right to make them as comfortable as circumstances will allow.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman will note that this vote is for a particular purpose. There are other votes in connection with buildings, there is also a general vote in the estimates for the care and maintenance of all the Ottawa buildings. From that vote each year a considerable amount of money is taken and spent in the direction the hon. gentleman refers to, cleaning, papering, painting and so on. We have here a large pile of public buildings. Some of the corridors are not exactly in the condition I would like to see them, and it is the intention this year to do something in that line. Numerous improvements can be made from time to time in different parts of the building. So far as accommodation to members is concerned, of course if it is the will of the committee that a larger expenditure should be made for that purpose, speaking solely for myself, I have no objection at all. I think the members of this House are entitled to more comforts than they receive at present, and they should be supplied with rooms where they can do their correspondence. As time goes on that which has always been a necessity becomes more of a necessity than ever. I do not know whether we will be able to put an item in the estimates this year. We have already considerably extended the accommodation, both for private members and for committees, the last few years. We have opened up the top flat both in the Senate wing and in the House of Commons wing, and probably all the space in this building that is possible to get is now fully occupied. I think the time has come when there should be better accommodation for the members themselves. I intend to discuss the matter with my colleagues, and to ascertain whether a vote can be taken to make an enlargement of the building in some other direction. This is not of course a new matter. It has been discussed in every session since I have the honour of sitting in this House. As I say, considerable improvement has been made and more room has been furnished, but we will have to consider the necessity of going still further.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. While we are on this item I would like to make a suggestion about lighting the approaches to this building. In an electrical city like Ottawa I think it would be both wise and easily possible to light up the walks leading to the main building a good deal better than is done at present. The electric lights and the gas lights furnished at present are in a rather crude condition.

Mr. KEMP. The minister mentioned about going over the rooms from year to year. I do not know whether it is by design or carelessness, but I certainly think that the members of the opposition are deserving of better quarters than they now receive in room No. 6.

Mr. HYMAN. I understand that two years ago, during recess, No. 6 was done over. Still I shall be very glad to do whatever is required there. As regards lighting, there is a vote now in the estimates for the purpose of improving the lighting. The matter is being attended to by the department. I will try and devise some means both of increasing the light and making a better appearance.

Mr. BARR. I am glad this subject has come up. I was rather surprised when I came to this House to find that the members were so poorly housed. They have indeed very poor accommodation, in fact almost none at all. In Toronto the members are very much better accommodated; no doubt the Toronto house is more modern and is provided with more conveniences. The quarters provided for the opposition in this House are certainly very inadequate. We are shut up in a little room with only three easy chairs in it for sixty or seventy members. It does seem to me that we deserve a little better accommodation than that. Even the Speaker's quarters here are poor compared with those afforded in Toronto. It would be well worth while to consider whether the Speaker's quarters might not be moved outside of this building and thereby afford so much more accommodation for private members. We

have to pass four, six and seven months of our time in this House, and, I think, we deserve more accommodation, and some place where we can do our correspondence without being interrupted.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand that some measurements are being taken around this building now ; is that with a view of enlarging the building ?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not think any measurements are being taken with a view of enlarging the building. Certain levels are being taken in connection with the Georgian bay canal survey. The matter has been discussed a number of times in the House, and a number of schemes have been submitted. I hope to be able to convince my colleagues that the time has come for the necessary enlargement of the quarters for members. There has been a scheme to have an extension from the present quarters occupied by the Speaker out to a line drawn from the building running north and south. That would provide a considerable number of quarters. The matter is under discussion at the present time. I do not know whether I will be able to include a vote for that this year, but I have taken the matter up and I am endeavouring to impress upon my colleagues the necessity for such an addition.

Mr. HENDERSON. While speaking of inconveniences in and around the House, I desire to draw attention to another matter to which I think I have never heard any reference made in this House. I refer to the character of the desks we have in this chamber. When the model for this desk was made I do not know. I think it must have been somewhere back about the time of Adam because it is something very ancient. I cannot conceive why it ever entered into the mind of the man who had charge of the furnishing of this chamber to put in desks with sloping covers. Why we cannot have a desk with a flat top on which we can place a book and know that it will not slide off and tumble on the floor is something that I cannot understand. These sloping desks are responsible for more profanity in this chamber than anything else I can conceive of. I believe that if a careful estimate were made of the books of reference from the library, the binding of which is practically destroyed from year to year by their sliding off the desks on the floor, there would be sufficient money saved in the course of a few years to put in desks properly constructed. There would not only be a saving in money but I need not tell hon. members of this House what a terrible nuisance would be avoided. An hon. member may get up to speak. He requires to have several volumes before him, probably copies of 'Hansard,' sessional reports of various kinds, or perhaps nothing more than sheets of paper. He lays them on his desk but the first thing he knows they are at his feet on the carpet. It is a terrible nuisance but it is one of those things that can be remedied and if it does cost a little money I think it would be worth while to make the change which I suggest. I wonder that this matter has not received the attention of the Minister of Public Works before this time or whoever has charge of this building. I am quite in earnest in what I say. I am not talking for talking's sake. If this improvement can be made it will be one which will be appreciated by every hon. member of this House. I see no advantage whatever in a desk with a sloping cover. I think we could all write on a flat topped desk just as well as we can on one that has a sloping cover. I invite the hon. minister's attention to the matter and I feel sure that he will find some way out of the difficulty and that before long we will be provided with more modern furniture and something that will not cause hon. members to reflect in such very strong language on the neglect of the government as I am sure many hon. members are obliged to do.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Chairman, there have been a good many objections taken in regard to various points in connection with the accommodation in this House, and I do not wish to add to the number, but I do wish to express my sympathy with some of the points raised. As a new member I have not felt pleased or satisfied with the amount of accommodation given in various ways in rooms for correspondence. I have particularly felt the absence of a good strong light in this House and think that if changes were made in the desks it would certainly add to the convenience of members and by making them of a light colour they might reflect the light rather than absorb it. My strongest feeling of sympathy goes out to the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) in regard to what he said on the subject of draughts. The ventilation is not good and I suppose the lack of ventilation has caused those who are responsible to endeavour to supply it in some other way. During the evenings that I spent here in the earlier part of the session, I was conscious of the existence of strong draughts. I made various excursions upstairs to find out where they came from. I did not succeed in finding out but I was still conscious of the draught and of the results after leaving the House. At the present time I am conscious of a strong draught which apparently comes from this opening behind me. After I sit here I frequently have an attack of neuralgia and I sympathize very much with the hon. member for Halton if he has suffered in this way. I hope the ventilation may be improved in such a way as to do away with these draughts.

Mr. INGRAM. My hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) has spoken about books falling off the desks. One reason why books

fall off the desks so much is that the index to the 'Hansard' has been changed and it has been changed for the worse. I wish to enter my strong protest against the system of indexing the 'Hansard' that we now have. An hon. member may have four out of the five volumes and yet he is obliged to send to the library for the fifth volume to get the complete index. I hope that the committee in charge of the debates will revert to the old style of index so that when a member takes up a volume of 'Hansard' and looks over the index he will find what he wants.

Mr. FOSTER. That is as it should be.

Mr. INGRAM. It is the worst system of indexing we have ever had in this House since I have been a member of it, and the sooner it is changed the better. Here are five volumes of the 'Hansard' of last session. You may send for four of them and then you are obliged to send for the fifth in order to get the complete index. I do not know who advised the change but whoever did was very ill-advised.

Mr. HYMAN. That is a matter which is under the control of the Debates Committee, but I will see that the hon. gentleman's remarks as reported in 'Hansard' are forwarded to the committee. As far as the question of desks is concerned, I have never heard a complaint of that kind made before. I have had several books fall from the desk but I have always found other reasons for getting rid of any profanity without taking advantage of that particular one. If any hon. gentlemen would like their desks made in the way which the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) suggests I shall be very glad to have it done. It is not necessary that they should all be changed. If my hon. friend from Halton desires his desk made in that way I will have it done right away.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is the first promise I have ever received from the government and I shall be most happy to accept the offer. I will not then be able to say that the government never did anything for me.

Ottawa public buildings—pavement on Wellington street opposite buildings, $35,000.

Mr. KEMP. Does the government keep the street in repairs?

Mr. HYMAN. It is part of the undertaking of the government to keep that street in repair. There is no contract for the work yet. It is proposed to advertise for a contract and it is proposed to adopt the specifications that the city has adopted for pavements connected with that street.

Mr. INGRAM. Does that include the pavements on both sides of the street?

Mr. HYMAN. This is the roadway between the two sidewalks.

Mr. KEMP. Do you propose to pave it with asphalt?

Mr. HYMAN. There has been no decision arrived at as to whether it will be paved with asphalt or with some other kind of pavement. I understand that some of the streets connecting with this one are paved with bitulithic and some with asphalt.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the present roadway?

Mr. HYMAN. Part of it is paved with old blocks which are in a very dilapidated condition and the other part is a macadam roadway.

Mr. INGRAM. This includes the pavement between the walks? Does the government not keep up the walk on this side of Wellington street?

Mr. HYMAN. I understand the owners on the other side keep up the walk but the government keep up the walk on this side.

Mr. KEMP. Is it just proposed to pave the part of the street facing the government property and not beyond?

Mr. HYMAN. It starts with government property and ends with government property.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would ask as a matter partly of curiosity what it costs the country to keep up the four public buildings in Ottawa? I have heard it said that it costs $100,000 a year. I do not find fault with the amount, but I should like to know what the cost is?

Mr. HYMAN. There is a vote in the estimates for that particular item and I would be very glad to give full information when that item is reached.

Mr. KEMP. I understand that not only this season but in other seasons serious accidents have occurred on the sidewalk at the gate opposite the main entrance to this building owing to the sharp decline at that point not being covered with sand or ashes.

Mr. HYMAN. It is supposed to be, but several times I have noticed that it was not covered with sand I have called the attention of the architects and had it attended to.

Mr. CLARE. I notice that part of this item is a revote and that the item has been increased by $7,000 or $8,000. How is this work to be done? Have you had any tenders?

Mr. HYMAN. When an estimate is prepared it is not always necessary to take a vote for the full, amount of the expenditure. This was in the supplementaries last year and it is not intended to vote the whole amount this year. This $35,000 is supposed to cover the total estimated expenditure. Of course $28,000 of that can be spent before the first of June and the balance after the commencement of the next fiscal year.

Ottawa post office—restoration of burned building, and addition of new story, $80,000.

Mr. KEMP. When did the fire take place in that building ?

Mr. HYMAN. January 4, 1904.

Mr. KEMP. Over a year ago ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. KEMP. How is it that it has taken so long to repair the building ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is owing to the character of the work. The hon. gentleman may have observed the great amount of stone cutting that is involved as the character of the work in the old building is being continued in the new story. The building is not only being repaired but a new story is being added, and the roof is of a new character. Everything is being done to hasten the work. The post office and customs departments are pressing this department and the work is being pushed forward.

Mr. KEMP. The work was not started until long after the fire.

Mr. HYMAN. All the debris had first to be cleaned out. A great deal of stone cutting had to be done before the laying was commenced. The work was commenced almost immediately. I remember bringing in a supplementary for this last year.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why is it that we see so much Cleveland stone used in this building instead of Canadian ?

Mr. HYMAN. Simply because whoever constructed the building in the first place thought it proper to have Cleveland stone, and the same kind of stone has had to be employed in the extension of the building.

Mr. LANCASTER. Could the building not be repaired without going to Cleveland to get stone and still retain its character ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is not possible to get stone to work in harmoniously with this in Canada.

Mr. LANCASTER. We have all kinds of stone in Canada.

Mr. HYMAN. In all buildings now being erected in Canada provision is made for the use of Canadian stone, but the appearance of this building would have been spoiled by using a different stone.

Mr. BLAIN. Is this being done by day labour ?

Mr. HYMAN. By day labour.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the total cost ?

Mr. HYMAN : The estimated cost is $160,000.

Mr. BLAIN. That is very much more than was stated in the first place. I suppose the extra story accounts for the increased expenditure ?

Mr. KEMP. How many stories will there be ?

Mr. HYMAN. Practically four stories and the basement, two additional stories. The old building really had no top story, as owing to the way in which the roof was made it was impossible to use the top story.

Mr. KEMP. It seems to me to be an extravagant piece of business. It is such a small area. I do not understand the transaction at all, it is so slow and so expensive.

Mr. HYMAN. In the first place the work to be done in the cutting and laying of the stone only amounts to $64,000. A great proportion of the expenditure is for the fittings for the building. Steel and iron work will cost $29,000, a new vault will cost $9.000, roofing $5,000, an elevator $6,000, the plastering and carpenter work is estimated to cost $10,000. The building has to be painted and glazed, a new clock is necessary, and then there is the heating, furnishings and fittings for the building.

Mr. FOWLER. What did the building cost in the first place ?

Mr. HYMAN. Three hundred and some odd thousand dollars.

Mr. INGRAM. From time to time we have voted money renewing furniture ; I would like to know what becomes of the old furniture ?

Mr. HYMAN. A considerable amount of renewal comes from the wearing out of furniture. In the case of this building the furniture was all destroyed by fire.

Mr. INGRAM. In this building, desks have been discarded which many men would be glad to get for use in their offices in the building, and no one knows what becomes of these desks. Some of these are very good and some account should be taken of them.

Mr. HYMAN. The deputy informs me that some four or five years ago there was a large collection of disused furniture on hand and a sale of it was held.

Mr. FOSTER. Did it realize much ?

Mr. HYMAN. I think two or three hundred dollars.

Mr. INGRAM. Some three or four years ago I wanted to get a table which I thought would do very well for one of the rooms ; but the table disappeared as well as some of the other furniture in the same way. If the furniture is disposed of, it is just as well that the country should get the benefit of it.

Mr. HYMAN. I have not heard any complaint of this kind before. The hon. gentleman knows that if my attention were called to anything of the kind, I would be glad to have it inquired into.

Mr. INGRAM. If the hon. gentleman would inquire a little more closely, he would find out enough to satisfy him.

Mr. HYMAN. If the hon. gentleman as a member of the House has any reason to make that insinuation, I think he should let me have the knowledge which he possesses.

Mr. INGRAM. I merely point out that it would be well for the hon. minister to make some inquiries.

Ottawa, Government Printing Bureau—to replace the present wooden roof by a fireproof roof and raise the walls for one additional story on main building and two additional stories on annex, $30,000.

Mr. BARR. Will this finish the work ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is practically intended to finish it, but there will be a small supplementary vote required.

Mr. KEMP. What is the object of doing this ?

Mr. HYMAN. The trouble in the Printing Bureau is that the work there has increased very greatly, and the present accommodation is not sufficient. I am simply providing this addition in response to the request of the Secretary of State, who has charge of the Printing Bureau.

Mr. BARR. Is this work done by day labour ?

Mr. HYMAN. No, by contract.

Mr. KEMP. Does the Secretary of State say that when this improvement is made we shall get the reports of the different departments more promptly ?

Mr. PATERSON. We will get them more quickly.

Mr. KEMP. But we will not get them promptly, as we would from an ordinary printer.

Mr. PATERSON. The Secretary of State has been complaining that the reason he cannot get out the reports more quickly is the lack of accommodation in the Printing Bureau.

Mr. COCHRANE. I have been informed that the trouble is that the ministers themselves do not get the reports in the Printing Bureau early enough. The Minister of Customs used to find fault with the amount of money expended by a previous government for printing done outside the Bureau, and the country was led to believe that when these hon. gentlemen came in, the Printing Bureau would do all the work. I think I am safe in saying that several thousand dollars are paid for printing outside the Bureau. The Minister of Agriculture especially gets a large subvention for a paper —he does not own the paper, of course, but his brother has stock in it. The Minister of Customs does not look as serious as I have seen him on this side of the House. He is getting old like myself, and he will have to answer.

Mr. PATERSON. You had better be careful, then.

Mr. COCHRANE. I think I stand as good a chance of getting through the pearly gates as he does. I saw to-day in the editorial columns of a paper a statement of the enormous sums paid for printing outside the Bureau, and I think the attention of the minister who has control of the matter should be drawn seriously to the fact. We have a Printing Bureau, and we are paying large sums of money for its extension, and I am willing to do it ; but if we have a Printing Bureau at all, we should have one capable of doing the work, instead of paying enormous sums to Grit sheets for advertising when they are not doing the work.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think that the fund to which the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) refers is what was familiarly known as the reptile fund, which is being continued by the present government. Hon. gentlemen opposite made serious complaints about it prior to 1896, but I fear that this reptile fund is growing very rapidly. I hope that when the Printing Bureau is extended, this fund will be somewhat reduced. I have no doubt that the Minister of Customs is quite familiar with the fund, because I have no doubt that he often used the terms along with the hon. gentleman who formerly sat in the next seat to him, but who has been elevated to the Senate. I see the hon. gentleman smiling as if he enjoyed these reminiscences of olden times. It is certainly very pleasant to us all to know that bygone days are not forgotten.

Mr. PATERSON. I can only say, so far as this item is concerned, that I do not remember finding fault particularly with the printing in days gone by. It did happen occasionally that there were matters which I thought might be improved, and I intimated it in as gentle a manner and in as subdued tones as I could command ; but it was not in reference to the printing. As to the reptile press, I think I have seen that term somewhere, but I am not sure that I ever used it. I do not feel that I have much to reproach myself with in regard to the criticisms I offered in days gone by. Things were not managed then. in my judgment, as well as they are now. There is perhaps room for improvement on the part of some of us, and it would certainly be a great improvement if we could get our reports out more rapidly. I may say for the hon. Secretary of State that I know that he has made representations to his colleagues time and again as to the necessity of enlarged accommodation for the Printing Bureau. I believe he bends every

energy to the work of getting out the reports. Some of them have had to be printed in outside offices; but this has been done on terms that have met the approval of those who are competent to judge what is fair and right in such matters.

Mr. COCHRANE. Do you have to send them to Montreal?

Mr. PATERSON. I think there is a complete supervision with reference to that matter.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that there was not as good a supervision over that whole matter prior to 1896? We have no evidence beyond the statement of the hon. gentleman, given at random, that any improvement has been made. But we know there is a much larger reptile fund than formerly, and whoever has charge of the fund had better give more attention to it and see that the money is not wasted. One or two evenings ago I was very much surprised to read the long list of moneys paid newspapers supporting the government. I did not notice any, or scarcely any, sum paid to any newspaper not supporting the government. I suppose that is why it is called the reptile fund. I can see no necessity for scattering this money all over the country, when we have a Printing Bureau at Ottawa and a large staff of men to do the work.

Mr. INGRAM. I might point out to the Minister of Customs that previous to 1896 the reptile press was glad to get written manuscript, but under the new order of things the manuscript must be type-written. The reptile press must be getting very independent, and if they received fewer favours might be glad to take written manuscript. I have the authority of the Secretary of State for what I am saying.

Mr. KEMP. It would be more satisfactory if the Minister of Customs could assure the committee that after this large amount which he asks us to vote is expended on the Printing Bureau, we will be able to have work done there as rapidly and thoroughly as in an ordinary printing office. We have the statement of the Minister of Agriculture that he has had manuscript regarding the census lying in that Bureau over a year waiting to be printed. That is certainly not business like, and I cannot understand why the government does not have things put in proper shape in that Bureau. Why does not the Minister of Customs tell the House that the government will put this Printing Bureau into proper shape, so that it may be able to turn out work as quickly and as well as it can be turned out by other offices? If manuscript regarding the census has been lying there over a year, no doubt other manuscript has had the same fate. It is quite evident that the whole thing is not managed as it should be, and I would strongly urge that it should be looked into more carefully, and that the minister should give us a more definite statement than he is now able to do.

Peterborough Armoury, $30,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The Prince of Wales Canadian Dragoons, 'C' Squadron, have their headquarters at Peterborough, and also the 57th Regiment of Peterborough Rangers, comprising eight companies. It is intended to construct an armoury there the same as at Chatham. The total cost, including heating, wiring, fittings, sidewalks and contingencies, is estimated at $65,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Has the land been bought?

Mr. HYMAN. It has not, but the department are in negotiations with the city to acquire a piece of land, and also an adjacent piece which can be used for parade purposes.

Mr. FOWLER. Does it belong to the city?

Mr. HYMAN. A part does, but the undertaking is that the city shall acquire all this land and we shall buy it from it.

St. Catharines drill hall, $45,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. When will this be erected?

Mr. HYMAN. The time in the contract is the 20th October, 1905, and it is understood it will be completed then.

Mr. LANCASTER. How much has been expended already?

Mr. HYMAN. The total expenditure is $54,800. There is an estimate for heating and fitting, wiring, sidewalks and contingencies.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the total cost?

Mr. HYMAN. The contract is for $79,829. The 2nd Dragoons are there. It is the special headquarters of 'A' Squadron, also the 2nd Brigade of Field Artillery and the St. Catharines Regiment—three different units which require increased accommodation.

St. Mary's public building, $15,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The postal revenue is $7,051; the customs, $20,497; and the population, 3,884.

Mr. INGRAM. Where does the department propose to build this post office?

Mr. HYMAN. No decision has been arrived at. The plan of St. Mary's is in my office, and a number of lots are marked off on it which can be obtained. When the prices are had, a decision will be given.

Mr. BLAIN. When will the building be commenced?

Mr. HYMAN. As soon as it is possible to obtain a site.

Mr. BLAIN. What will be the total cost?

Mr. HYMAN. It is estimated the total will be $30,000. The building itself will cost $21,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What rentals are paid now ?

Mr. HYMAN. $240 and $340.

Sandwich public building, $15,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The population is 1,450 and the postal revenue $955. There is no customs revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. How much do you propose to spend ?

Mr. HYMAN. We propose to expend there about $17,000. Sandwich is the county-town of Essex, and besides, is immediately opposite the city of Detroit. We may expend a few dollars more on the elevation of the building than we otherwise would.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it the policy of the department always to purchase a site for a post office building ?

Mr. HYMAN. During the course of these estimates that matter has come up quite often. Municipalities sometimes offer the government a site. Of course, where the site offered is a proper one, we accept it.

Mr. BLAIN. That applies to armouries as well ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the rentals now paid by the government in Sandwich.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The position of Sandwich is peculiar. It adjoins the city of Windsor and Windsor has a very considerable revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. Not post office revenue ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. How much ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Over $30,000. In addition it is an exchange office with the United States, and whilst a large part of the revenue that might in one sense be attributable to Sandwich goes to Windsor, there is a great deal of distributing work done at Sandwich for which no credit appears in the revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. How does that affect the question ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman asked what the revenue was. I do not know what the revenue of Sandwich is as shown by the books, but these are adjoining towns rather running into each other, with suburbs, I believe, connecting.

Mr. FOSTER. They generally do.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not know to what the point of that remark may be, but there are many towns whose suburbs do not connect with the suburbs of other towns.

Mr. FOSTER. Suburbs generally connect somewhere.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I understand that there is a continuous suburb between these towns.

Mr. FOSTER. Sandwich is a sort of double suburb ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The business between the two is so divided that a large part of the revenue inures to Windsor, while the incoming business, from which no revenue is derived is distributed from Sandwich, that is Sandwich has to do a great deal of work for revenue is earned but is credited to Sandwich.

Mr. FOSTER. Is seems a little involved.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I would be glad to make it plainer. Sometimes, it happens that people receive their letters through one post office, but send their letters out by another. In the present case there are letter-boxes along the route between Sandwich and Windsor, and as Windsor is a railway point and a point of distribution, the collectors along the route take the letters to Windsor, and the people along the route, as a rule purchase their stamps at Windsor and so Windsor is credited with a relatively large revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. That's not fair of Windsor, is it ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Sandwich, at all events does not get credit for the business it does because of the circumstances I have mentioned. Nevertheless, letters are distributed through Sandwich.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there two distribution ends ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, Windsor and Sandwich.

Mr. FOSTER. Which is the biggest end ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not know what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) means.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Sir William Mulock) is trying to argue that Sandwich does more business than the returns show.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I say that a part of the revenue which, under other circumstances would appear to the credit of Sandwich goes to Windsor on account of the proximity of the two places.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me that the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) has made a strong argument against this grant. Letters, it appears, instead of being mailed at Sandwich are mailed at Windsor. If the business is done at Windsor that is

the best reason in the world why you should not have an expensive post office at Sandwich. After listening to the lucid argument of the Postmaster General I think this item should be dropped.

Mr. FOSTER. At least it should be diminished by a few dollars. Well give us the present rentals at Sandwich anyhow.

Mr. HYMAN. The rental is paid directly by the postmaster.

Simcoe public building, $15,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population of Simcoe, and what are the revenues ?

Mr. HYMAN. The population is 2,627, the post office revenue $6,351, and customs $35,077.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the minister propose to expend there ?

Mr. HYMAN. On the building itself, $21,000 ; heating, $2,000 ; wiring, $750 ; fittings, $3,500 ; and contingencies to make a total of $30,000.

Stratford armoury, $47,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Has the lot been selected ?

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. MacLaren) will know the properties—the Moore property, the Myers property and the Burke property. The question of site is not entirely settled.

Mr. FOWLER. What does the minister expect to pay for the land ?

Mr. HYMAN. In the neighbourhood of $8,000.

Mr. FOWLER. How big is the site ?

Mr. HYMAN. The lots have a frontage of 104 feet, 20 feet and 36 feet—sufficient for the whole size of the building.

Toronto customs house—alterations and additions, $15,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is all a revote.

Mr. KEMP. Why was not the work done last year ?

Mr. HYMAN. Some question arose as to the method in which this money should be expended. We have now arrived at a decision, the plans and specifications are ready, and we will proceed. These alterations are to be done on the main building of the custom house. In the first place, there is a change in the basement; then there is certain underpinning work, then on the ground floor a new staircase is to be built, improvements made on the front of the building, certain wooden and glass partitions have to be moved, something has to be done on the arches, laying a tile floor, the old windows to be taken out and new ones put in so as to give more light, a certain number of partitions are to be removed, a new stairway on the ground floor—all internal improvements.

Toronto drill hall—additional accommodation for new corps, $40,000.

Mr. KEMP. Has this work been commenced yet?

Mr. HYMAN. There are practically two works comprised under this vote, and I shall have to ask in the supplementary estimates for a considerably larger vote. Plans are all in the hands of the printers, and we shall proceed immediately with the work of raising the armoury on one side and making it deeper. In addition to that, it is necessary to provide very much more accommodation, practically the old drill hall will have to be enlarged. This is the building known as the armoury. It is contemplated to have nearly as much space in the new building as there is in the old building, it will nearly double the area, but the cost will not be as great as in the old building, because we can take advantage of one of the walls and there will not be the same amount of excavation. The building will be lengthened to the east. It is all on government ground that we own there now.

Mr. KEMP. Why has this work not been done before ? The Minister of Public Works last year told us that the reason the work was not proceeded with was because of the severe weather in the winter time. Then why did not the minster proceed with that work in the summer? Now I want to know if the government are really sincere in their promise to go on now. From year to year this estimate has been put in here, and nothing has been done whatever and all the time the different corps in Toronto are cramped for want of space; indeed I think they are worse off than in any other part of Canada.

Mr. HYMAN. The plans for the expenditure on the armoury itself are in the hands of the printers at this moment, and that work will be proceeded with at once. As soon as the specifications are ready we will advertise for tenders, and contracts will be entered into. So far as the larger work is concerned, it will take some time to prepare the plans and specifications.

Mr. MACDONELL. I desire to take advantage of this occasion to call the attention of the minister to the statement his predecessor made last year in discussing this matter, on March 9. Referring to the same matter the minister said :

The plans are under consideration, and I think in a few days they will be decided upon.

'A few days' have gone by, nearly a whole year, and nothing has been done. I can assure the minister that the people of Toronto are a good deal dissatisfied. As my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) has said, the militia has not anything

like adequate accommodation for their quarters. As the minister may have heard, there has been considerable difficulty among some of the battalions, and some unfortunate unpleasantness has occurred just because of the cramped condition. The various corps endeavour to get proper accommodation, and in doing so encroach upon other regiments. Perhaps the minister is not to blame for what has occurred in the past, but I would urge upon him the wisdom and necessity of having this matter undertaken as soon as possible, and completed as soon as possible.

Toronto examining warehouse—addition to, $12,000.

Mr. HYMAN. That is under contract.

Mr. MACDONELL. I would like to ask the minster if it is the intention of the government to build a new customs warehouse at Toronto, and also if it is the intention of the government to build a new post office at Toronto. I see no appropriation in the present estimates for either of those works. though possibly the minister may bring down supplementary estimates for that purpose. However, I desire to call his attention to a statement in the Toronto 'Globe' of October 13, shortly before the then pending elections, under the heading of 'New post office for Toronto—A great building adjacent to the union station—customs warehouse, too—charges rendered necessary by railway expropriation.' Then it proceeds to say :

The application of the Grand Trunk Railway Company for an order to expropriate that part of the city of Toronto lying south of Front street, between the custom house on the east and York Street on the west, for a union passenger terminal station and other purposes, came before the Railway Commission to-day. During the discussion an important announcement was made as to what the Dominion government purposed to do in the city of Toronto. The present examining warehouse will be taken over for railway purposes, and in lieu thereof the government will build a large new examining warehouse west of the custom house on the south side of Front street. West of the examining warehouse a magnificent new general post office will be erected.

Then the article proceeds to quote Mr. Ross, superintendent of post offices. He stated :

Sir William Mulock, the Postmaster General, was desirous that such buildings would be erected as would meet the growing needs of the most important city in the Dominion from a postal standpoint. The present postal revenue of the city of Toronto is $1,000,000 per annum, and an annual expansion of from $60,000 to $100,000 had been the record during the past few years.

In the same issue of the paper appears an editorial under the heading 'The new post office and custom house':

With characteristic farsightedness Sir William Mulock has been laying his plans for perfecting the post office system of this city.

It has become the greatest revenue producing point, and more mail matter is handled here than at any other place in the Dominion.

The article commenced in that way and it concludes :

The government is to be heartily congratulated on its recognition of the needs and growth of Toronto.

This was all before the elections. We see a different aspect of affairs at the present time. In examining the estimates before the House can we see any appropriations for the purposes that were indicated in this issue of the 'Globe' by the hon. Postmaster General ? I would like to ask the hon. minister if it is his intention to put into the supplementary estimates appropriations for these works that are spoken of in this manner in this paper ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonell) desire to know what the policy of the Post Office Department is in connection with the proposed postal station near the contemplated Union statin ?

Mr. MACDONELL. A new post office for Toronto—not a branch.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My advice is that we should erect on the south side of Front street at the corner of Front and Bay streets a postal station that would do, of course, general business and that would be of a sufficiently extensive character to meet the reasonable expectations of a growing city like Toronto. I attended a meeting of the Railway Commission in Toronto—I do not remember the date, but some time last fall—when they were dealing with the question of expropriations for the purpose of the Union station, and in order to prevent the railway companies obtaining the lots that we desire I announced to the commission what I am announcing to the committee now that the Post Office Department would require a strip of land, of probably 250 feet frontage on the south side of Front street extending southwardly to the lands to be taken by the railway companies. We want to be in direct connection with the railway so that postal cars can be dealt with adjoining the post office itself. As to the style of building I offer no opinion. It will be possible, I think, to utilize the upper flats as an examining warehouse and in connection with the customs building I believe that the railways, though this I only know from hearsay, desire to expropriate the land occupied at present by the examining warehouse. If they do it will be necessary to abandon the examining warehouse and find other accommodation for it. I think my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Public Works has been considering that question and thinks that he will be able to find accommodation for the examining warehouse between the main building of the custom house which is on the south-west corner of Yonge and Front

streets and the building the lower portion of which it is proposed to utilize for post office purposes.

Mr. MACDONELL. The Postmaster General has stated what his advice is. I would like to know whether the government is going to follow his advice. If that is his advice is the government going to follow his advice and are we going to have a new post office and custom house in Toronto as stated in the paper to which I have referred, the statement being made therein on his own authority ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not know that it has been made on my own authority. I did not see the article before it was published. But, it quite represents what I would like and what I hope for. I expressed myself somewhat in that way at the Railway Commission but our action depends somewhat on the action of the railway companies. The present Union station is west of York street and before the conflagration, not anticipating their moving their site, we had made some progress in acquiring a site for a postal station on the south-east corner of York and Front streets. That property was owned by the city but leased to the Canadian Pacific Railway and we had made arrangements with the city to convey that property to us for a figure that had been spoken of. The transfer had been practically arranged, and if it had not been for the conflagration we probably would at the present moment have been erecting our building on that land. Since then the idea has originated of abandoning the Union station at the west side of York street and building a new one easterly of York street extending to Bay street. If the railway companies carry out that policy and establish a union station coming down to Bay street then it is the policy of the Post Office Department to erect, if we can do so, if the government will agree to it and I think they will—I have no reason to doubt that they will—our postal station on the south-east corner of Bay and Front streets. If the railway companies locate the station easterly of York street then our policy is to locate our post office at the south-east corner of Bay and Front streets but we cannot conclude anything until the railway companies determine their course.

Mr. MACDONELL. Will that new building be a general post office ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, it will do all the business of a post office but it will not mean that we abandon the one at the head of Toronto street. It will be as much a general post office as the other.

Mr. MACDONELL. There will be no new general post office on the present site ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Where ?

Mr. MACDONELL. At the head of Toronto street.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No.

Mr. FOWLER. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that the railway companies propose to take the site where the examining warehouse now is ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think that is part of their scheme. Is my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) familiar with the situation of Toronto ?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Well then he will remember that the custom house is composed of two buildings, one the custom house itself on the south-west corner of Yonge and Front streets. They do not disturb that but southerly of that and adjoining the tracks is what we call the examining warehouse and I think they want to enlarge their strip of land so as to run their tracks through there.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you think it is good policy to spend $12,009 on additions to that building ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It has all been stopped.

Mr. FOWLER. But I see it in the estimates.

Mr. HYMAN. Of course, because the contract was let long before there was any idea of touching this building at all. The very moment the department had any notification of the intention of the railway companies the work was stopped. In any case if the railways took this building they would be required to pay the government for any work that has been done on the building even if we were to go ahead and complete the building. This contract has been stopped. There is only an expenditure requisite to finish the work of some $6,000. The question is now before the department as to whether it wil not be better to spend about half of that sum, about $3,000, to complete this building temporarily so that it can be used. At the present time they can make no use of the building whatever and we are now going to make an expenditure of about $3,000. It may be two or three years before the railway companies will actually take possession of the building and in the meantime we will remain in possession. If the railway companies take over the building they will have to pay us its full value. Then, it is the intention to acquire the whole of the land between the present custom house and Bay street. The corner part of it is to be used for the erection of a postal station and another portion will be used for the erection of the examining warehouse. That is the policy of the two departments. It is necessary for the pneumatic tube service and for postal purposes generally that the post office shall be in the immediate vicinity of the station. The policy of the government depends entirely on the action of the railways.

Mr. KEMP. The plans which were presented before the Railway Commission involve taking the land between the present custom house and Bay street for the Union station. Now, we are informed by the Postmaster General and the Minister of Public Works that it is the intention that this shall be taken for customs purposes and for the purpose of a sub-post office, so that the whole explanation which we have had is not at all clear. I repeat that this very site which these hon. gentlemen tell us is for the purpose of an examining warehouse, customs house and post office is the very location where it was intended to have the new union station, not west of Bay street.

Mr. HYMAN. They are taking more property than Bay street are they not?

Mr. KEMP. They are not going west of Bay.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. They are going to York street.

Mr. KEMP. There is no application.

Mr. HYMAN. We do not propose taking the whole depth, but the front.

Mr. KEMP. I understood they intend to take the whole.

Mr. HYMAN. They may, but we do not.

Mr. KEMP. Why, if this new building is being proceeded with, would you contemplate making this large expenditure? These improvements were commenced after the fire, but as I understood the minister some years would elapse before the new building is erected. May I ask the hon. gentleman when this question is to be settled?

Mr. HYMAN. I have no idea at all. The railways changed their plans. Their original plan was not to take this examining warehouse property from the government, but they found that it was necessary later to do so, because they could not otherwise run their tracks. No decision has yet been arrived at, and in the meantime we thought it better not to increase the examining warehouse, but to make it fit for use.

Mr. KEMP. Is it not possible to hurry the matter? The railways are slow, and the property holders' interests are being sacrificed by the long delay in dealing with the matter. Those who own the land have lost money by the delay. The government are interested; can they not hurry the matter along? I would press the necessity of something being done at an early date.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. What?

Mr. KEMP. I do not know. I think that with the influence of the government they could do something.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Well what?

Mr. KEMP. I am not prepared to say offhand what steps could be taken, but surely something could be done by a conference between the four parties who are interested in the matter, the railways, the Railway Commission, the city of Toronto and the property holders.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I noticed a report in the papers yesterday that the Railway Commission, at a recent sitting in Toronto, determined the terms on which the valuation should be made. It is optional, I suppose, with the railway companies to buy the property or not. I do not suppose there is any way in which we can compel them to go on and complete the purchase. They have given notice and it is for them to proceed. It is very unfair for them to lock up this property. I entirely sympathize with the property holders and I think that the people who are interested in the properties there have been very badly used indeed as from the moment notice of expropriation was given, they could not go on and rebuild, yet the railway companies did not complete their purchase and then the lessees who were liable to pay rental and taxes could not rebuild, could not fix locations elsewhere for their business and the whole thing is most unsatisfactory. It is an illustration, I think, of the unsatisfactory condition of the law applicable to the expropriation of lands by railways, and I think it indicates to us that the law requires amendments so that when railways contemplate demoralizing trade by giving notice of expropriation they shall be bound by that and perhaps be considered from that moment the purchasers, subject to the determination of value. Then they could not play fast and loose. The law is very unsatisfactory but it is that way. It has been built up in the interests of the railways. They were here, I suppose, when we knew nothing of railway law and it is only now that we are beginning to find the weakness of our railway law. I am not making any reflections on any one or on any government; we must all take our share of responsibility, but as I said, I think that the railway law with regard to the expropriation of lands is most unsatisfactory and unfair. There should be more mutuality about it, so that once a railway gives notice of expropriation it should be bound from that moment to proceed with the expropriation and purchase.

Mr. KEMP. Are they not liable to damages?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I see by the newspaper reports that the commission, if they are correctly reported, found that the purchase shall be deemed to have taken place from the time of the notice, but I believe so far as the press reports are concerned, that they did not decide whether the owners are entitled to compensation for

loss of business. That point was raised, but does not seem to have been determined.

Mr. KEMP. If the railway authorities change their minds, what is the position of the property owners ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is a point of law ; I do not know. It would be most unfair if they had no redress. At one time there was a clause in the Railway Act saying that a railway company might desist at any time after giving notice of expropriation and arbitration, no matter what progress might have been made. They could at any moment they chose, desist and there have been cases where railway companies have abandoned proceedings after the arbitration has made some progress. Possibly getting the idea that the award was going against them they desired to have new arbitrators to start again. I think that clause of the Act has been taken out, but some years ago it was the law and it was a most unfair provision of the law.

Mr. LENNOX. The Postmaster General spoke of the possibility that the railway company would expropriate the examining warehouse. I would like the Postmaster General to state whether the railway company can, as a matter of law, expropriate against the government. The Minister of Public Works referred to it, but I did not think he made it definite one way or another.

Mr. HYMAN. I think I was clear. There is no question of doubt that the railway companies cannot expropriate government property, but I did not suppose that the government could stand in the way of the city of Toronto if they came to a conclusion, and if the railway companies wish to purchase that property for the purpose of an approach to the station it seems to me that we should not adopt a dog in the manger policy. We should negotiate, the railways of course paying us full value for the property. It is a matter entirely for the government to decide whether they would retain the property or not.

Toronto military buildings—barracks for permanent corps to replace property sold to the city, $50,000.

Mr. MACDONELL. What headway has been made with regard to the erection of this new barracks ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is a large scheme. The headway so far has been that the requirements of the Militia Department have been furnished to the Department of Public Works and the Public Works Department is at the present engaged in making the necessary plans and specifications for the barracks.

Mr. MACDONELL. When is it expected that they will commence operations ?

Mr. HYMAN. It will be necessary to put another vote in the supplementary estimates for the year, and if the committee will allow this vote to pass, by that time I am sure I shall have full information. The hon. gentleman is aware of the negotiations that took place for the sale of one property and the purchase of another.

Mr. FOWLER. Why was that done ?

Mr. HYMAN. Largely to meet the wishes of the city of Toronto. It was felt, from the city's standpoint, that it was better to have the barracks for the permanent force in another location somewhat further removed from the city.

Mr. KEMP. When does the government have to abandon the present barracks ?

Mr. HYMAN. I really do not know that part of the arrangement, which was made by the Militia Department and not by the Public Works Department.

Mr. KEMP. Unfortunately, the Minister of Militia is not here.

Mr. MACDONELL. The great reason for haste is the absolute inadequacy of the present barracks.

Mr. HYMAN. As far as the Public Works Department is concerned, the very moment the money is available we will not lose any time in proceeding with the work.

Toronto post office—land, building, pneumatic plant and machinery, $100,000.

Mr. KEMP. What has been done about that ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is intended to have a pneumatic tube system to quicken the service between the railway station and the main post offices. The department are proceeding as fast as they fairly can. The pipe has been bought by contract. It is being manufactured in Glasgow, but it will be a considerable time before it can be delivered. The tenders were for 36,000 feet in Toronto and 8,000 in Montreal at $1.45 per foot. It was bought after public tenders were called for.

Mr. FOWLER. Can that not be made in this country ?

Mr. HYMAN. No. I think the lowest Canadian tender was $5 per foot.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the diameter of the pipe ?

Mr. HYMAN. Ten inches. The city of Montreal and the city of Toronto are the only places in Canada where the department propose at present to try the system.

Mr. KEMP. Where is it in existence in other parts of the world ?

Mr. HYMAN. In all the large cities of the United States and, I think, also in the large cities of England.

Mr. HENDERSON. What will be the rate of speed ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. At least a mile in two minutes.

Mr. KEMP. This has nothing to do with the improvements that have recently been discussed ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes ; it has to do with them so far, that we cannot determine where the terminal is to be until we know where the station is to be ; but we have ordered the pipes, and are proceeding as rapidly as we can.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there a vessel put in the tube ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes ; a carrier.

Mr. KEMP. Are there to be double tubes?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. How long does it take now to convey the mail from the post office to the depot ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I suppose if this were to connect only with the main office, we might not adopt the system ; but Toronto is spreading out for a great distance westward. The Union station is not central, and with trains going and coming at all hours of the day, an hour's delay to a business man in getting his mail is very serious. Even the street railway is a very slow process for conveying the mails from the Union station two or three miles distant.

Mr. INGRAM. Instead of using your automobiles.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We have tested them and found them a failure.

Mr. KEMP. They are out of commission ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not know that they have all been used up but we have tested them and they have been tested elsewhere and been pronounced unworkable.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that the scheme now proposed has passed the experimental stage and the minister has no doubt it will prove a success.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No doubt about it.

Mr. FOWLER. Are the automobiles in working order ?

Mr. HYMAN. I understand they are pretty well worked out excepting one machine. There were six altogether.

Toronto post office—additional postal station, $60,000.

Mr. HYMAN. That is on 675-7-9-81-83, Young and Charles streets.

Mr. KEMP. Is the Queen street post office complete ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, it is in operation.

Toronto postal station ' C '—quarters for caretaker, $1,500.

Mr. KEMP. Is that the Queen street post office ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, we are making quarters in the building for the caretaker.

Some resolutions reported.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the government propose taking up to-morrow ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The Minister of Public Works thinks there is some understanding between the Minister of Justice and the hon. member for South York about proceeding with the Bill respecting the Railway Commission. When that is disposed of, we shall proceed with supply, public works estimates.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 23, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the Canadian Canals Corporation.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate La Compagnie du chemin de fer à Montréal, Québec et du sud.—Mr. Gervais.

QUESTIONS.

DEPORTATION OF IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. URIAH WILSON asked :

1. How many immigrants were deported from this country during the fiscal year 1904, and up to the 1st of February, 1905 ?
2. What were their nationalities, and what was the cause of their being deported ?
3. How many were deported for diseases, and for what diseases ? How many because they were liable to become paupers ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I am sorry to say that this answer will not be ready for some time yet and I would therefore ask that the question stand.

ACETYLENE GAS LIGHTS.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. How many oil lights, under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, have

been, since the 1st of July, 1904, replaced by automatic acetylene gas lights ?

2. What annual saving will these changes effect ?

3. How many keepers have in consequence of these changes been dismissed ?

4. Who were they, and what were their former salaries ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Thirty-two.

2. $910.

3. Five.

4. Thomas Fraser, Windmill Point light, $180 ; John Hamilton, Hamilton's island light, $130 ; Barnaby Malette, lightship No. 1, $250 ; Vital Crépin, lightship No. 2, $300; Michel Allard, lightship No. 3, $300.

HALIFAX FISHERY AWARD.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. Has the government decided to distribute among the provinces interested, the amount of the award received by Canada, generally known as the Halifax Fishery Award ?

2. If so, on what basis is the distribution proposed to be made ?

3. If not, is the question to be submitted for decision to the Privy Council of England or the Supreme Court of Canada ?

4. Will the government take action in regard to the settlement of this question during the present session of parliament, if not, already settled ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. No.

2, 3 and 4, answered by No. 1.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Is the third section of the question answered ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, it is answered by the first.

Mr. A. MARTIN. It is not answered by the first. I must say that these questions are not answered. The third section of the question reads :

If not, is the question to be submitted for decision to the Privy Council of England or the Supreme Court of Canada ?

Is that answered ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, that is answered, 'no', the same as the first part of the question.

DREDGING AT RUSTICO HARBOUR.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. What has been done by the government during 1904 to dredge the harbour at Rustico, Prince Edward Island ?

2. Has the sandbank in the harbour been removed ?

3. If not, what steps are to be taken to remove it ?

4. How much has been spent on this work last season ; what were the means used in performing the work, and who had charge of it ?

5. How many vessels were lost or stranded on this bar during the season of 1904 ?

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works). No dredging was done during 1904.

5. According to information supplied by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, only one vessel was reported wrecked at Rustico, during the year 1904.

RESOLUTIONS RE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES AUTONOMY.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether it is his intention to give notice of resolutions in connection with the Autonomy Bill and when we may expect these resolutions.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is not expected that the second reading of this Bill will be taken for some time to come. I cannot say when the resolutions will be introduced, but they will be introduced in ample time for consideration on the second reading of the Bill.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER. I would like to call the attention of the ministers to the delay in bringing down returns. The delay seems a little inordinate ; may be it is not, but I would like to draw the attention of the Premier to the following : There are the returns from the Minister of Railways with reference to the hay transport question. We think that by this time they should be ready and we would like to get them as soon as possible. Then there is one with reference to the Royal Mint and another, of which I cannot complain, because it has not been passed so long, with reference to public buildings in towns of 5,000 population, or less. That is a return which should take a very short time to prepare and I would be glad to have it as soon as possible.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). I might explain with reference to the motion for a return for papers connected with the transportation of hay that the mails and trains have been so impeded in Cape Breton that we have not been able to gather up the certificates. They have to be brought in from the different stations to Moncton and then forwarded on here. We have been waiting for a complete return and I can assure my hon. friend that the information will be brought down at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a fair excuse unless we throw it back on the minister and say he is there to see that the trains are kept running.

STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to ask the Minister of Marine if the steamers have succeeded in renewing communication with Prince Edward Island? What was the last trip the steamers made?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I am not informed that the ferry has been resumed. I understand the last trip was made a fortnight or three weeks ago.

Mr. A. MARTIN. That is very indefinite. Is it not four weeks?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have not the exact date.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Has communication been renewed or is it still at a standstill?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Communication has not been renewed.

QUESTIONS RE TRANSCONTINENTAL CONSTRUCTION COMMISSION.

Mr. E. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the government if questions concerning the doings of the Transcontinental Railway Construction Commission can be answered and information can be obtained in regard to those questions, when they are asked in the usual form. I am tempted to seek this information because, on the 20th February instant, I put the following question:

1. Did the government, during the months of October and November, 1904, employ civil engineers to make a survey for a line of railway in the county of Joliette, Quebec?
2. For what object was this work and survey undertaken by said engineers, and was this work and survey undertaken in connection with the proposed Transcontinental Railway?
3. What was the total cost of this work and survey already accomplished by said engineers and their assistants?
4. Have said engineers made their report concerning this work and survey? If so, what was the date of said report?
5. Who was the overseer charged with the direction of this work, and what salary did he receive?

This question was answered in the following form:

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). The government did not during the months of October and November employ civil engineers to make a survey for a line of railway in the county of Joliette, but I have reason to assume that the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners made a survey through that county, not under the direction of the government.

The point to which I wish to draw the attention of the government is that it seems to me that the Transcontinental Construction Commission, is so to speak, a department of the government. I believe that under the rules, questions can be put in this House to the government, to the ministers and to individual members. This last form is seldom adopted. Most of these questions in fact can only be answered by information sought in the different departments, sometimes far from Ottawa. That information is obtained from officials of the government at some remote places. It seems to me that a question put in this form is pertinent and should have been answered on the principle that this commission is really a servant of the government. The practical object of my question is to know in what form, according to the rules, questions must be put. If they are put in the form suggested to me by the government, will questions be answered or is the Transcontinental Railway Commission a body independent of this House?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) is to be found in a motion of which my hon. friend has himself given notice, asking all information with regard to these surveys. When the motion is reached, I have no doubt it will be carried, but it will have to be amended, because the information has to be obtained from the Transcontinental Railway Commission, and not from the government.

Mr. MONK. Perhaps my right hon. friend will allow me to say that that is not the information which I sought by my question. The information sought by the question I put was simply in relation to the fact. In the motion I asked for a copy of the report, detailed accounts of expenses and the names of the parties employed. The question I put had reference to a department of the government, and I think should have been answered in the form in which it was put.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend wants the information, he will have to make a motion. We have not the information in our hands, but shall have to obtain it from the commission itself.

THE CAPITAL OF SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. J. H. LAMONT (Saskatchewan). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Prime Minister if the Bill providing for the creation of the province of Saskatchewan fixes the permanent capital at Regina, as stated in one of the evening papers yesterday?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. It is provisional only, and subject to the will and the determination of the legislature.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 36) to amend the Railway Act, 1903.—Mr. Fitzpatrick.

On section 1—tenure of office of chief commissioner if ex-judge.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Apparently it is the intention of the government to go on with this proposition and to recognize the principle of the promotion of judges. In a former discussion in this House I tried to show that it was bad policy to introduce this principle in this country, and I still hold the same opinion. The ends of justice will be better served if those who are appointed judges remain where they are, if hopes of translation to other boards or courts are not held out to them; if once they have taken office they concentrate their efforts entirely upon the interpretation of the law and the doing of justice, instead of trying to earn promotion to some other sphere where the emolument is greater. Bearing on that, I wish to read the opinion of a newspaper which is supposed to reflect the sentiments of the farmers of this country. Last week the 'Weekly Sun' said:

> Is it desirable that judges should be open to promotion by the government of the day? To ask the question, it seems to us, is to answer it. The courts must be free from any suspicion of subjection to political pressure, and how can such freedom exist if judges can be promoted at the will of the government? Give to an administration power to advance a judge who strains the law to favour the party in power in an election trial, and we shall at once have all the evils of an elective judiciary with none of the advantages of that system.
>
> Once a man is appointed to a seat on the bench it should be clearly understood by all concerned that he has nothing further to hope for or fear at the hands of the government of the day.

This utterance, which is supposed to reflect the opinion of the every-day farmer and the ordinary citizen of this country, expresses good policy. It is on the line of the precedent established in the old country. It is in the public interest that our judges should not have the chance of being promoted to offices with higher salaries, but that they should concentrate their whole lives to the doing of justice in the sphere in which they are placed. Hon. gentlemen opposite have asked, should a judge not aspire to promotion? I say he should not; I say that the door ought to be shut on such aspirations. True, this may be somewhat detrimental to the judge; but it is not the hopes or prospects of the judge that ought to govern us, but the doing of justice and the maintaining of the integrity of the bench, which is of much higher concern to the people of this country. I leave that point simply with that statement, and I go on to the next point, that is, that the government propose to make the chairman of the Railway Commission removable only upon an address of the Senate and House of Commons. This is a direct reversal of the policy that was laid down here by the government when they passed the Railway Act through this House. When they introduced the Bill to establish a railway commission consisting of the chairman and two assistant commissioners, they said: we do not intend to have these men placed as judges, but as lieutenant governors. The Hon. Mr. Blair, when introducing the Bill—said this:

> The opinion of council, in going over the Bill, was that it would be desirable to place the members of the commission very much in the same position as lieutenant governors under the British North America Act. It is a very cumbrous proceeding to invite the action of the Senate and House of Commons by an address. Cases might arise in which it would be very important and desirable that prompt action should be taken without waiting for a session of parliament.

Yet the proposal now is to absolutely reverse the policy that was then laid down as being in the public interest. I will quote from what Mr. Blair said in that respect:

> The Bill which we submitted last year contained, and the present Bill, when printed, will be found to contain a clause providing that the members of the commission are only removable on an address of both Houses of parliament to the Governor General. This, on full consideration, we concluded to change, and although the Bill when it is distributed will contain such a clause, it is an oversight which will be remedied in the committee. We propose that the members of the commission shall be removable in the same manner as the lieutenant governors of the provinces, namely, by the Governor General in Council for cause.

Now, I think the government are bound to give a reason for this reversal of policy. They said they wanted to have the members of this Railway Commission occupy the same status as lieutenant governors and they took power to the Governor in Council to remove them for cause. Now they are introducing a Bill to provide that the chief commissioner, if he happens to be a judge, can be removed only on an address of both Houses of parliament. A very interesting incident came up in the Railway Committee room this morning. We were discussing how the public might be relieved from certain conditions that exist in connection with railways, and it was argued with great vehemence by railway representatives that this Railway Commission was not only judicial but legislative.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In what respect is it legislative?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Read the Act in any of its sections almost, and you will find evidence of my statement. Take clause 25:

> The board may make orders and regulations limiting the rate of speed at which railway trains and locomotives may run in any city, town or village or any class of cities, towns or villages described in any regulation; and if the board thinks fit the rate of speed within certain described portions of any city, town or village, and allowing another rate of speed in other portions thereof.
>
> Section 25 (f). The board may make orders and regulations with respect to the rolling stock

apparatus, cattle guards, appliances, signals, methods, devices, structures and works, to be used upon the railway so as to provide means for the due protection of property, the employees of the company and the public.

All through that Act, this railway company is given practically legislative powers. The Minister of Railways argued all morning in the Railway Committee that great power in matters of legislation were practically vested in this Railway Commission. Then I come to this point, which I commend to the right hon. gentleman who says he has always been an apostle of responsible government. Where you have legislative powers conferred on anybody, ought not that body to be responsible? If this Railway Commission is vested with legislative powers and functions, it should be responsible to parliament, and it was with that intention that the law was made as it passed two years ago. Mr. Blair's argument was that the only way in which you could keep a check on this Railway Commission and compel it to discharge its duties was to make it responsible to parliament, that was why the commissioners were made removable by Order of the Governor General in Council, and in thus limiting their tenure of office, their conduct could be discussed in this House and relief obtained where required. If the conduct of these commissioners is subject to discussion in this House, then the responsibility will rest on the government either to remove them, if the House has censured their administration or change the law. It seems to me that the public interest demands that this commission should be kept as it is and the chairman, as well as every other member of that commission, be removable by Order of the Governor General in Council. I make the charge boldly that the government, by this amendment to the Railway Act which they are asking us to pass, are reversing their policy. Now that the elections are over, they are taking a step backwards in the interests of the railway companies; and because I brought Judge Killam's name into the debate, not in any spirit of criticism as regards that gentleman, who justly holds a high place in the judiciary, but because I thought that the government were not justified in placing the chairman of the commission, whether he might be judge Killam or anybody else, in a different position from that provided under the present law, the right hon. gentleman said I was casting a slur on a distinguished member of the bench. I was not doing anything of the kind, but the right hon. gentleman and his government are casting a slur on the policy they adopted two years ago, and which they led the public to believe would be maintained.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend will of course understand that when I say I cannot do better than refer him to the debate that has already occurred for an answer no discourtesy is intended. Almost everything my hon. friend has just said was then argued with equal force and emphasis, and I then endeavoured to reply as well as I could. My hon. friend knows the views I hold in common with himself respecting the promotion of judges meets with my entire approval, but the views he and I hold in common do not appear to have got beyond the apostolic stage. We are both apostles of a new idea, and new ideas do not advance as rapidly as we would like. In this country the principle of no promotion for a judge has never been accepted or acted upon, nor has it been acted upon in England to any great extent. It has been stated in England in the abstract, but has not been lived up to. In the present instance however, we are not dealing with the question of promotion, but with the question of the translation of judges from one sphere to another.

We transfer the judge from the position of judge of the Supreme Court to the position of chairman of the Railway Commission. That brings me to the other question my hon. friend brought up—the question of tenure of office. I understand him to put his argument in this way: It was intended, when this Railway Act was introduced, to make these Railway Commissioners practically controllable by parliament; the intention was that their conduct might be discussed in parliament with greater freedom than would be possible if they were judges. But I would point out that there is nothing here that departs from the principle laid down in the Railway Act. We do not depart from the principle of removal of members of the commission by the Governor in Council. We maintain that principle. But with respect to one particular class of persons, the judges of this land, we provide that if one of them is taken from his court and made chairman of the Railway Commission, his tenure of office should continue as it was before. It is not a question whether the chairman of the Railway Commission shall or shall not be removable by vote of parliament, but it is a question whether or not we shall take to ourselves the right to extend the sphere within which we may select our chairman of the commission, and whether we shall or shall not so arrange our legislation as to put us in a position to go to our judges and say to them: We can requisition your services for this position without in any way interfering with your tenure of office. We do not go beyond that. We do not say that if a layman is made chairman of the commission he shall not be removable by the Governor in Council, or that the two other commissioners shall not be so removable. The general rule with regard to the tenure of office remains the same; all we say is that if we hapen to take a judge as chairman of the commission then, with regard to that particular individual, his tenure of office as

judge shall not be altered. I hope my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) understands that. These are the facts. If he misapprehends the Bill, it may be because he has studied newspaper reports about the Bill, rather than the Bill itself.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will the hon. minster permit me to answer him in one word?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Certainly.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The hon. minister says that this is an exception, and an individual case. I venture the prediction that every appointment hereafter will be of a judge from the bench, so that from this time forward—and that is the intention of the Bill—this principle shall always apply to the chairman of the commission.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course, my hon. friend will realize that my obligation is to deal with the Bill and not with his predictions. His predictions vary so that it would be, perhaps, embarrassing to follow them. I would like him to do as I am doing—to deal with the Bill and leave the predictions aside. And let me ask him if my statement is not correct as to the actual provision of this Bill. Does not the tenure of office remain the same as it is now for members of the commission except in one particular case?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The hon. minister is begging the whole question.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I put the question if not to my hon. friend, to the House for his benefit. Does the general principle of appointment and tenure of office remain the same as before?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will the hon. minister allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Does not it follow that under this exception the general principle can be ignored for ever in the future?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend has not answered my question, but I will answer his. The general principle remains the same as before. If, in the future, instead of asking a judge to become chairman of the commission, we choose a chairman from the bar, or from outside the legal profession, he will be removable by the Governor in Council. There is no use in dealing with predictions about it. We have to take the responsibilities for the legislation we have introduced. But we want the legislation to be understood, and we want the House to pass upon the measure and not upon some misapprehension of the measure.

Mr. SPROULE. This is class legislation with a vengeance.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It may be so in the view of my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) but, of course, I cannot be expected to take that view. But, I would like to state my case in the meantime——

Mr. HAGGART. Will the minister answer this question: Suppose that two other commissioners are appointed under the same tenure of office as this chairman, what would become of the general principle of appointment ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The application of the principle is to the chief commissioner alone. That is the conclusive answer. Now, what will be the condition of affairs if this Bill goes through? You will find the Board of Railway Commissioners, so far as tenure of office is concerned, will continue to be, as they are now, removable by the Governor in Council. That will be the general principle. But, if you take a judge as chairman of the Railway Commission, then, so far as that person is concerned he will not be removable from his office except on the action of parliament. That is what the legislation provides. We desire to be able, if the man best qualified for this position happens to be a judge, to go to him and offer him the position with the assurance that, if he accepts it, he will be in no way prejudiced so far as his tenure of office is concerned.

Mr. HAGGART. It is confined them, to the chief commissioner ? I thought it applied to all.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is confined absolutely to the chief commissioner. And there is a reason for that. The chairman, so far as questions of law are concerned, is the supreme arbiter. His ruling upon a question of law is binding upon the commission. Therefore, it is desirable that we should have a man in that position—that honourable and important position—who has not only the necessary legal attainments, but, in addition, has had judicial experience. We think that, under certain conditions, this may prove most desirable. The chairman practically plays the part of a judge. From his judgment on points of law there are few appeals, and these under most restricted conditions. Now, we say, that, in order to enable us to secure the services of such a man, it is desirable to amend the law in this particular. I do not think I can add anything to this, I fear I have wearied the House by repeating what I have said before. But let the legislation be understood. I do not want the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) —I say it without any discourtesy—to misrepresent the Bill, or hon. members generally to decide upon anything except the Bill itself.

Mr. LENNOX. I rise with some diffidence to speak upon this question, for certainly it is a question of difficulty. I do

not think it is free from doubt whichever way you look at it. Having given it consideration both when it was put before the House and to-day, and having listened to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), I am obliged to say that, in my opinion, the departure now being made is attended with danger. It is quite true that this Bill applies only to the chief commissioner. But, that being the case it applies to one who, as the Minster of Justice has said is in the position of a supreme arbitrator. A good deal of discussion has taken place throughout the country as to the peculiar and special powers that are given to the chief commissioner. But I apprehend that is absolutely necessary that these powers should be intrusted to the one who occupies that position. In this commission we have virtually two courts sitting, a court of three for the trial of questions of facts, and a court of one for the trial of questions of law. We must confine the decision of these cases of law, in the first instance, to some one who has a knowledge of law and is able to decide them. But all the same, we are giving this chief commissioner a great deal of power, very much more than we are giving to any of the others, and in proportion as we are giving him more power it is essential that we should be in a position, whatever his feelings might be, to control those powers in the interest of the country, in case it should happen—and that is possible, though not probable—that he does not appear to be acting in the interest of the country. There can be a great deal said in favour of the legislation that is now proposed. It is the same class of legislation that we are applying, as I understand, to the Auditor General. Is that correct?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. In the case of the Auditor General, we have on many occasions pointed out the great benefit of the system we there adopted. I am convinced yet that it is a benefit. The difficulty that I see is this, that it removes to some extent the control that we have over the chief commissioner, and introduces what I regard as a great danger, the danger of political influence. In the case of the Anditor General there is no great power that can be rallied by him in his support so that he can virtually defy parliament. There is no great power that can be rallied against him so as to do him an injustice, or do the people an injustice by dismissing him when he is there in the interest of the people. But in the case of a chief commissioner who is controlling to a large extent the great railways and corporate interests of the country, there can be a lobby of such stupendous influence invoked as has never been presented probably upon any occasion in this House of Commons. When a question arises in this House we are confronted with great corporate interests, but usually by a corporate interest of one great railway alone, and fortunately for the balance of power, we have another great corporate interest, another great railway company, probably minimizing to some extent the influence of the other. But when we come to deal with these we have the possibility of that kind, the corporate influence of all the great railways of this country, and they are growing greater every year. We may have the influence of all the great railways on the one side and the people demanding a dismissal upon the other; and I venture to say, without any reflection upon parliament or upon any member thereof now sitting here or who may sit here, that it is not in the interest of this country, at least it is very questionable whether it is in the interest of this country, that we should have an official as commissioner in that position, as regards our right of removal. It is a very serious question, one of the most serious which parliament has been confronted with. It is a very radical departure from the principle upon which this matter was introduced in the first instance. It is a departure as to the appointment and control of at least a third of the commission, yes, more than a third, because it is the chief commissioner that has most control, the one who interprets the law. He has three-fourths as much power as the power of the other two combined. Therefore, though I do not want to be extreme, because I recognize the importance of looking at this matter calmly, still I desire to call attention to the fact that a great question is at issue here, and it behooves us to be careful in what we do. We may be confronted in the near future with the position of having a commissioner whom we virtually have not power to remove in the way that is proposed. Now, let me point out one other thing that probably several hon. gentlemen have thought of, though I do not think it has been mentioned. We might have this position of things, we might have a judge, or there might be in the eye of some administration a person for this position who is not a judge, but there is nothing to prevent them making him a judge, and so translating him from a judgeship to a commissionership in order to make him come within this provision. The Minister of Justice has said, and no doubt sincerely, that it only applies to a case where we remove a gentleman from the position of a judge and put him in this position, but we can put a gentleman in the position of a judge and within a week, or a month, or a year, remove him to the position of chief commissioner, and then this law applies to him. So you see what vast power, what vast political influence can be invoked under this provision. I do not mean for a moment that the administration have that object in view, that is not my view of the matter. I say that I wish to approach this statute exactly in the way the Minister of Justice says we should, and to deal with it after

looking at all possible eventualities. I am surely within the judgment of this committee when I say that this is a difficulty that may arise.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) supposes a case where the government, in order to bring a commissioner within the provision of this Act, might appoint a person as judge for the purpose of raising him to the office of commissioner. Not to say anything of the gross indecency of such a proceeding, I would like to point out that it would fail of its purpose. The commissioner is appointed for ten years, a judge at the expiration of ten years has not acquired a right to anything, he has no title to compensation. Now, with respect to the first question the hon. gentleman has put, when he says there may be danger resulting from the appointment of a man who is practically irresponsible. Of course, I do not admit that if a man is responsible to parliament he may be correctly described as irresponsible, but where he is practically irresponsible because of any inconveniences that would result from the proceeding such as adopted in the case of a judge. Does my hon. friend not remember that, assuming all the corporate influence brought to bear upon the commissioner, assuming his present position, and assuming him to remain in his present position, he would be just as liable to be subject to that corporate influence if he were a commissioner and held his position subject to the control of the Governor in Council, as at present.

Mr. LENNOX. What I mean is this, that we may find that this chief commissioner is not acting in the interests of the people, but that, in our judgment as representatives of the people, he is acting in the interests of railway corporations. We attempt to remove him and then that corporate influence is marshalled and brought into this House into the lobbies, and we are unable to remove him.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I understand my hon. friend to say that if improper influences were exercised over the commissioner, as he holds his office subject to the control of the Governor in Council, there would be in the Governor in Council power to control that commissioner to the extent of obliging him to do what is right. That is what my hon. friend says.

Mr. LENNOX. No—if my hon. friend will pardon me for interrupting him. I do not mean necessarily an improper influence. I mean that the commissioner may not appear to be acting in the interest of the country—may be with the very best intentions and according to his judgment; but it is a case where we find it is not in the interests of Canada that that gentleman should occupy the position.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In effect our positions are the same. My hon. friend sees that the interests of the country are better protected by the fact that the commissioner holds his office subject to the control of the Governor in Council. That is so, is it not? Now, my hon. friend is not forgetting the fact that the best control you have over any ruling or any decision given by the board is the fact that the same Governor in Council can, on appeal, set any one of these rulings aside. That is the best control you can exercise. It is not necessary that they should cancel the commissioner's appointment. If an improper ruling is made by the commissioners, all that a person who has suffered has to do is to take up the Railway Act, look at section 44 and he will find that the Governor in Council has power to amend or rescind that ruling on appeal. What more effective control could you have than that?

Mr. MONK. I would like to say that I think this Bill has many objections and presents a great danger. It seems to me that we are consecrating by legislation the principle of the promotion of judges, and thereby incurring the danger that has been mentioned by my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean). It is sufficient to look at a paragraph in the clause under consideration to see that it involves the consecration of the principle of the promotion of judges, a principle which has never been admitted in England.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, it has been admitted.

Mr. MONK. It has been departed from on rare occasions and departed from here.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not on rare occasions.

Mr. MONK. On rather rare occasions. I would go the full length of what my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has said; I would not be prepared to admit the principle that a judge can be promoted, even in his own court, to the presidency of the court. The hon. Minister of Justice knows better than I do that this question has given rise to a great deal of discussion. I do not think you can find a single statute where the principle is as clearly enunciated as it is in this Bill we now have under consideration. Besides that, the hon. Minister of Justice has himself intimated that we probably will follow that practice. It was not a prediction that my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) made. He was arguing from the inconvenience that would be caused in the future by this Bill if carried, and the hon. Minister of Justice himself says that we require as the president of this tribunal a man who not only knows the law, but who is accustomed to the judicial interpretation of the law. That is an intimation, a very natural one, but a very clear intimation, that not only will we con-

secrate the principle of the promotion of those who are called upon to discharge these functions, but it is probable that in future we will not only choose men who have a knowledge of the law, but men who are accustomed to the exercise of judicial functions. Of course, I quite recognize that the possibility of anything such as was suggested by the hon. gentleman who spoke before me is a very remote one. I do not think, as the hon. Minister of Justice has said, that we will at any time—although we see very extraordinary things nowadays —place a lawyer upon the bench to transfer him immediately to this important position, but I think it presents a danger of a different kind, and it is more than probable that if this policy is consecrated by the House, and if what was intimated by the hon. Minister of Justice is carried out, this position may become a shelving position, a place where we will shelve judges who have had some experience on the bench, and I think the principle that we are now called upon to consecrate is a dangerous one. But I would like further to call the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice to this anomaly: We are establishing by this Bill a varying tenure of office. If we take a judge and place him in that position, making him independent of the executive, we are establishing a peculiar and special tenure of office. I am very far from disapproving of that principle; I think it is an excellent one. I would argue that the members who compose this commission ought to be in that position. Upon that point I differ from my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean). I revert to the old principle establed by the Settlement Act in 1701. Judges occupying high positions, occupying seats in the superior courts, ought all to be placed in the position that they cannot be removed except upon the joint address of both Houses. My hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) says that they are not open to criticism if we give them that tenure of office. They are. Judges can be criticised in this House freely. Their decisions are open to criticism by the representatives of the people, but their removal from office can only be subject to this important condition that the executive can only act upon the address of both Houses. Is that a too protected position to give men occupying seats upon what I would call a most important tribunal in the country I do not think so; in fact, I would almost argue—although this view is one which I have not carefully considered—that according to the spirit of our Constitutional Act of 1867, if not according to the letter, they have the right to that protection, because, if I remember the section well, all judges or superior tribunals are named by the federal authorities, and can only be removed on a joint address of both Houses. I would go to the length of saying that if the federal authority creates the tribunals that are called the superior courts, the judges are entitled to that protection. But my hon. friend the Minister of Justice sees what my objection is. It makes the tenure of office a varying one. If the office has been occupied by a judge for several years, it may afterwards be occupied by a man who has not had a seat on the bench, and who will be removable at will. I think that is objectionable. We ought to fix the tenure of office in an irrevocable way, and I am quite prepared to accept the tenure of office which I think would be the most suitable for a man occupying a position of that kind. There is another point of some importance worth the consideration of the committee, and it is this: Not only is the tenure of office of the chief commissioner a varying one, but it differs from that of the two other judges, if I may call them judges. I think they are. In the case of a judge being promoted to this position, he is in that position of independence which has always been considered, since the beginning of the eighteenth century, a matter of the supremest importance. He is independent of the executive, but his two colleagues who sit with him, whose jurisdiction is the same, except in one particular pointed out by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, and who ought to be, I submit to this committee, in the same position of independence as the president of the tribunal, are in a very different position indeed. They are subservient to the executive and can be removed by the government. At any rate, they do not occupy that position of independence, which, under the special circumstances contemplated by this Bill, is assigned to the chief commissioner. I think that is very objectionable. I think the three members of the tribunal, although their attributes may differ in the particular pointed out by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, ought to be placed on the same basis of independence. I do not know whether I expressed that opinion last year when the Bill was up for consideration, but my hon. friend the Minister of Justice will remember that the discussion upon that Bill was very long. and I, for one, would be of the opinion that they all ought to be placed under the same tenure of office. These men are called upon to decide most important questions. Their jurisdiction covers matters involving thousands and millions of dollars and, from a material point of view, they are occupied with things of far greater monetary value, as a rule, than are any of the other tribunals of the country. I think, under these circumstances, they are subject, as all judges are, to dangerous influences, and to render them perfectly independent I do not think we could do better than to apply to them that very important principle which was adopted in England at the time it was first consecrated in the Settlement Act.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to find that the principle I advocated when

the resolutions were first introduced to the House seems to be very unanimously supported by both sides of the House. The principle may be departed from in some instances in Great Britain and perhaps in this country, but it is the principle which underlies the appointment of all judges in any part or portion of the empire, particularly in the Dominion, that when a man gets the appointment of judge he must expect to remain in that position for the full tenure of his office and must expect no promotion. If you depart from that principle once then you offer to the judge an opportunity of becoming a political partisan, because the support of a political partisan may give him promotion from one court to another. However, I am glad to find out that that principle of mine is supported by the Minister of Justice and is very generally adopted throughout the House. Now as to the other point, the tenure of office of judges when this Bill—I may call it an extraordinary Bill—gave to some gentlemen in this country greater powers than are given to any other gentlemen that I know of in any other part or portion of the world, it was intended to give them greater powers. When the ex-Minister of Railways introduced the Bill he intended to make this a court, and if I remember rightly, the commissioners were not to be removed without cause and only by address of both Houses of parliament. I protested, and if I remember rightly the right hon. gentleman who leads the government agreed with me, that the appointment should be during good behaviour or subject to removal by the Governor in Council. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) says that we have ministerial responsibility for this now, in the matter of appointment. What we wanted when the Bill was passed was to have legislative control over every action of that commission, and to have them directly responsible to this House through ministerial responsibility. You appoint a man who is only removable by addresses of both Houses of parliament and to that extent the right hon. gentleman who leads the government at the present day is relieved from any ministerial responsibility in the case. The Minister of Justice says 'no,' we retained that under the Bill; we have the power of revising any judgment that is given by this commission from time to time and of altering and amending it. They have on their own motion, if I understand the Bill, power to revise any judgment of the commission. The Minister of Justice would argue that that ministerial responsibility continues. How does it continue? Suppose they alter, amend or find fault with the judgment of the chief commissioner. How are they to punish him? He is not removable by the Governor in Council: he will go on giving the same opinions from time to time, forever. The anomaly of it is this: there are two parties on this commission who are directly responsible to this House and to the country for all their judgments; there is one whose tenure of office is entirely different, who is placed in the position of a judge, and whose opinions this House has no way of correcting, judging, altering or doing anything to unless there is some cause and an address is made by both Houses of parliament finding fault with him and asking for his removal. That is exactly the position in reference to the chief commissioner who is placed in the position of a judge. I differ from my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) altogether, in reference to the contention that these parties ought to be given the powers of judges. For exceptional reasons extraordinary powers were given to the judges of this country; for the interpretation of the laws, for the decision between the government of the country and the individual and for a great many other reasons the judges of the country have to be entirely independent of political pressure, of the pressure of the government or of legislative pressure of any kind. This is an entirely different court. This is a court which primarily was in the hands of the legislature altogether, through its representatives, the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. For anything that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council did they were as directly responsible to parliament as it was possible to be. Is a chief commissioner appointed under this Act, with the tenure of office which is given him under this Bill, in that position? I contend that he is in an entirely different one and that there is no reason under this Bill to change or alter the tenure of office of the party who is chief commissioner. It may have been difficult for the government to get a chief commissioner who will have their confidence who is well known to be an excellent judge and fitted in every respect for the office. If you have such a man, give him the position, make provision if necessary for his retiring allowance, but do not alter the tenure of office, do not deprive this government nor this legislature of the power of control exercised by the Railway Commission as appointed by this Act. Do not take away part of the powers of the legislature because this is nothing else than taking away part of the powers of this House, exercised in giving them a different tenure of office.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) argues for ministerial responsibility with respect to the control of the Board of Railway Commissioners. My hon. friend will realize at a glance that the whole principle of the Railway Act under which the board was created, is a departure from that principle. The old Railway Committee of the Privy Council carried out the idea which my hon. friend had in mind. It was in operation for a great many years, but in 1903 it was decided that we should depart

from that principle and adopt the principle of a Board of Railway Commissioners, independent of parliament altogether, except in so far as parliament might exercise control over the commissioners in two respects, through the Governor in Council—mark you there is no direct control but control through the Governor in Council in two respects, first, in respect to the control in so far as appointment and tenure of office went, and then only in case they misbehave because their tenure of office was subject to their good behaviour. In addition to that parliament desired that that parliamentary control which my hon. friend speaks of should be exercised by the Governor in Council in the most absolute manner under section 44, I think it is, of the Railway Act, which provided that the Governor in Council not only should sit as a Court of Appeal, but that the Governor in Council should of his own motion have the right to interfere and to alter, vary or change any order made by the board. Now you have, in so far as control is concerned, the same supreme control over the action of the commissioners through the Governor in Council as you had before this Bill was introduced. There is no departure from that. What is the use of beating the air or fighting with windmills over this ?

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the wind-mill ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Let us realize what we are doing. We are now, Mr. Speaker, dealing with a concrete case, and my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) if I have understood his argument correctly, agreed so far as the principle is concerned with respect to the particular appointment, but said: 'Make provision with respect to the particular appointment in the way you have provided, but do not make the principle general. Now we have departed from his view in this respect, that we have applied the principle to a class of persons and he wants to have it applied only to the individual. There is where I differ from my hon. friend from South Lanark.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Justice argues that when we passed the Railway Act we made a departure altogether from our usual method of trying these cases. I differ from him entirely, and if he will follow his own argument afterwards he will see the fallacy of it. It was only for the convenience of the Privy Council that we delegated to the commission the right of inquiry into these cases. The Minister of Justice says the residue of power is in the Privy Council, and, therefore, there is a responsibility to parliament. Then the argument of the Minister of Justice fails altogether. Here is a court appointed for the convenience of the Privy Council, and there is no giving away of any power which the Privy Council had in the past, only a delegation of power. The Privy Council retains the power all the time, and, as the Minister of Justice says, is responsible for the judgment of the commission. Parliament intended that this commission should be controlled by this legislature, but if you appoint to the commission parties who are in no way responsible to the government for their conduct, then you vary the power and control which this House had hitherto over the commission.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It has been contended in this House that the members of this commission are judges. They may be judges; I would not altogether dispute that, but they are more than judges. To them parliament has delegated the power to legislate in regard to railways, and I hold that when parliament has delegated powers it ought to have control. Parliament has retained control over all the commissioners except the chairman. The hon. Minister of Justice says that this case is an exception, and I wish to describe exactly what it is. This legislation is a reversal of the general principle by an exception that can be made continuous, that is, a complete reversal of policy. I have no doubt that it will be made continuous, and that for all time we shall have the chairman of the commission holding his office under a different tenure from that of his colleagues. Again, if we delegate parliamentary powers to these commissioners, making them more than commissioners, we ought to hold them in our hands as we did under the original law. But that is now changed in reference to the chairman of the commission, who happens to be a judge. I do not want to say anything personal, but I wish to ask if Mr. Justice Killam asked for this change ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not know whether he asked for the change or not. I know that we offered him the office and he has accepted. More than that, he is a most desirable appointment.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. He is a most desirable appointment, and I would like to see Mr. Justice Killam accept the office under the original conditions, and under them give the country the benefit of his valuable services. I agree with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that it would be better to increase the salary in this case than to consecrate, as we are doing, the principle that judges may be promoted.

Mr. MONK. I do not wish to prolong the discussion in regard to the character of this commission, on which a great deal might be said. I do not agree that the commission was instituted in order to relieve the administration of administrative work. This question has been studied a great deal in the United States and England, and I think that a perusal of what has been written on the subject will show that, on the contrary, the object of the institution of a Railway Commission is to remove the decision of cases

from the executive and to bring them under judicial consideration by making the Railway Commission a kind of tribunal. That being the view I take, I still think we ought to go the whole length and apply this tenure of office not only to the president of the commission, but to all its members, on account of the immense importance of the questions submitted to them and of the nature of their functions. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice is perhaps able to say what was the tenure of office of the British Railway Commissioners. My recollection of what happened in England is that a railway commission was resorted to, but did not operate satisfactorily and has since been abandoned. Has my hon. friend the Minister of Justice had occasion to learn what was the tenure of office of the Railway Commissioners in England.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There were three appointed commissioners and two ex-officio —one each for England, Ireland and Scotland, and they had always to be superior court judges. In England the chief commissioner was the Lord Chancellor, in Ireland the Lord Chancellor of Ireland and in Scotland the Lord President of the Court of Session; that is, they took as chief commissioner the highest judical officer in the country. The term of office is for life.

Mr. MONK. I thank the Minister of Justice for that information. My hon. friend from South York must see that in England they consider the functions of these men as essentially judicial functions, and they are all protected—they cannot be removed without the intervention of parliament.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The debate, as far as it has gone, seems to establish a few very plain facts. One is that we had a chairman of the Railway Commission and that we are now without him.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend has the habit of being exceedingly accurate, but he knows that the statement is not correct. We have a chairman now.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. We are making a further appointment under this Act.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We have made it.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Another point that is apparent is that the business of the country suffered by reason of the way the office was vacated. The chairman of the Railway Commission was a man of undoubted ability. He has dealt with very many important matters, and many others were under consideration. These matters were in an unfinished state at the time he left the office. Without any apparent reason the office was vacated.

The business of the country, so far as this commission is concerned, has been at a standstill for upwards of three months, and what the country wants to know is who is going to pay the immense damage caused by this delay. This Bill takes no cognizance of the main point which has been brought out by the experience of the past. That experience has shown that a man appointed to a high office can lay it down at a moment's notice without paying to the country any damage for the losses caused by his conduct. Because the chairman of the Railway Commission gave up his high office at a moment's notice, the business of the country has had to suffer, yet we are now proposing to make a new appointment without taking any means to prevent the recurrence of similar conduct. The new appointment we are hedging about with every safeguard, so far as the incumbent is concerned. We are promoting a man from a judgeship to be the head of that commission. I know nothing of the ability of the gentleman appointed. He may be everything he is declared to be, and I take it for granted he is, but I would like to point out that the business of the country is no more safeguarded in this proposed legislation than it is in the present law. I read over the Bill carefully and I cannot find in it any attempt to guard against a repetition of what has just occurred. Would the directors of any railway system appoint a man to manage that system and leave him perfectly free to resign without a moment's notice, either because he did not like the job or because he wanted to avoid some unpleasant or difficult business, or for any other reason, and leave him free to do so without giving any explanation and without their having any recourse against him. Under this Bill, it will be very difficult, almost impossible, to remove the chairman of that commission, but there will be no difficulty whatever on his part in laying it down. It seems to me that a safeguard should be provided so that he could not resign office without the consent of parliament. Parliament makes the appointment, and the consent of parliament should be required before he can be relieved of the office. I draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice to that fact. We have had a long debate on the appointment of judges, but I have yet to hear any satisfactory explanation why the chairman should be at liberty to lay down the office without giving due notice, notwithstanding that important matters may have come before him and be awaiting his decision. A great deal of expense and loss and inconvenience has been caused by the resignation of the late chairman. That gentleman was a man of high standing, who commanded the confidence of the public, while he presided in that court. So far as I am concerned, I always looked upon him as a higher authority than any hon. gentlemen opposite on railway questions, and particularly on the question of the cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. I looked upon him as an authority and the country did also.

An hon. MEMBER. Up to what date ?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Up to November, 1904. He certainly was an able man, but he held his position only a brief time. During that time he had travelled a good deal about the country and heard many cases and in many of these cases had not given judgment. But apparently without any reason, he lay down this office, and we are now proceeding to make an appointment in his place. But in making this appointment we are not benefiting by the experience of the past. That experience should teach us to require of the new incumbent due notice of his intention to leave the office and due responsibility for any damage which his sudden resignation might cause parties interested. I trust that the Minister of Justice will consider the point I have raised and consider it in the same spirit as that in which I submit it. The gentleman who has received the appointment may be as eminent and learned as we are told he is, but what guarantee have we that he will not vacate his office without first obtaining our consent. We cannot remove him, but he may remove us. We cannot hold him, but he can hold us in the hollow of his hand, and he can step down and out at any moment without any regard to the business of the country.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend, no doubt, has considered this matter, as he does all matters, with a great deal of care. But he must not lose sight of the fact that if the chairman of the Railway Commission lays down his office before the expiring of the time fixed, he will loose his retiring allowance. If in addition, my hon. friend will give us the benefit of his business experience and suggest anything else we can do, I shall be very glad to consider his suggestion.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I would suggest that he should give due notice of his resignation, so that the government may have some opportunity of putting some one in his place before he leaves the office. He could very well give due notice. He should be required to give decisions also in the cases he has had in hand. It seems to me that we ought to be able to make some provision which will prevent the holder of that office from giving it up without a moment's notice, leaving the business before the court unsettled, and saddling the parties interested with the delay and expense of going all over the proceedings again, and yet not be liable in the slightest degree to any penalty or damage.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The point to which my hon. friend has called attention is most important. No doubt the resignation of Mr. Blair is the only instance we have had of a man holding high office, throwing it up without giving any notice and without any regard to the cases that were pending before him. That is no doubt the only instance of the kind in our history,

but it has had the worst possible effect on the morale of the whole service of the country. We have had the chairman of this Railway Commission resigning that office without warning, leaving a lot of unfinished business behind which he, as a judge sworn to do his duty, should have had completed, and doing this without any explanation. If the contention made by the Minister of Justice to-day is correct, the Minister of Justice and his colleagues are responsible for that Railway Commission.

I say, an explanation is due the country why that officer resigned. And there ought to be provision, whether in this law or in the general law against a recurrence of such a thing. It is a most deplorable thing, and some notice ought to be taken of it, some reprobation passed upon it. It is worthy of a resolution of this House, and perhaps such a resolution may be introduced this session. The case is that of a man holding the greatest office in this country abandoning that office, refusing to give judgment in cases he had heard, yet giving no reason for his conduct. And those who are responsible for his appointment and for the execution of the duties of that office have given no explanation. This is an injury to the public morals. The thing will not down. Those who are responsible must discharge their responsibility and explain the conduct of this man ; or if they are not in a position to explain it, they ought to free themselves from responsibility by letting censure rest upon him. And, having censured, they ought to make the law of the land such that so deplorable a thing cannot occur again.

Mr. FOSTER. Did I understand the minister to say that there was a penalty upon the chief commissioner if he resigned in a pet, or, whether in a pet or not, suddenly, after large questions have been brought before him and leaving those questions undecided ? If he does this, he should lose part of his emoluments.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Taking the particular case of the new chairman of the commission, the fact is that he must sit for ten years more in order to get the benefit of his whole retiring allowance. Up to this time, Mr. Killam has sat on the bench for twenty years, and, therefore, has acquired the right to a retiring allowance of two-thirds of his present salary. His age, I believe, is fifty-five or something like that, and after he has held office for ten years longer, he will be able to retire with the full allowance that will be given him under this Act ?

Mr. LENNOX. Under section two he can retire at the end of fifteen years with an allowance.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. An allowance of two-thirds—that is what I said.

Mr. FOSTER. This would be only a partial disability then ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It means that he would not get the benefit of anything that would otherwise accrue to him under this Act.

Mr. FOSTER. The Bill makes provision for a chairman who 'has become afflicted with a permanent infirmity disabling him from the due execution of his office.' In such a case, does he forfeit any of his emoluments ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. His position is that of a judge. If a judge is appointed to-day and to-morrow becomes afflicted with a permanent infirmity he is entitled to retire on an allowance of two-thirds of his salary. Or if a judge occupies his position for fifteen years and then retires, he gets two-thirds of his salary. Or, if he keeps a place on the bench for thirty years, regardless of his age he is entitled to retire on his full salary. If he has attained the age of 75 years and has been twenty years on the bench or if he is 70 years of age and has been 25 years on the bench he may retire on full salary. So far as Mr. Killam is concerned he has acquired the right to retire with a pension of two-thirds of his salary—that right accrued to him when he had been fifteen years on the bench. But he must sit ten years more—because then he will only be sixty-five years of age, but will have had thirty years on the bench—in order to get his full retiring allowance. If he retires in the interval, no matter what the cause—permanent disability or anything else—he does not receive his full retiring allowance.

Mr. FOSTER. Would bad temper be considered a permanent disability ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Some of us are infirm in that respect, I admit. But I hope that what happened before will never happen again. I think the penalty has been paid for what has occurred.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the minister think there is some way of meeting the point ? Is it not fair that a judge put in this important position, having matters involving great interests to decide, should be precluded—unless he is disabled by the act of providence or something of that kind—from resigning until business before him has been disposed of, under penalty of forfeiting something he has already earned ? I have not learned what the practical situation is in this other case—whether there has been serious delay of important matters, or whether cases have to be gone over again at heavy expense. But, if that were the case we should provide against it occurring again, if we can. For, the minister will observe, there are two evils. In the first place there is the long delay of unfinished business—now nearly three months—because of the sudden termination of the career of one of the commissioners. Then, on account of that sudden resignation, if the evidence has to be gone over again, there is a duplication of expense and a very serious loss. Is it not reasonable that there should be some provision in the Bill to prevent a man from leaving undecided the cases he has heard ? That it is reasonable is shown by what right my hon. friend (Sir Wilfred Laurier) said concerning Judge Killam himself. He told us that Judge Killam would not accept this office at once, not because he was not willing to take the office and receive the emoluments, but because he said considerations of duty prevented. Judge Killam said: Litigants have come before me and I have heard their evidence and must give decision in these cases. I cannot accept the invitation of the Prime Minister until I have finished that business. That was honourable. That is the basis upon which these things should be done. But if a man is not controlled by such considerations, then he should be controlled by compulsion or under penalty. The minister could add such a provision with perfect propriety and I think the country would approve it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Under ordinary circumstances I should hate—that is I should much regret—being asked to make provision of that sort in connection with an office so important as this, an office to which we should appoint men of the highest possible honour—and that ought to be the best safeguard in cases of this sort. Still, I realize, in view of the experience we have had, that something of that kind should be considered. The difficulty was suggested by my hon. friend when the Bill was introduced. I have considered it and, have not abandoned the idea of meeting the difficulty. I have considered an amendment of the General Railway Act to meet some of the difficulties caused by the resignation of Mr. Blair. For instance, two members of the board travelled far and wide over the country and took evidence in important cases. These cases were not disposed of at the time of Mr. Blair's resignation, and it was my painful duty to advise the remaining commissioners that, quite clearly, they could not decide these cases, for the reason that one of them had not heard the evidence. We are endeavouring to meet that difficulty with the co-operation of Justice Killam by communicating with the parties and asking if they will give their consent to the disposition of the cases by the board as now constituted. My intention, I may say, is to move an amendment to the Act which will enable us to deal with such cases in the future. That is going as far as I have seen it right to go up to the present time. But I must confess that some amendment is needed, though I do not commit myself before having con-

sulted my colleagues by promising to make a provision in the direction indicated by my hon. friend ; but I will be glad of any assistance I can get in the direction of making it impossible that what has occurred may be repeated ; and before the Bill is read a third time I will ask for an adjournment in order to consider any suggestions I may receive from any quarter.

Mr. FOSTER. While my hon. friend is considering that, he must consider it doubly. There is the ordinary and general peccability and perverseness of human nature in the individual, an instance of which has been given in this case ; but he must also remember that governments are liable to error; and the fact that such a state of things has arisen at all has been, in the first instance, because of lack of judgment in the appointing power, which is the government.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend does not expect I am going to introduce an amendment to correct that ?

Mr. MONK. Has the hon. gentleman thought of applying the remedy that I think used to exist in France, under a very ancient law, providing that the judges could not get their breakfast until they had rendered judgment ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am afraid that would be too harsh.

On section 3,

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is there an age limit with respect to the commissioners ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, the Railway Act, section 8, provides the age limit for commissioners at seventy-five years.

On section 4,

Mr. LENNOX. I have given notice to the Minister of Justice that upon the third reading of this Bill I propose to move that this clause be struck out. When the Bill was introduced I referred to this section, and gave some reasons why I thought it should not be left in the Bill. I do not propose to discuss the matter now, but merely to recall it to the attention of the minister, particularly in view of a good deal that has been said this afternoon.

On the preamble,

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Before you proceed any further, I propose to add one or two clauses while we are in committee on this Bill. I move in amendment :

That section 3 of the Railway Act, 1903, is hereby amended by inserting after the word 'persons' in the first line, the words 'and express companies.'

Section 3 reads :

This Act shall apply to all persons, companies and railways (other than government railways) within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, and shall be incorporated and construed as one Act, with the Special Act, subject as herein provided.

In substance, I propose an amendment that has already been before the House in previous sessions, namely, that express companies shall come under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. I am not going to take up the time of the House. I have often pointed out before that express companies are now doing more and more freight business in this country, and their rates are not at present under the jurisdiction of this commission. I think they ought to be. Every one admits it. They are carrying more and more the freight of the country, they are carrying more and more a class of freight that needs to be handled quickly, and they are entitled to better terms for that. But as a matter of fact, all these express companies are the railway companies. They are owned and controlled by railway companies, the railway companies consider them as assets; and, as I pointed out, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in its annual report, calls the Dominion Express Company the property of its shareholders. These companies are doing more and more business, they charge now what they like. They are doing a freight business, they are owned by railways, and if the railways are to be regulated in their passenger rates and freight rates, they ought also to be regulated in their express charges. This same matter has come up at Washington the other day. A man of very large capital and engaged in some large industries in Michigan, went so far the other day as to petition Congress to take action which was in substance an impeachment of one of the members of the Senate. The charge which he made in substance was that the senator had acted in such a way as to entrench express companies so firmly that they could not be regulated in their charges and that all the railway interests were against any attempt at regulation. In fact, the entire business community of the United States is up in arms against the express charges in that country but so strong is the railway lobby in Washington that up to the present time they have not been regulated, they have not been brought under control and so strong is the express lobby backed up by the railway interests that the American government and the Postmaster General of that government are not in a position to establish a parcel post system like that which we have in this country and which they have in England and Germany. The Postmaster General of the United States himself is my authority for the statement that the express companies are so strong that they have prevented the adoption of a parcel post system. If we wish to regulate the express companies now is the time to regulate them. As an endorsement of what I have said to-day I would call the attention of the committee to the fact that boards of trade everywhere have asked

parliament to bring express companies within the jurisdiction of this Act.

Mr. LENNOX. It was stated last year that possibly this amendment would conflict with some other parts of the Act. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) who introduced the amendment has considered that question, and it would probably be important to the committee to know whether it is a fact that it does not require a change in any other part of the Act to give it full effect. I have not myself looked into the question, but the objection was raised last year when this amendment was introduced. While I am on my feet I would say, in regard to what my hon. friend has said about the Postmaster General of the United States, that we have a very high authority in this House on that subject. Towards the close of last session, the hon. Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) called the attention of the House to the fact that we could not establish a free rural mail delivery in Canada, because in the United States the government had to yield to the demand of the mail carriers for increased wages, thus throwing the whole system out of working order. This was because the letter-carriers resorted to the carrying of parcels, thereby interfering with the express companies, and the express companies were enabled by their influence to bring such pressure to bear on the American government that the American government had to yield. This is in line with what my hon. friend has moved and it shows the enormous powers of these companies.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The government has no opinion to express at this moment upon the merits of the amendment introduced by my hon. friend for South York (Mr. Maclean), but I have to observe to him that his amendment is premature and that he is out or order.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. In what way ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Because it is already before the House upon a Bill introduced by my hon. friend. My hon. friend's amendment is couched exactly in the same language as the Bill which he has introduced, which is Bill No. 4 on the order paper, and which is set down for its second reading to-day or whenever it is reached. Section 1 of the Bill reads as follows :—

Section 3 of the Railway Act, 1903, is hereby amended by inserting after the word 'persons' in the first line the words 'and express companies.'

That is the first section of the Bill introduced by my hon. friend.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And therefore it is out of order to move this section as an amendment to this Bill

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. In answer to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), I beg to say that the procedure which I am following to-day is the procedure which we followed last session.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I beg the right hon. gentleman's pardon. I moved these amendments in exactly the same way and no objection was taken then, I consented to my right hon. friend taking four days in the week for government business relying on my being able to discuss these amendments. The right hon. gentleman is in this matter departing from the practice of parliament.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Again I say that these amendments were brought up in this way last session and with the understanding that I would have an opportunity of moving them, I consented to the government taking four days in the week. Now, my right hon. friend may be able to close me out, but I will ask the opinion not only of the chairman but of the House on this question. It is not going to facilitate the transaction of public business this session. I know what my right hon. friend wishes to do. He wishes to send me to the Railway Commission with my Bill. He brings in a new Bill of his own, we assist him all we can in getting his Bill through, but because I am a private member and he is the Prime Minster he has a law for himself, but he has not the same law for me. He may take refuge under a rule of order. I am going to sit down and let the chairman decide. I think I am quite in order and I hope the point will be discussed here before the ruling is given. Notwithstanding anything that is on the order paper, I say that when a public Bill is in committee it is the right and privilege of every hon. member, even if he is a private member, to make any amendment he sees fit to the Bill under consideration.

Mr. HAGGART. Before the point of order is decided I would like to discuss the question. A private member introduces a Bill in which there are certain clauses, the government introduces another Bill, and although it may be necessary to make the latter Bill workable that it should be amended, because the Bill introduced by the private member includes a clause similar in terms to a proposed amendment, you preclude a private member from amending the government Bill. I am aware of the rule of the House which declares that where a member gives notice of motion and it is on the order paper he cannot move that motion or what is set forth in that motion as an amendment to a Bill. The proper thing to do under those circumstances is to drop the motion, but I do not think that rule applies at all or that it can be held that

when a private member introduces a Bill he is precluded afterwards from moving any clause of that Bill as an amendment to a public Bill.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to point out to my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) that if, when he gave notice to amend Bill No. 36, he had looked at section 3, he would have found that the language he was using in the resolution would not apply to the section because he proposes to amend it by adding these words 'and express companies.' It was not necessary for the hon. gentleman to do that. All that he was required to give notice of was the word 'express.' Therefore, he would have got over the difficulty if he had paid attention to the wording and the objection raised by the right hon. leader of the government, would not apply to this case as I am afraid it does apply on account of my hon. friend having introduced his Bill first, as the right hon. leader of the government has said, and then having moved a resolution covering exactly the same thing afterwards.

Mr. SPROULE. I hold that we have followed this practice for many years. It is a common thing in this House to have two or three Bills standing as amendments to the election law, when the government move to bring in a Bill and ask that the Bills introduced by private members be allowed to stand as they will incorporate the clauses contained in these Bills in the government measure. Although there is a rule which says that you shall not anticipate what is on the order paper we do anticipate it by incorporating some of the clauses contained in these Bills, and when we have reached these Bills afterwards they have been allowed to drop. We have done that several times. All that my hon. friend would require to do, when he reaches his own Bill, is to say: I have incorporated the provisions that I intend to enact in this Bill, in an amendment to the Railway Act which you propose as a government measure, you have allowed me to do the same thing with Bills before and I am endeavouring to do it today.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would in the first place answer my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Ingram) that the resolutions which he has addressed to the House have no bearing upon this occasion. My hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) gave notice of his amendment, but he required no notice of an amendment to a public Bill. Notice of amendments is required only in the case of private Bills and he could at the table offer an amendment to a public Bill if it affected the Bill. Therefore, the question is not affected one way or the other by the notice. The amendment which he offers to the House is simply that we shall take the first section of his Bill and introduce it as an amendment in the present Bill. My hon. friend has been very candid as to why he acts in this manner. He has a Bill before the House and he can move it; he has let the opportunity of moving it pass three or four times, to my knowledge, and why would he not move it? Because the policy of my hon. friend is different from the policy of the government. I told him—it is on the record—when the Bill was first brought to the attention of the House that we had no opinion to offer upon it; we were not prepared to say yes or no. There is a good deal in the proposition he makes that express companies should be committed to the jurisdiction of the commission, but we informed my hon. friend that it was not our intention to take up this matter in the House; we wanted to refer it to the Railway Commission, there to be dealt with and discussed in the light of full information obtained from all parties interested in it. But this policy does not suit the convenience of my hon. friend.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He will not have it this way and, therefore, because our views do not accord with his views, he will not accept the very reasonable offer which we made to him of referring this matter to the Railway Commission; he wants to get his Bill passed by a side wind, and he wants to bring it to the attention of the House in spite of the rules of the House. My hon. friend has no need of taking refuge and of crying misericordia because he is a private member. He has as much right as a minister to introduce legislation; he has availed himself of this right, but because the Bill we introduce does not suit him he wants to violate the rules of the House in order to offer his amendment to the House at this moment.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will the hon. gentleman quote the rule?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is much latitude for amending. Any amendment may be brought in that has reference to the matter under discussion, but the rule is that if an amendment, which it is sought to introduce to the Bill before the House is already a notice for consideration on another proceeding, that amendment is therefore out of order. There is no doubt about that; every one knows it; but my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has offered a most subtle distinction and it is this: That the rule will apply to a motion but not to a Bill.

Mr. HAGGART. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Where do you get that?

Mr. HAGGART. I would say——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Allow me. It has no bearing, it is all technicality and no substance. There is no proceeding before the House which can be initiated, whether it be a Bill or anything else, except upon a motion. The Bill of my hon. friend, Bill

No. 4, stands upon the order paper in this way :

Second reading of Bill (No. 4), an Act to amend the Railway Act.

When the Speaker comes to call this order he will put the question to the House and my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) will move for the second reading of this Bill. Therefore, it is not necessary at all to say that this rule applies to a motion and not to a Bill. Every Bill must be introduced by a motion and it would be, I think, the most extraordinary proceeding that a rule of that kind should apply when there is a motion and should not apply when it is a Bill under discussion. What is the essence and the object of this rule? It is simply to ensure that a matter which is before the House cannot be taken from its order as a substitute for another order. That is the ruling given by previous speakers. Bourinot, at page 442, note (i) says :

It is not regular to move as an amendment to a question a motion of which notice has been given—and when it appears on the notice paper in a particular place.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Speaker Ouimet decided in 1889 (Journals, page 214):

It is not in accordance with the rules or parliamentary usage to take a motion out of its proper place, and move it as an amendment to another question.

Is it more in accordance with the usage of parliament to take a Bill out of its proper place ? To say that you cannot take a motion out of its place, but you can a Bill, is not sense, or I might use even stronger language. My hon. friend will have to exercise a good deal of reasoning in order to satisfy the House of the extraordinary proposition that a motion cannot be taken out of its order and a Bill can.

Then, May, which is a standard work on the principles of procedure, says :

Nor can an amendment be moved which anticipates a motion or amendment of which notice has been given on matters contained in the order of the day.

So, therefore, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that according to the principles of parliamentary usage this amendment is out of order.

Mr. HAGGART. In this case there has been no notice of motion given. My hon. friend proposes to amend a public Bill. The argument of the right hon. the Prime Minister is that this is virtually a Bill moved as an amendment to a public Bill. The rule of the House is clear, that no Bill can be moved out of its proper order. Is this the moving of a Bill out of its proper order ? The other rule which applies to motions something similar to this is that no motion of which notice has been given shall be moved in amendment to a public Bill, nor shall the substance of any motion. Does this come under either category? Not at all. Look at the absurdity of the position. A private member or half a dozen private members may give notice of Bills proposed, say on election matters or on a dozen other questions, and they may intend to move them. Then, according to the argument that has been advanced, because one of them has a clause in it referring to a particular election matter, it would not be competent for another member to move a similar motion in amendment to a government Bill, because some member or perhaps half a dozen members in the House had introduced Bills along the same lines.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Why certainly.

Mr. HAGGART. The object of the rule is to prevent a motion or a Bill being by any means or in any form moved out of its proper order in order that the House should discuss it. The other reason is that when a party gives a notice of motion that the motion should be on the order paper of the House, and that he should have an opportunity of discussing that measure, and that no other member of the House, by a side wind or an amendment to a public Bill, should take the credit of the motion which some hon. gentleman has moved. I contend, Mr. Chairman, that this does not come within either of these categories; this is a clause in a Bill which my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) has introduced. He is moving it in amendment to a public Bill but that does not necessarily mean that it is the introduction of a Bill out of its ordinary course on the order paper.

Mr. INGRAM. There may be a difference of opinion as to the rule of parliament in connection with this matter. I think the first minister was not present when this Bill was introduced on the 9th day of this month. At that time a certain understanding was come to between the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) and the hon. the Minister of Justice in reference to the discussion of this Bill. The discussion is thus reported in 'Hansard.'

Bill (No. 36) to amend the Railway Act, 1903—Mr. Fitzpatrick—read the second time.

Mr. SPEAKER. When shall the House go into committee ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I am quite willing that we should go into committee now provided that the Minister of Justice will give one or two days' notice of the third reading, as I have two or three amendments to propose.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What my hon. friend really wishes, I presume, is to move, by way of amendment, the different clauses of the Bill now in his name on the order paper.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think it would be advisable to thresh them out in committee. There are some features in one of the clauses of his Bill which I think ought to be discussed.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I am not quite ready to go on now, but will be on Tuesday.

That seems to me to be a sort of understanding between the Minister of Justice

and the hon. member for South York. Therefore, I think the hon. gentleman is fairly entitled to discuss his Bill now.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend is very kind indeed to champion the cause of my hon. friend from South York. If the hon. member for South York has had any understanding with me, I am quite sure he can state it himself, and I am willing to abide by it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If the hon. Minister of Justice asks me to explain, I will say that I understood that I might bring up the substance of my Bill in connection with his Bill to amend the Railway Act. I think we had that understanding, and I leave the Minister of Justice to say whether or not that is the case. Of course, that is quite outside of the question of order. I do not care how it is settled. I wish to see the rules of parliament observed ; but last session we proceeded in this way, and no objection was taken, and for that reason I consented, as I might not otherwise have done, to the proposal to take four days of the week for government measures.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What my hon. friend from South York has said with respect to the understanding is absolutely correct, and I certainly was under the impression at the time he made the suggestion that he might move in committee. I was ignorant of the rule referred to by the Prime Minister. I do not want to break the rule of parliament, but I am sure that the Prime Minister will agree with me, that if the rule is such that the hon. member for South York cannot move now, a day ought to be fixed on which he could bring up his Bill for discussion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I certainly did not confer with the Minister of Justice before I raised this point. I did not know of the understanding between the Minister of Justice and the hon. member for South York, or I would not have raised it. I will not press the point.

Mr. SPROULE. If I recollect aright, there have been many Bills in the same position, and no objection has been raised before. We followed the course proposed with regard to the Franchise law, the Election law and the Alien Labour law.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend forgets that there is a difference between this occasion and the occasions to which he refers. On those occasions the government accepted the amendments, and the moment that was done, there was no question of order. But when a Bill of this kind is proposed, which the government does not accept, we have a right to invoke the rule.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that is a strange argument—that one rule is to apply to the government and another to private members. I thought parliamentary rules were to apply to the government and to private members alike ; but the Prime Minister has given an entirely different turn to them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not at all. If, when a government Bill is under consideration, amendments are moved and the government accepts them, no point is raised on either side ; but if the government or any one else objects, the rule applies.

Mr. SPROULE. That was not the case. Those Bills were on the order paper, and it was suggested that they could be better included in government Bills than passed as separate Bills. When the Railway Act was under discussion some of those Bills were incorporated in it. That was done because it was the usual practice that had applied, not only to railway Bills, but to many others. Several times we held Bills over so that a portion of them might be incorporated in some government Bill.

Mr. WHITE. I approach this question with a good deal of diffidence, I confess, because I have become somewhat rusty in my parliamentary law ; but I think the right hon. leader of the government is correct in his interpretation of the rule. A Bill standing on the order paper is really notice of a motion, and it seems to me that the rule that applies to motions would apply with equal force to public Bills. But there have been instances, and many instances, both under the present administration and under their predecessors, in which a public Bill introduced by a private member, or some of its provisions, have so commended themselves to the government that the government has been quite ready to accept them. The member who has introduced the Bill is advised by the government that they will accept either the whole Bill or certain portions of it ; and when the Bill is reached on the order paper, it is either dropped or the member who has introduced it moves that the order be discharged, and the Bill is taken up as an amendment to a Bill of a similar character introduced by the government. My own opinion is that the right hon. leader of the government is correct in his interpretation of the rule ; but as there seems to have been an understanding between the hon. Minister of Justice and my hon. friend from South York, I am sure that the government will carry out that understanding and allow my hon. friend from South York to proceed with his amendments when this Bill comes up at a future stage, if not at the present sitting.

Mr. HAGGART. Notwithstanding the statement of my hon. friend from North Renfrew (Mr. White), I must say that I entirely differ from him. A Bill is not a motion. Motions have often been dropped, because their being on the order paper prevented members moving them as amendments to Bills. My hon. friend suggests

that because of an agreement made between the hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. member for South York, we can set aside all the rules of the House. That is an anomalous position. It is only by the unanimous consent of the House that a rule can be set aside. I have been in the House a long while, and I have never before heard the rule in question applied to a Bill. I have heard it applied to motions hundreds of times, and I have seen the motions dropped in order that the members making such motions might be in a position to move amendments to Bills. But while we live we learn, and I learn now for the first time that this principle applies, not only to motions, but to Bills.

Mr. WHITE. I feel that I ought to defer to the superior knowledge of my hon. friend from South Lanark; but I frankly confess that when I had the honour of occupying the position of the Speaker of the House of Commons my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) and myself differed upon points of order very frequently. Not only he but the other members of the government, of which he was so distinguished an ornament at that time, also differed from me with regard to points of order and procedure. I had up to that time given considerable study to those subjects, and I do not think it is quite within the province of my hon. friend from South Lanark to say that I ever assumed that because there happened to be an agreement similar to that in the present instance between the Minister of Justice and the hon. minister for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), namely, that this question should be taken up when the Railway Bill was being considered, such an agreement can set aside the rules of this parliament. I do not believe it can. I do not think the rules of parliament can be set aside by any such agreement, but if the Minister of Justice and the hon. member for South York did come to the agreement in question, it seems to me that the government ought, in all fairness to the hon. gentleman, to agree to the proposition he makes, and have the matter he has brought up discussed when this Railway Bill is before the House either at this or some future stage.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. While I agree in the opinions expressed by my grave and reverend co-members, I wish to say—and I would ask the Prime Minister to make a note of it—that when we are revising the rules of the House—and it is high time that we did—we should make provision that the same procedure ought to apply to public Bills as to government Bills. If a private member's Bill has to go to the Railway Committee so also should a government Bill. It is because there is a different procedure applied to public Bills than is applied to government Bills that I have to resort to parliamentary strategy and try to get my proposals discussed in connection with those of the government. The rule ought to be that exactly the same kind of treatment should be accorded to all amendments to the Railway Act. If that is not to be the case, and if I were introducing a Bill again to amend the Railway Act, I would simply put in one clause, a non-important clause, and keep my other ammunition in my pocket until the government Bill to amend the Act came up.

Mr. HENDERSON. As far as I can judge, the point of order raised by the right hon. the first minister is well taken. From my reading of the rule, I think there can be no two opinions about it. I think we had better not depart from the good healthy practice of sticking closely to the rules of this House. We do not know where a matter of this kind may end. I do not see how this House can be called upon to recognize any agreement made between two individual members which is not known to every member. My position is this, I intend to vote for this amendment, whether it comes up as an amendment to the Railway Act or a portion of the Bill of the hon. member for York (Mr. W. F. Maclean). It makes no difference, so far as my position is concerned, whether I vote to-day on this proposition as an amendment to the government Bill, or on some other day, when it comes before the House in the form of a Bill; but I do think we had better stand by the rules of the House and not have it said that one hon. member must have one rule applied to him and another hon. member have the benefit of a different rule. Possibly in a very short time I may be ruled out of order on the very point now raised. Why should I not have the same privilege as my hon. friend from York? I feel strongly that we should adhere to the rules of the House, and I desire to make it plain that, so far as my position is concerned, I intend to vote for this amendment regarding express companies, whether it comes in the form of an amendment to this Bill or of the Bill placed on the notice paper by the hon. member for York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) I understand the right hon. first minister has withdrawn his point of order, and now it is open to any other member to raise the same point, and I desire to do so. I submit to you, Sir, that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for York is out of order.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. After the declaration of the hon. member for Halton, (Mr. Henderson) I withdraw any claim to any privilege arising out of any understanding and I leave the hon. gentleman to shoulder the responsibility. You can report the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPROULE. As the government have taken two more of the days belonging to private members, it may be utterly impossible for this Bill to come before the House unless brought up in connection with some government Bill, and my hon. friend will be de-

prived of the right to have his Bill dealt with.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend from York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has had many opportunities of moving his Bill.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I agree to that.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that he could not go on for want of certain information which he desired to have when discussing it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. That is right.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the government took the private members day away. In other sessions, when that happens, it is usual to draw attention to the fact that certain important Bills are on the order paper and permission is given to the member to bring his Bill before the House and have it dealt with, if not as a separate Bill, in connection with some government measure. We have done that frequently in connection with railway charters and the labour question and various other questions without objection ; and if we abandon that privilege to-day, we are giving up a privilege of our own, and our privileges are quite as important to us as the rules that govern us.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. A good deal of time has been wasted in discussing a matter which was settled some time ago. This Bill has been called several times. Sometimes it was postponed to suit the convenience of my hon. friend and other times to suit mine. It was understood between us that when the government Bill reached the committee stage, we would consider my hon. friend's amendments. But as regards the practice referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) he is entirely in error. I have had more to do with these Bills than he has—if he will pardon me for saying so—and my invariable practice is, when I am introducing general legislation, to adopt any principle that I find in a Bill that stands in the name of any private member on the order paper. I adopt the principle of such a Bill of my own motion, just as I would have a right to amend my own Bill. But I cannot do that in this instance. If I felt free to adopt the principle of my hon. friend's Bill and add it as an amendment to my own, I would do so. But I intend to oppose his amendment and give reasons why the House should not adopt it.

Mr. INGRAM. Perhaps it would be possible to suggest a compromise that would satisfy both sides——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. To go on with our business would satisfy me perfectly.

Mr. INGRAM. That is just the suggestion that I was going to make. Suppose the hon. gentleman is allowed to proceed with his Bill ; and, then in view of the number of new members in the House who have not heard the matter discussed, we could refer it to the Railway Committee, with a view to having all interests heard and the matter fully discussed.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I appreciate very much what the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has said ; and what he has said is exactly correct. But I do not wish to appear as taking advantage of any rule of the House. Nor do I wish to be heard in this discussion merely as a matter of courtesy. I thought I was within my right. But, of course, I defer to what has been said. Another opportunity will be afforded me to bring this measure up——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Next Monday.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes, it will come up next Monday, and there will be an opportunity for discussion. All I had in mind was to facilitate the public business and help to make the session as short as possible. In view of the scrupulous consideration of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) for the rules of order, I must go about it in another way.

Mr. WHITE. There is no difficulty in getting over the point raised by the hon. member from Halton (Mr. Henderson). If my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) desires to have his Bill discharged from the order paper. When it comes up for discussion he can do that and then he will be at perfect liberty to proceed with his amendment. The fact is, he wants to have two strings to his bow—he wants to move in committee, and, if defeated in committee he wants to take up his Bill. I think that would be contrary to all the rules of parliament.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is what is called strategy.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must rule the point of order well taken according to rule 24, which says :

All items standing on the orders of the day shall be taken up according to the precedence assigned to each on the order book ;——

But there is a reservation made for government measures.

The right being reserved to the administration of placing government orders at the head of the list in the rotation in which they are to be taken on the days on which government Bills have precedence.

I find this amendment is identical word for word with Bill No. 4 which stands on the order paper as a public Bill.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY—MANITOBA ELECTION RETURN.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. Will the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) permit me to call his attention to a statement made by him yesterday in reply to a question by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), who is not here to-day, on the subject of the elections in Manitoba :

I may inform my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) that I received to-day two memoranda from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on this subject, but I have not yet been able to look at them. I will be able to give him an answer to-morrow.

That 'to-morrow' is to-day. Can the right hon. gentleman give us any information on the subject now ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say that the matter will have to stand over until to-morrow, because I could not look into it.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

At six o'clock, the committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Public buildings—Manitoba—Brandon drill hall, $20,000.

Mr. HYMAN. No expenditure has been made on that yet. There is one squadron of mounted rifles there.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the cost of building a drill hall such as is proposed to be erected in Brandon ? What would be about the difference in cost between erecting this building and a building of the same size in Ontario ?

Mr. HYMAN. The architect thinks there might be a difference of 10 per cent greater in Manitoba.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the material used ?

Mr. HYMAN. It will be a wooden building with brick veneer.

Mr. FOSTER. I was surprised when I was out there in some of those far western towns to find out how cheaply brick are produced. At Edmonton they produce brick for $5 a thousand, at Moosejaw for about $8. I think we pay more than that in the city of Toronto, or quite as much. Of course, bricks can be made cheaper at Edmonton, because coal is more easily procured. It seems to me that with brick so cheap in the west it would be cheaper in the long run to make the building of brick than of timber, or even of timber with brick veneering.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister said it would cost 10 per cent more to build in Manitoba ; but if bricks are so cheap there, where does the extra 10 per cent come from ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is a considerable difference in the price of labour and of other materials than brick.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I desire to bring to the attention of the minister the urgent necessity that exists for a drill hall in the town of Minnedosa. I think Minnedosa has got the largest company of any of the small places in the province of Manitoba, and in the drill contest in Brandon last year they carried off the major portion of the honours. Virden is a smaller town than Minnedosa. They make bricks in Minnedosa, and I would urge the claims of that town on the minister in fulfilment of the promise that was made last year.

Mr. HYMAN. I will bring the matter to the attention of the Minister of Militia.

Dominion buildings—Manitoba—renewals, improvements, repairs, &c., $8,000.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Who is the inspector for Dominion buildings now in Manitoba ?

Mr. HYMAN. Mr. Chisholm.

Mr. INGRAM. There is an increase of $2,000 over last year ; why is that ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is a larger number of buildings.

Selkirk public building, $15,000.

Mr. HYMAN. No site has been purchased yet. The building will accommodate customs, post office, Indian affairs and fisheries. The population at the last census was 2,188. Customs and postal revenues amounted last year to between $5,000 and $6,000. In order to accommodate these four offices I do not think we can put up a building there at a less cost than $16,000.

Virden drill hall, $20,000.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What is the size of that building ?

Mr. HYMAN. 60 feet 10 inches by 31 feet 8 inches.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What is it constructed of ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is brick veneer.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Had you to pay for the site ?

Mr. HYMAN. The site was given free.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. When is it to be completed ?

Mr. HYMAN. In October of this year.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the total cost ?

Mr. HYMAN. The estimated total cost is $15,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Then what are you asking $20,000 for ?

Mr. HYMAN. I see that I have a memorandum in connection with this vote

which I was not aware of. I move that the vote be reduced to $15,000.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Who has the contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. Mr. W. H. Ireland.

Winnipeg district military stores building, $10,000.

Mr. HYMAN. That was explained last night.

Mr. INGRAM. Is that the general system adopted all over the country ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, at the different headquarters.

Winnipeg—new immigration building, $62,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is to provide for the completion of the building being erected at the request of the Department of the Interior. A contract has been let to the Manitoba Construction Company. The building is to be completed by the first of April, 1905. The total estimated cost is $177,000.

Mr. STAPLES. Where is this building to be located ?

Mr. HYMAN. The building is located on a site transferred from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company situated between Maple and Fonseca streets, and has an area of 200 feet by 61 feet 4 inches. The contract for the building is $162,000 and the total cost will be about $177,000.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Has there been any change since last year ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, the building has been made fire proof and increased in size.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. It was estimated last year at $60,000.

Mr. STAPLES. Who has the contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. The Manitoba Construction Company.

Mr. INGRAM. Is that building in charge of the engineer located at Winnipeg or is there a superintendent for this work ?

Mr. HYMAN. No, it is under the supervision of the architect Mr. Joseph Chisholm.

Mr. INGRAM. A permanent officer ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Winnipeg military buildings—quarters for non-commissioned officers, including guard room, &c., $6,000.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Nothing has been spent on that ?

Mr. HYMAN. No, there has been no money spent on that. This is supposed to be quarters for the married non-commissioned officers of 'A' squadron, guard room, cells, quartermaster's stores, lecture room, &c.

Mr. INGRAM. Is this connected with the armoury ?

Mr. HYMAN. No, this is for the permanent force.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the hon. minister in his department a list of the military properties taken over from the imperial authorities by the colonial authorities ?

Mr. HYMAN. That will be in the Militia Department.

Winnipeg new post office—land and building, $300,000.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What was the cost of the site ?

Mr. HYMAN. The site cost $132,350.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What is the estimated total cost of the building ?

Mr. HYMAN. About $600,000.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Including the site ?

Mr. HYMAN. No, outside of the site.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The estimate is increased a great deal from that of last year.

Mr. HYMAN. Of course, the estimate was given before the contract was made.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Who recommended the site ?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not know, I am sure. This was very fully discussed last year in the House. It was a very profitable bargain. We could have sold the site any time for more money.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Is it a corner lot ?

Mr. HYMAN. No, it is not a corner lot. There will be space on both sides of the building.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What is going to be done with the old post office ?

Mr. HYMAN. The idea is to use the old post office building for a customs house.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. There was a question raised last year by the hon. gentleman who represented Provencher in regard to the title of the old Bannatyne property which contained the stipulation that the site was only to be used for the post office building. He stated that the site was given for a small consideration on the understanding that it was to be used for a post office building. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Sutherland) stated that the matter had only been brought to his attention the previous day in regard to the title and that he would inquire into it. I do not think he ever furnished the House with any information on the subject. Was

there not some distinct understanding that that site was to be used for all time to come as a post office site ?

Mr. HYMAN. The deputy informs me that the matter was looked into both before and after it was mentioned in the House and that there is no evidence in the department of any kind on which such a statement can be based.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I will just read what the hon. minister said last year.

The matter of the title to the site of the post office in Winnipeg was brought to my attention only yesterday. I am having it investigated. I believe there is some condition, but I do not think it is so narrow as that mentioned by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Larivière), —that the site is to be occupied by the post office. I believe that the land was sold on the condition that it was to be used as a site for government offices.

Mr. HYMAN. Well, these are government officers.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. So he must have had some evidence in his possession when he was able to make that statement.

Mr. HYMAN. I will ask the deputy to look into the matter.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the size of the site ?

Mr. HYMAN. The site is of an irregular shape, 166 feet front by 80 feet in one part and 134 feet in another part.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. From whom was it purchased ?

Mr. HYMAN. W. F. Alloway and J. W. Good.

Mr. INGRAM. Is that not a very good price, $132,000 ?

Mr. HYMAN. That is the price. The information I received from the department is that the property could be sold to-day for more money. I know that the department has been looking for some more land there, and it is almost impossible to get any more land near the centre of the city for anything like what we would consider a moderate cost.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Who negotiated the sale ?

Mr. HYMAN. Thos. B. Metcalfe.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Did he receive any commission ?

Mr. HYMAN. There has been no expenditure other than the cost of the site.

Public buildings, Northwest Territories—barracks for permanent corps, Strathcona Horse, $40,000.

Mr. AMES. Where is that barracks ?

Mr. HYMAN. There has been no decision by the Militia Department yet as to the headquarters of the Strathcona corps, and therefore the matter is in that shape. This is for the permanent corps.

Calgary public buildings—enlargement of post office and examining warehouses, changes, fittings, &c., $40,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This building is being enlarged for the use of these different departments. The building has become altogether too small and it is being enlarged. The area of the present post office is 1,360 feet. With this addition there will be nearly three times that amount of area.

Calgary land titles office, $15,000.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Would the minister make an explanation ?

Mr. HYMAN. I think I shall ask to have that item stand.

Item allowed to stand.

Court House,—lock-up and police accommodation, $1,500.

Mr. HYMAN. This is to provide accommodation at different places.

Edmonton jail, $33,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is for the continuation of the work on the jail there. It has been in progress for some time.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What is the total cost ?

Mr. HYMAN. The contract is for $50,150.

Medicine Hat, public building, $15,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is to provide a public building at Medicine Hat. The postal revenue is $4,679 and the customs duties $26,113.

Moosejaw public building, $20,000.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What is that ?

Mr. HYMAN. That is for the purpose of a public building at Moosejaw. It is under contract. The postal revenue in the year 1903-4 was $7,800 and the customs revenue $49,700.

Mr. FOSTER. What are you building there ?

Mr. HYMAN. A brick building with stone foundation.

Mr. FOSTER. Can your officer tell you what he has to pay for brick there ?

Mr. HYMAN. Of course it is let by tender, but he thinks the price is between seven and eight dollars a thousand.

Prince Albert, public building, $40,000.

Mr. HYMAN. That is under contract.

Mr. FOSTER. How much is that to cost ?

Mr. HYMAN. $95,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population of Prince Albert ?

Mr. HYMAN. The population is about 2,300 now, but this is for a court house, post office, customs house, land office and registry office.

Mr. FOSTER. And what is the revenue there ?

Mr. HYMAN. The postal revenue is $5,249 and the customs revenue $8,427.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What public buildings have they now ?

Mr. HYMAN. Nothing but an old court house and jail. They use an old one-story building for a land office.

Mr. FOSTER. How much was paid for this site ?

Mr. HYMAN. $1,400.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Then the building is not to be on the site of the old court house ?

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why ?

Mr. HYMAN. The old court house, I am informed, is quite out of the town.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That might have been said when the town consisted of one street along the river ; then it was a couple of streets back, but there is a nice residental district growing up near the post office. A gentleman who is now in the Senate lives farther out than the court house.

Mr. INGRAM. When will that be completed ?

Mr. INGRAM. The contract was let on January 1, and the building will be completed in October, 1906.

Red Deer court house, land office and lock-up, $6,000.

Mr. HYMAN. That is under contract.

Mr. FOSTER. What is that to cost ?

Mr. HYMAN. The total cost is estimated to be $20,000.

Mr. FOSTER. When is it to be finished?

Mr. HYMAN. On November 20.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, it is a nice little town, and that is not too expensive a building for it.

Regina post office, custom house, &c., $20,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The postal revenue of Regina last year was $20,736 and the customs revenue, $241,000. I estimate that, Regina being the capital, the building will cost complete, $55,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is it to be placed ?

Mr. HYMAN. No site has yet been purchased.

Mr. FOSTER. Have there been any negotiations?

Mr. HYMAN. There have been some negotiations, but no site has been selected.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the hon. minister what the policy of the government is in regard to some of these estimates. We have voted this evening, and are no doubt going to be called on to vote again, sums of money which are destined to be expended for purely provincial works in the Northwest, such as jails and asylums. The Autonomy Bill, as it is called, will come into force on July 1 next, and what will then become of these votes? Some of them may not have been expended; some of the buildings are in course of construction, and some may not be commenced before July 1. What course does the government intend to take with regard to those works which are provincial in their nature? Because once parliament has voted an item, even for a work of a purely provincial nature, it cannot very well be varied. Parliament having voted a specific sum for a specific purpose, it must be spent for that purpose and for no other.

Mr. HYMAN. In any case, we have to carry out our contracts, and these votes are for contracts which were entered into by the Public Works Department some time ago. I do not know that the government have arrived at any conclusion, but after the Northwest Government Bill passes, there is no doubt that all the buildings intended for purely provincial purposes will be transferred to the provinces. The only difficulty will be as to joint buildings, which are used partly for provincial purposes and partly for Dominion purposes, such as the Prince Albert building, which is used as a post office and custom house and also as a court house. In such cases we shall either have to take over the building and make some financial allowance to the provincial government or they will take over the building and make some financial allowance to us. I do not see any other way in which we can do what is fair and right.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Has the government considered the question of a penitentiary for the Territories?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not know that the matter has been under consideration. I believe the Edmonton jail has been suggested for that purpose.

Mr. MONK. As some of these votes are for works of a purely provincial character, I think it would be advisable not to vote too large an amount for these purposes.

Mr. HYMAN. I am not going to ask for any new votes for works of that character. We are only providing for contracts which have already been entered into.

Saskatoon public building, $5,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The postal revenue in the year 1902-3 was $2,000 and in the year 1903-4

$4,195. Saskatoon is quite a growing town. The building is estimated to cost $9,500, and the total cost, including heating, contingencies, &c., at $14,500. The work is not yet commenced. The building will be of brick.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the population of the town?

Mr. HYMAN. I have not the present population. In 1901 it was between 500 and 600.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Saskatoon is a very nice place. It has derived its importance largely from the fact that during the last couple of years it has been the point where settlers coming in by the Regina, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway leave the railway and start to tramp to their destination. In a short time both the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern will have lines through Saskatoon, and it will then be an important town.

British Columbia—renewals, improvements, repairs, &c., to Dominion buildings, $8,000.

Mr. HERRON. I would like to ask the government if it has any intention to put up a public building in the town of Pincher Creek? We have never had a public building in that town, not even one in which to hold the court, and I think it has a population which fairly entitles it to a building such as those which have been erected in many other towns not so large and not increasing in importance so rapidly.

Mr. HYMAN. I would remind my hon. friend that if a public building is required there for the purposes of a court house, after the 1st of July it will be the duty of the new provincial government to take that matter in hand, and my hon. friend will have to make his representations to the provincial authorities. I am not aware of any representations having been made for the purpose of having this government erect a public building there, but am always glad to hear any my hon. friend has to make.

Fernie, B.C., public building, $10,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The postal revenue is $5,500; the customs, $8,200. It is estimated the building will cost $21,500. The site has not been selected yet.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Is there any difficulty about the location of the site?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not know of any.

New Westminster public building—enlargement for accommodation of Indian branch, $7,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is asked for the purpose of putting up a building for the Interior Department; but since this vote has been placed in the estimates, I have had my attention called frequently to the overcrowding in the New Westminster building at present. The fishery branch of the Marine and Fisheries service may be put into that new building, which will add to its cost. The $7,000 is only intended to cover a building for the Interior Department.

Vancouver public building, $100,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is not only to be a post office. It is intended for a post office, custom house and examining warehouse. The plans and specifications are being prepared. It is going to be very expensive. I do not see how that building can be put up at a less cost than $400,000 to $450,000.

Mr. BLAIN. When will it be completed?

Mr. HYMAN. As the contract has not been made yet, I am unable to say, but it will be completed as soon as possible, because there is great need for it at present.

Salaries to resident clerks of works, assistants, &c., public buildings, generally, $14,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is to pay the salaries of the clerks of works and their assistants in other places than Ottawa.

Mr. FOSTER. How many are paid out of this $14,000?

Mr. HYMAN. Ten.

Mr. FOSTER. They are distributed all over, are they not?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the hon. minister give the distribution?

Mr. HYMAN. There are two in Ottawa, one in Quebec, one in Winnipeg, two in Montreal, two in Victoria, one in Regina, one in Three Rivers.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there any in New Brunswick?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Any in Nova Scotia?

Mr. HYMAN. Our work is done there by Mr. Doddrell, engineer of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. These are all the clerks of works employed in superintending public buildings throughout the Dominion?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. That does not mean architects?

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not notice that you read over any for Ontario.

Mr. HYMAN. Mr. Curry, the architect in Toronto, does our work there.

Mr. INGRAM. I suppose the hon. gentleman is continuing the system that has existed for years. Where there is a public work erected, you employ a superintendent of works at so much per day. That system has been continued for years, and every session it is objected to. These men simply

assist in prolonging the work by not insisting on more men being put on the building. You pay them from $2.50 to $7 per day, and the longer the building is under construction the better for them, consequently you will have a building take two years in construction which an ordinary contractor would build in four or five months.

Mr. HYMAN. Surely, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) has overstated the case. The contract for the construction of the building fixes a time within which it is to be finished. You must have a clerk of works, somebody who will represent the department in the work. We cannot employ architects all the time to do that work. In cities, for instance, in London or in Toronto, we employ an architect to overlook work of this kind. But, there are places where public buildings are under construction and where there are no architects. We must, in such cases, have a clerk of works, and I can hardly conceive of any way to pay him except by the day. You could hardly give him so much for the work——

Mr. INGRAM. Why not?

Mr. HYMAN. Well it would practically come down to so much a day anyhow.

Mr. INGRAM. You could pay such an officer percentage on the contract price. If that were done, he would have an interest in earning his money as quickly as possible, and he would insist on the proper number of men being on the job. On the other hand, if he is paid $5 or $7 a day, he will be very glad to have the time of construction an extended one. We suffer loss year in and year out in this way.

Mr. HYMAN. I have done a considerable amount of building and I never heard of the inspectors being paid on any such a plan as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) speaks of. I do not think that plan is followed by private individuals or companies. As I say, we employ an architect where we can, but in the case of a building being put up in a small town, it is impossible to employ an architect.

Mr. INGRAM. It is not necessary that a man should be an architect to be able to insist that the contractor shall carry on his work according to the plans and specifications, and shall put on enough men to finish the work in a reasonable time. In my own city, a building was erected by the municipality costing $50,000 or $60,000. The architect in charge was paid on the percentage plan, and he insisted on a proper number of men being employed. But he was inspector also of the government armoury building. He inspected the armoury building in the morning and the municipal building for the balance of the day. He could stand it to have only two or three men on the armoury, but he insisted on the full number of men on the municipal building. The result was that the municipal building was completed more quickly than the armoury was, which cost only about half as much. When you consider the number of buildings being constructed in the Dominion, you will see, that, in the aggregate this is a serious grievance. With private individuals it is by no means unusual to pay architects on the percentage plan. It is a common plan in all our cities.

Mr. HERRON. I would call the minister's attention to a case of this description. The building was under contract, and the inspector was appointed to oversee the work, I presume at a salary of about $7 a day. The unfortunate part of it was that this inspector was not a mechanic of any description. The building was about a year and a half under construction, and the inspector received $1,200 or $1,300 for his services.

Mr. HYMAN. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Herron) tell me to which case he refers.

Mr. HERRON. Yes, the court house at Fort Macleod. I do not think the inspector in that case had enough mechanical knowledge to superintend the building of a pumphouse to say nothing of a court house. Yet he drew a salary during construction.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Herron) is mistaken in his facts. In the case to which he refers the inspector was paid $4 a day not $7.

Mr. HERRON. Will the hon. minister tell us what the inspector received altogether? My information is that he drew about $1,300.

Mr. INGRAM. What the minister says does not lessen the fact that inspectors are paid $7 a day in British Columbia.

Mr. FOSTER. Take one of these clerks of works as an example—take the one at Quebec. He is paid by the year, his salary being $1,282. Just what does he do? What are his duties from January to December ?

Mr. HYMAN. He practically has charge of all the government works in that vicinity.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the hon. minister mean by saying that he 'has charge' of these works?

Mr. HYMAN. He looks after all the buildings, sees that the caretakers do their work. In this particular case, the inspector has charge of the public buildings at Grosse Ile, and he has to go there very often. It is the duty of these inspectors to have charge of the public buildings in their districts.

Mr. FOSTER. Is his district the whole province?

Mr. HYMAN. No, we have an inspector in Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. This inspector is for what is called the Quebec district. He has to go

to places where there are public buildings and make an inspection of those buildings.

Mr. HYMAN. He goes where we send him. We use these officers largely in the purchase of sites. No site is purchased by the department without a report either from an officer sent from the department or from one of these so-called inspectors.

Mr. FOSTER. When the government wants a site the inspector reports upon it? That is one thing he does. Does he oversee buildings under construction?

Mr. HYMAN. He supervises all the work of repairs and renewals—not necessarily new buildings, because in that case he would have to be on the new building all the time.

Mr. FOSTER. He has nothing to do with the new buildings?

Mr. HYMAN. That is all arranged by the architect. If, in any particular instance we can use one of these officers, we do so. For instance, in the post office building in Ottawa, the work is overseen by Mr. Adams who is paid out of this vote.

Mr. FOSTER. He is in Ottawa, and has nothing else to do, and so he is there. But in the case of this clerk of works in Quebec, if the government were spending $20,000 or $3,000 on a building at Grosse Ile the work would not be overseen by this clerk of works? The department must put on a man who would be there every hour of every day, in the case of an important building like that. I want to find out what these men do.

Mr. HYMAN. They visit the building during the course of construction, oversee the work.

Mr. FOSTER. Then he looks after making repairs on all public buildings in course of construction occasionally, and reports with reference to them. To whom does he report ?

Mr. HYMAN. Directly to the chief architect of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Is he kept pretty busy ?

Mr. HYMAN. They have got plenty to do on the kind of work the hon. gentleman has just mentioned, where they represent the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Now with reference to the plans of all these buildings, are they made in Ottawa ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes. There are instances where the department employs outside architects to make the plans and supervise. In all these cases the architects themselves do the whole work.

Mr. FOSTER. Supposing you are building a $20,000 post office in Quebec ?

Mr. HYMAN. In that case it would be done here.

Mr. FOSTER. The architects in the department here make the whole of the plans for that building ?

Mr. HYMAN. Almost invariably. But there are instances in which we employ an outside architect to make the plans, but that is not the rule. We keep our staff here for that purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. Now after you have prepared the plans and let the contract, do you employ a local architect for that building ?

Mr. HYMAN. Very often.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you also employ a man to oversee the work ?

Mr. HYMAN. Not where there is an architect.

Mr. FOSTER. When you employ an architect who does not oversee the work, how do you pay him ?

Mr. HYMAN. We pay him by commission, and from that commission he is supposed to employ a man on the work continually.

Mr. FOSTER. That is to say, in some cases. In the cases of all these buildings the plans of which are drawn here and where you do not employ an architect and a clerk of works, so to speak, locally, then, there is no other architect there but the government architect ; none that have anything to do with that building ?

Mr. HYMAN. No men who are paid by this vote.

Mr. FOSTE. I am speaking of men whom you employ to see that the architect's plans are carried out in the construction of the building ; that is a clerk of works, so to speak, temporarily there while the building is being erected. In that case you do not employ an architect ?

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Then you appoint a man who is to see that the building is constructed according to the architect's plans. In that case you employ of course a mechanic ?

Mr. HYMAN. We always do, a man, for instance, understanding masonry or carpentering.

Mr. MONK. Where extensive repairs are undertaken in the public buildings of a province such as we have been voting many thousands of dollars for, or where a public building is to be modified or improved, are the plans made beforehand in the department here ?

Mr. HYMAN. All made in the department here.

Mr. MONK. Who reports as to the necessity and approximate cost of those repairs ? This year we have voted about $200,000 for repairs and improvements on public buildings in the province of Quebec. These must have been preceded by a report to the minister showing a necessity for these repairs and an estimate of the cost. Who is that done by ?

Mr. HYMAN. That comes from the department who are using the building. For instance, in post office improvements the request would come from the Post Office Department asking for certain repairs or additions to be made. Then the Public Works Department have a staff here who prepare the plans for those works, repairs or additions.

Mr. MONK. I understand the call for repairs or improvements comes from the department interested. But before the estimate is placed before us, who gives to the government a report of the probable cost, and the necessity and extent of those repairs ?

Mr. HYMAN. The chief architect of the department.

Mr. MONK. Then he visits these places in order to prepare the estimate ?

Mr. HYMAN. He cannot personally visit all the places, but some members of the staff are sent to each of these places.

Mr. MONK. Then when the repairs are finally decided upon, who superintends the work of carrying them out ? For instance, we have voted $25,000 to make some changes in the front part of the post office in Montreal ?

Mr. HYMAN. That would be overlooked by the agents of the department in the different cities. In the city of Montreal we have a local man who is paid out of this vote we are discussing ; in that case he would overlook the repairs.

Mr. MONK. I heard the name of Mr. Béland mentioned for Quebec ; who is the man in Montreal ?

Mr. HYMAN. Mr. C. Desjardins is in charge in Montreal.

Mr. MACDONELL. Who is the man who performs the same duty in Toronto ?

Mr. HYMAN. Mr. Hamilton is in charge of all the buildings there, in so far as the employees are concerned. We generally employ Mr. Currie, the architect there, to make the plans, or to consult with in case of any renewals or repairs.

Mr. MACDONELL. I am speaking more especially of repairs.

Mr. HYMAN. Mr. Currie generally overlooks the repairs of the department there.

Mr. MACDONELL. A lot of repairs took place last year in the Toronto post office, who was the person ?

Mr. HYMAN. Mr. Currie, the architect.

Mr. BLAIN. In the case my hon. friend brought to the attention of the minister a few moments ago, the Macleod post office, Northwest Territories, I see the contract price is $13,973, and the clerk of works got $1,464 ; making for the architect and clerk of works $2,879. Is not that rather a high commission ? I want to ask the hon. minister this question : Has he not in his department officers who can prepare these plans without engaging an outside architect ? These are buildings that are being erected every day almost. New towns are springing up, appropriations are made and a court house that is suitable in one town is suitable in another town with very little alteration. Surely, when this Fort Macleod building was put up, the hon. gentleman had in his department plans and specifications suitable for that building without employing an outside architect at a cost of $1,415.

Mr. HYMAN. There is no architect.

Mr. BLAIN. Yes, Martel & Langelier, $1,415.

Mr. HYMAN. Those are the heating contractors.

Mr. BLAIN. Those were heating contractors ? On this point I would like an answer from the hon. minister as to what the policy of the government is. Are we to understand that when a building is to be constructed in Macleod, for example, the department have plans and specifications that would be suitable for a town of that size, or are we to understand that special plans are made for each town ?

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman will know that it depends altogether on the question of the site. It is almost impossible to have a plan that is equally suitable for two sites. Very little alteration makes it necessary practically to make a new plan. The policy of the department has been to do all that work in the department. But we cannot follow that policy at all times. There are occasions when we employ an outside architect, in which case he has the supervision of the building, and is paid a percentage for his work ; yet, in all those cases in which an outside architect is employed, his plans are sent to the department and examined by the chief engineer before anything is done.

Mr. MONK. Who is Camille Desjardins, who does the work mentioned by my hon. friend a moment ago in the city of Montreal, and how long has he acted in that capacity ?

Mr. HYMAN. About fifteen years. He is a brother-in-law of Mr. Justice Ouimet, and was appointed by him.

Mr. MONK. What is his remuneration ?

Mr. HYMAN. $1,080.

Construction of armouries, $50,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the first construction ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is a vote that has been in the estimates for some years. It is asked for by the Militia Department for the purpose of constructing small armouries in different places.

Mr. FOSTER. What armouries are proposed to be constructed ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have no demand from the department as yet for these armouries to be constructed out of this particular vote.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. minister think it is quite proper to come down here and ask for a lump sum of $50,000 or $100,000 when he has not even decided that the armouries are required ? That is no proper voting of money. You should not ask for a vote unless you have outlined what uses you propose putting it to, and are able to give details to a certain extent. This bulk sum voting of $50,000 or $100,000 and placing it in a minister's hands, especially those of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden), would never do at all.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman will understand that contracts have been made, for which a certain amount of this vote will have to be used.

Mr. FOSTER. Give an explanation of that.

Mr. HYMAN. I am speaking of the new ones. That does not take up the whole vote.

Mr. FOSTER. What are those contracts, and what do they amount to ?

Mr. HYMAN. They are for armouries at Kaslo, Fredericton and Brockville.

Mr. FOSTER. What is proposed to be done at Kaslo ?

Mr. HYMAN. I see that Kaslo was completed out of this year's expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, drop that out.

Mr. HYMAN. The places at which these armouries are to be erected are Burford and Fredericton, and there is some expenditure at Brockville.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the expenditure for these three ?

Mr. HYMAN. About $30,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is going on at Burford ?

Mr. HYMAN. An armoury is being erected.

Mr. FOSTER. Why is not the construction of an armoury at Burford, where you are spending $30,000, detailed here just the same as in those other cases in which you are making expenditures of from $10,000 to $30,000 ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is just a small expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. What—$30,000 ?

Mr. HYMAN. No ; the expenditure is not $30,000. That is the expenditure for Burford and Fredericton together.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the expenditure at Burford ?

Mr. HYMAN. $9,900.

Mr. FOSTER. And at Fredericton ?

Mr. HYMAN. $12,000. And then there will be heating, electrical wiring and contingencies. The cost of the two buildings will be in the neighbourhood of $30,000.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what I understand. The hon. minister wants a vote for the construction of armouries of $50,000. A question brings out the fact that you are spending $9,900 on an armoury at Burford and $12,000 on an armoury at Fredericton. These expenditures may be all right, but what answer is there to the question : Why, instead of having it blindly for the construction of armouries, the minister should not have a vote for each, and should not put down 'armoury at Burford, $9,900' and 'armoury at Fredericton, $12,000' ? That is the way, I think, my hon. friend will admit it ought to be put in, and I would move that it be amended in that direction. Let us have it by all means in the vote, because you might as well just simply say : Here is $500,000 for the construction of armouries ; but that is not the way that votes ought to go through the House of Commons. There ought to be a definite building for which each vote is taken. In the way of repairs it is difficult to do that, because there are small repairs running from $10 to $300 or $400, but this is for the construction of a building.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The policy of voting a lump sum for the purpose of constructing small armouries was adopted some years ago. I do not know whether it was adopted during the time of my hon. friend——

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think so.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Well, three or four years at any rate and for this reason : Often times it is necessary to have accommodation which is not foreseen and cannot be foreseen perhaps, and it was thought desirable to vote a sum—I think we began with $35,000 or $40,000—to build armouries which would cost anywhere from $2,500 up to $10,000 each. It was considered to be good policy, the matter was discussed here and the House agreed to it and that is the reason, if it be a reas-

on, why this vote has been placed in the estimates. I think it is a good reason. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who I am sorry to observe just now seems to have some want of confidence in me—I thought he had the very greatest confidence in me—made some reference to the fact that I was not here last evening. I think the criticism he made was perfectly fair; I think the minister interested in votes ought to be here, but it so happened that I was not able to be here last night. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) would have had an opportunity, had he been here during the last four or five years, of learning that a policy with reference to expenditures of this kind had been laid down. My hon. friend wanted to know what the policy of the department was. That was a perfectly proper question. If he had been here he would have known, because he would have heard it stated. Perhaps it would not be inopportune for me to read one or two statements which I made to the House some two or three years ago upon this very subject, and if the committee will bear with me for a moment I shall do so. In October 1903, my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) asked a question and in answer to him I made this statement, which will be found at page 13084 in the last volume for that year. I then said:

My hon. friend (Mr. Blain) will understand that it is impossible to do this work all at once. It will involve between one and two million dollars, and perhaps more, to properly house the different militia corps throughout this country. We are going on as rapidly as possible throughout the country, and I assure my hon. friend that we are selecting the places in which these buildings are to be constructed on the advice of military men and from a non-partisan, a purely military point of view. With regard to the rural districts and the smaller towns, where there is only say, one unit, my idea is that we should construct a substantial building which can be headquarters, armoury and storehouse, and with a room sufficiently large for a lecture room, where the officers who take an interest in military matters can bring their men together in the evening, and, by means of blackboards and so on, illustrate military affairs and give necessary instruction. This is the idea I have, and that I hope to be able to begin to carry out in the near future. My plan will include every village of any importance in the Dominion of Canada.

Later on I again discussed the matter and on the 8th day of October, I made this statement, which will be found at page 13403 of the same volume:

I have already referred to the importance of housing the militia. If we want to make the infantry force of this country what it ought to be, we must provide for every single unit, every company, sufficient accommodation for at least one hundred men where they may meet together and spend their evenings, using it as a sort of club room, and having blackboards and other means to educate themselves in the art of war. If you do that, you will excite renewed interest among the men, and you will get together and get the sympathy of the very best men in the community. You will not then have to worry over the question whether you are to pay them seventy-five cents or a dollar or fifty cents a day. It is not the money that brings that class of men out. It is the loyal spirit in them and the desire to serve their country; and all they will ask is the opportunity to acquire the necessary knowledge in order to do so.

I have read this simply to show that the matter has been under consideration, and that the department has adopted a policy with reference to it. I may, however, say to the committee that I believe we should have at every company headquarters, the headquarters of every unit, as I have said before, a substantial building. I had hoped that such a building in the rural districts might be constructed for $2,500 for the smaller ones up to $5,000 or $6,000 or $7,000 and that for a total of between $1,000,000 and $2,000,000 running over perhaps five, six or possibly ten years, which would not be felt very seriously in any one year, we might have the whole militia of the country on its present footing properly housed. I am bound to say—and the acting Minister of Public Works, I am sure, will not object to my saying so, that I have been disappointed in the cost of the buildings which have been constructed.

Mr. FOSTER. That is that they have cost more than you thought.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They have cost more than we thought they would, and more than I think they should have cost.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the trouble with public works; it always has been, it always has been.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think some plan, some system can be devised by which these buildings can be constructed at a lower cost, and only yesterday I discussed this matter with my hon. colleague, the acting Minister of Public Works, and we agreed that there should be established an inter-departmental committee composed of officers of his department and officers of my department, one or two of each, who should meet from time to time, once a week, once a fortnight or monthly, and take up all these questions in which the Public Works and Militia Departments are jointly interested, where the Public Works Department is called upon to construct buildings or do work for the Department of Militia. This we intend to do, and I hope that in the near future, before this session is over, we will be able to lay before the House a scheme of a very definite character as to the cost of these buildings which will vary in size from those which would accommodate 100 or 125 men up to those which would accommodate 1,000 men. In the meantime I hope the committee will not refuse this general vote. It will be the

duty of my department to place in the hands of the Public Works Department a carefully prepared list of the places which first require buildings, the more urgent ones, and that list, I promise the committee, will be prepared by the military men of my department and submitted to the Militia Council. No list will be submitted to the Public Works Department or undertaken until it has been decided to be necessary and important in the public interest.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad to have the minister present. It is a great pity he was not present last night, but we will excuse his absence of last night because he has acknowledged handsomely that he should have been here. That is a business view which we will take. I am sorry, too, that I have to put him to the trouble of spending 15 minutes going over what he has gone over before. He has to do it because I was not in the House last parliament. It was not my fault that I was not in the House and if he has been caused any trouble let him fight it out with the Postmaster General, who is peacefully reposing just ahead of him, for I believe he is largely instrumental in having prevented my presence here. I believe it was mainly through the kindly offices of the Postmaster General that I was deprived of being here during the last three or four years, and that consequently I have been obliged to trouble the Minister of Militia for fifteen minutes repetition of what he stated a few months ago. It is just that kind of light, thrown upon the subject by the minister who has the initiation of the votes, that helps the committee to understand what these votes are for, I said there was chronic trouble in the Public Works Department. It was so in my time. There was a continuous struggle of this kind—and I dare say that those ministers who have large works to construct experience the same difficulty today—that whereas as a business man you want to put up for a corps of one hundred men a storehouse and shelter, which a business man would put up for $2,000 or $2,500, when you come to have it done by the Public Works Department it would run up to $6,000 or $8,000. That is true with reference to post offices and public buildings of every kind. As business men and citizens of a common country, which is growing rapidly and in which the expenditures are enlarging in different ways, we must come to the conclusion that we shall have pretty hard times ahead of us to meet all the services of the country if we do not bring these down to an economical basis. I have every sympathy with the idea of having the militia of this country well cared for and having every one of these units provided with a home of its own ; but if you are going to do that, you have to get rid mighty quickly of the idea of spending $50,000, $60,000, $70,000 or $80,000 on these places. You cannot furnish all these units with proper accommodation under $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 if you go on in this way. That is what I meant last night when I asked where we would come out at if the minister proceeded on a fixed line of providing for all at that rate. We can give all these units decent housing if we make up our minds to put up businesslike buildings. I think that is an excellent idea of the Minister of Militia ; and if the Postmaster General and the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Public Works, with reference to their various constructions, were to have a sort of international conference at Ottawa in which they would get together with their officers and compare notes and bring matters down to a business level, they would economize more than they are doing now and would serve the country very much better. Mind you, I am not criticising in any carping spirit any expenditure for the necessary services of the country. We have to have them and more of them. But I remind the committee that we are at this moment setting up sister provinces and furnishing them, that this is going to cost this country a large amount of money, that our services are reaching out to distant places, and that these are becoming more costly. Therefore, we ought to set our houses in some sort of economical, businesslike order, and have the expenditures carried out in such a careful and reasonable way that the general distribution in the end shall not overburden the country to such an extent that we shall at some time get freightened at it or find it impossible and have to stop the very thing that we might have carried on if we had carried it on in a reasonable and economical way. Probably all ministers and governments make mistakes in that way, but every year makes it a more vital question with us in our growing country, and I am glad to hear the minister say he is proposing something of the kind. I do not forget that the Minister of Militia is on pledge that in the selection of sites for militia purposes he will act on the principle, not that Thomas or John or somebody else who has given good service to the party asks for something, but because it is necessary for the service. If I have caused the Minister of Militia and Defence trouble in asking for an explanation, the onus rests upon the interesting gentleman who sits beside him, the hon. Postmaster General.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am very glad that my hon. friend gave me the opportunity to make the statement which I have made, and I assure him that it was no trouble, particularly, as I have found that the seed I have disseminated has fallen on such good ground. I am glad to find that, after all, my hon. friend has not such a want of confidence in me as I might have been led a few moments ago to suppose he had. With regard to the large expenditure in the great centres, there are in the city of Toronto, for instance, probably forty units.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not quarrelling with a large expenditure in large centres.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The large expenditure there is perfectly justifiable. The same is true of Montreal, Hamilton and other large centres. I do not think any one will complain of that. But we have to construct in the country districts in order to house the militia properly six or seven hundred buildings, because we have at least one thousand units. I think it is quite as important, perhaps more important, that we should provide places where these units can meet and spend their evenings profitably, than it is even in the cities. As I pointed out in my remarks of two years ago, I think it is of the utmost importance to the welfare of the rural militia that this should be done as soon a possible, and, as my hon. friend has pointed out, it cannot and will not be done unless we are able to do it at a much lower rate of expenditure than we have been involving the country in up to the present time. I think that with from $2,500 to $7,500, possibly $10,000, we ought to be able to get all the accommodation required for one, two, and in some cases three, companies in a country district.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would draw the hon. minister's attention to the fact that in the village of Colborne complaint is made that the cavalry corps there, has no place in which to store its guns and other equipments. Although the town is not a large one, this corps should be furnished with some place in which to store its equipment. I think at present it has to store them in Coburg. I heard one of the officers say last summer that they had not a cartridge in their possession. I thought it rather strange that we should have a cavalry corps there and yet not have a cartridge among them. That would be rather awkward if any trouble should arise. I would also draw attention to the fact that there is a militia corps in Brighton, and that in Brighton there is no place in which that corps can store its equipment. I have never had any ambition in the soldiering line, but as the representative of the people I am prepared to vote for any reasonable expenditure to house and equip these men properly and also to pay them for their services. I think they have been underpaid, and if they get enough now I am very glad of it. So long as economy and business like methods are practised, I think that our militia should be furnished with these things and above all with ammunition to use if necessary.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The place to which my hon. friend refers is exactly one of these where a building of the kind I have described should be and will be constructed. With regard to the ammunition, I have no doubt that there is ammunition not very far away from the headquarters.

Mr. LALOR. As a representative of a rural constituency, I was much pleased to hear the remarks of the hon. Minister of Militia, I am glad to hear that he has outlined a policy by which he proposes to take care of the rural battalions. In the votes we have been giving to the militia for the building of armouries, it did strike me that all the money was going to the large towns and cities and that the rural battalions were being completely neglected. The county of Haldimand has one of the best battalions in the province. I am told that the 37th battalion is probably the best of those that go to the Niagara camp. Yet, in the whole county there is not one drill shed for that battalion. I hope that the hon. minister will see his way clear to furnish us with some drill halls in that county. The town of Dunnville, where I reside, is a large, prosperous and growing town, and it has a splendid volunteer corps. I have received a number of letters already, since I have been in the House, from Dunnville, asking me to bring this matter before the House so that the hon. minister might know that the company in Dunnville have no place in which to drill or store their arms, but have to rent a place and pay for it out of their own pockets. The officers are very anxious that a drill hall should be built there. I can not refrain from complimenting the hon. minister on the policy he has outlined, and I hope he will not forget that good old county of Haldimand when he is distributing armouries and drill sheds.

Mr. TAYLOR. I intended last evening, when the militia votes were being put through, to say a few words, but refrained from doing so as the hon. minster was absent. However, now that he is here I wish to draw his attention to some facts. I share in the pleasure of my hon. friend from Haldimand at the announcement of the minister that he intends to house all the militia in the rural districts, villages and towns. Gananoque is an important town. We have there a field battery, one of the oldest and best in the Dominion. We have also a rifle corps. A few years ago they had comfortable quarters containing a drill shed and an armoury, but my hon. friend tore that down and purchased another site. It was the intention of the government to provide housing for that corps but for some reason or other nothing was done, although ten years have elapsed.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not so long as that.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was in 1896—nine years anyway. I have asked repeatedly to have our boys housed again. They have had to rent an old warehouse in the centre of a lumber yard where the guns are stored as well as the harness and other accoutrements, but they have only room to run the guns in and no place suitable for the men

at all. I beg to draw the hon. minister's attention to the fact, and would urge on him the necessity of providing without delay an armoury in the town of Gananoque. I am sure my hon. friend has waited long enough now, and I hope that he will see that a sum is put in the supplementaries to provide for such a building. The site was purchased and paid for some eight or ten years ago, and nothing done yet. I referred to another matter last night when the hon. minister was not present nor was the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Harty). But I had a conversation with that hon. gentleman afterwards, and he said he would remind the minister of the necessity of having the Martello towers at Kingston, which were injured a few winters ago by the wind storms, put in respectable repair. We have Americans coming to Kingston by the thousands every year, and it is certainly no credit to us that these towers should remain there with their tops blown off and in a dilapidated condition. I hope that the hon. minister will, the first thing this spring have these Martello towers repaired, otherwise they may tumble down altogether.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Is a part of this vote to be expended for the purpose of erecting an armoury in Burford village? Burford is a flourishing village which has a very good company of dragoons. This company has no armoury or drill hall, but there is a building in course of erection. Might I ask the hon. minister what has been expended and what further will be expended on the armoury at Burford?

Mr. HYMAN. The contract for the Burford armoury it $9,900. That will complete the building.

Mr. MACDONELL. I would like to take advantage of the presence of the Minister of Militia to draw his attention to the Toronto drill shed. This $40,000 for the extension of a drill hall is a revote. I asked the question when this contract would be commenced, also the nature of the work and in what direction the extension of the drill hall would be made. It was pointed out, that, a year ago when this appropriation was put in the estimates, the then minister of Public Works stated that the work would be proceeded with at once, in fact he said, the plans would be perfected in a few days from that date—March 2, 1904—and immediately the plans were completed and the frost sufficiently out of the ground the work would proceed. I think the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) knows better than any man in this country the immediate necessity for better drill hall accommodation in Toronto and the unpleasantness and difficulty among the regiments that has arisen because of the inadequacy of the present hall for all the troops there. The question is one of immediate importance to the militia men of Toronto. They have waited long for this extension, and they are anxious to know when it will commence, what direction it will take, and generally what it will be.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am not able to answer all my hon. friend's questions, but I think my colleague the Minister of Public Works will be able to give any information I cannot give. I wish to say, in a general way, that I consider the giving of additional accommodation to the militia force of Toronto a matter of the most urgent necessity. And, so far as I am concerned, I will continue to impress upon the Public Works Department the importance of giving that accommodation at the earliest possible moment. While I am not charged with the preparation of the plans and have not really examined them, I am told that an agreement or understanding has been reached, between the gentleman at the head of the engineering branch of my department and the chief architect of the Public Works Department, on a plan which will give all the accommodation that is required for the Toronto garrison. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works will be able to tell the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) when the work will be commenced.

Mr. TAYLOR. What about Gananoque?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I had intended to reply to my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) when somebody intervened. I can only repeat the assurance I gave the committee a little while ago, that we will proceed with the construction of public buildings for the accommodation of the militia in accordance with the most urgent requirements of the service in different localities as decided upon by the officers of the Militia Council. With regard to Kingston, I am glad attention has been called to that matter. That pertains to my own department exclusively. We have a vote out of which can be taken the sum necessary to make these repairs, and I will see that it is done.

Mr. P. H. McKENZIE. I wish to say a few words concerning the condition in this regard of the county I have the honour to represent, the county of Bruce. We have what our people consider a very good regiment in that county, without any accommodation whatever except small rooms, provided at low rentals, at the company centres. The policy of the Minister of Militia, as he has enunciated it to-night, has been laid before our people, and they very much approve of it. They are looking to the department now for more suitable accommodation for the regiment there, and I hope that when the minister is preparing his estimates he will not forget the great county of Bruce and will not give all the money to the cities and the portions of the country farther east. We in the west, look on ourselves as belonging to the fighting

races,—and we want consideration for our militia in that western part of Ontario.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We in this House must know that we owe a very great debt to the county of Bruce for sending such a very able representive as it has to this House. I am glad to hear from him that the policy which was first outlined two or three years ago is approved by that county. I can only say what I have said before, that we will take this matter up and we will see to it that Bruce is not neglected—of course, in the order of merit.

Mr. PRINGLE. I join with the others in expressing my pleasure at the presence of the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) to-night. Last night, while the items for armouries throughout the province of Ontario were under consideration I brought up the subject of the armoury for the town of Cornwall. I pointed out to the Minister of Public Works the great importance of the eastern district, and the splendid battalion in the counties of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, and the fact that that regiment was without a building even to store their arms. I stated that we in that section were very moderate. We quite agree with the proposition laid down by the Minister of Militia. We do not wish to see any such extravagant expenditure as that made in the town of Brockville, and then have the battalion disband and have a monument there to the Militia Department or the Public Works Department in the form of a building which cost, I think, in the neighbourhood of eighty or a hundred thousand dollars and is used only for social entertainments, and bazaars. We have in Cornwall a live battalion, one that is a credit to the province of Ontario. The officers of that department have waited on the Minister of Militia from time to time. They have not received from him any definite promise that I know of. They waited on the ex-Minister of Public Works, and that gentleman gave them a positive assurance that that armoury would be erected. Not only that, but he visited the town of Cornwall and went over the sites pointed out to him by the gentlemen who were extending to him the courtesies of the town. He approved of one site. The citizens naturally expected that the contract would be let immediately afterwards and that by this time they would have had a building ample for the purpose. Yet nothing has been done. The battalion feel very much aggrieved that they have been neglected. As I pointed out last night, the officer who is in charge of the battalion is a most active supporter of this government. My opponent in the last election is also an officer of that battallon and as I understand, a very capable officer indeed. He also, I believe, feels disappointed that nothing has been done. We had from the Minister of Public Works last night an assurance that it would come. If he had said not only that it would come, but that it would come within a certain period, I would have been satisfied with that and would not have had anything to say to-night.

Now that the Minister of Militia is here—he knows that the case is urgent. He knows that the officers and prominent citizens of the town have waited upon him several times urging that this building should be constructed. Perhaps he would be able to supplement the assurance I have received from the Minister of Public Works, and state definitely whether some portion of this $100,000 that we are now discussing is to be expended in Cornwall to erect a suitable building. As I have said, we are very modest. An expenditure of $8,000 or $10,000, I think, would be ample to provide accommodation for the 59th Battalion. I hope the Minister of Militia will give me definite assurance to-night that the building will be put under way this year.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Pringle) is perhaps not aware—I do not know that he is a military man—that the regiment to which he refers is a rural battalion and not a city battalion. It is a battalion composed of eight companies, two of them and not more than two, have their headquarters in the town of Cornwall; the remaining companies or units have their headquarters in probably six different places in that county, and perhaps the adjoining county. A few years ago it was recommended to the department that there should be a central armoury for country battalions, and that there should be one armoury alone for eight companies. That was found not to work, and that policy has been changed; in fact we have reverted to the old system of keeping arms at company headquarters. I may say to my hon. friend that I agree with him absolutely that there should be a building procured or constructed in the town of Cornwall, but it will be of the kind that I have described, and which I am glad to observe he is reasonable enough to be satisfied with, a moderate building which would also give accommodation for regimental headquarters. I would suggest that Cornwall being a growing town, probably we might provide for two companies additional, having in view the future. Subject to what I said a moment ago, that these matters must all be decided by the Militia Council, by the expert advisers of the militia and of the government, I think I can give the assurance that it will not be very long at any rate before provision is made for the regiment to which my hon. friend refers.

Mr. LALOR. I notice that some hon. gentlemen who have spoken asking for drill halls for their counties have received assurances from the Minister of Militia that drill halls will be built for them. I have not been fortunate enough to draw that promise from the Minister of Militia as to

whether he will remember Haldimand county. I have already complimented him on the policy he has outlined, it is a wise policy and in the interests of the rural militia. I think the great difficulty with rural battalions in the past has been that they have not received the attention they deserved. In fact my predecessor in this House not long ago alluded to the rural battalions as being the shadow of a shadow of a skeleton. That was not very complimentary to the rural battalions, especially as coming from a military gentleman himself. Now I hope the Minister of Militia will improve that state of affairs, and rejoice the hearts of the battalion of Haldimand county that I have the honour to represent, by promising that he will build a drill hall in the town of Dunnville.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The appeal of my hon. friend is quite irresistible. If I did not refer especially to the county of Haldimand, it was not out of discourtesy, but because some one intervened before I had had an opportunity of speaking. I will only repeat what I have said, that I believe the county of Haldimand is one that is especially deserving as the regiment of that county is especially deserving. I have had the pleasure of seeing that regiment on many occasions, and it will give me a great deal of pleasure if the Militia Council should recommend my hon. friend's town as one of the early towns to receive a building of this kind.

Mr. MORIN. Am I going to be left out ?

Mr. MACDONELL. Would the minister tell us what he is going to do with the Toronto work ?

Mr. HYMAN. I explained last night that there are two works to be done in Toronto. One is the enlargement of the armoury, putting another story on the armoury to be used for storing the arms. The plans and specifications are now in the hands of the printers, and as soon as they are received tenders will be advertised for. As regards the other and larger work, the plans I understand are to be sent over to the Militia Department, whence they will be forwarded to Toronto to the officers there to pass upon ; then they will come back to the Department of Public Works. All that of course will take some time. As the building will be a large one costing some $250,000, it will take some time to prepare the plans and specifications.

Mr. MACDONELL. Is it the intention of the department to proceed with this work ? Last year we were told the same thing, we were told the plans would be finished in two days.

Mr. HYMAN. I think the hon. gentleman must have been mistaken, and that the minister had reference to plans for an addition, that is, putting on an extra story where the arms are to be stored. I cannot conceive that he referred to the larger work.

Mr. MACDONELL. I understand it is the intention of the government to proceed with this building in due course ?

Mr. HYMAN. Without question.

Mr. FOSTER. What is being done in Fredericton ? $12,000 of that vote I think is devoted to the armoury in Fredericton.

Mr. HYMAN. That is for restoring the building that was burnt.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to the condition of the drill hall at Summerside. I have had several conversations with the hon. gentleman last year on this subject, and I had his assurance that the matter would be looked into and possibly something would be done. Up to the present there has been no move made. If it is the desire of the minister to have the efficiency of the different companies up to standard, and to keep up the interest of the rural and small town companies, he will have to provide better accommodation than we have in the town of Summerside. As I pointed out last night, we have an old building forty or fifty years old on our public square, with no floor and absolutely no accommodation.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is true that my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) called my attention to the matter last year, and I had one of my officers visit the place and make a report upon the building. The question is now before the department for action. I hope that in the near future some action will be taken. I would like to add in this connection that it is impossible that all these buildings should be erected at once. I may be permitted to remark that in my own county we have a regiment of infantry of eight companies and two squadrons of cavalry, yet we have only an old wooden drill hall in the town of Kentville, which was built many years ago. There has not been a thousand dollars expended on buildings to house the militia in my county during the nine years I have been a minister. I tell my people that they must be patient. The time will come, I hope, when they will all be housed and I will ask some of my hon. friends to emulate my example and be patient.

Mr. LEFURGEY. We would almost prefer in my town to wait a year or two, if we had the assurance that a suitable building would he put up, and one which would at the same time be an ornament to the town.

Mr. HYMAN. Before we proceed further, there was one item left over in the Ontario list, on the understanding that the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence would make a statement in regard to it. I refer to the Woodstock armoury. I suppose there is no objection to passing that item ?

Mr. FOSTER. All right.

Ottawa public buildings, including repairs, ventilation and lighting, furniture, &c., $140,000.

Mr. INGRAM. What is this ? There was a vote last night for this same thing.

Mr. HYMAN. Oh, no ; but there was really a discussion upon this vote last night. This is the usual vote for the care of the buildings.

Rents—Dominion public buildings, $64,000.

Mr. PERLEY. Are these all in Ottawa ?

Mr. HYMAN. No ; the Ottawa rents amount to $47,111. These are the rents which the department pays for rented buildings throughout Canada.

Mr. PERLEY. I suppose these rents have to be paid as the leases are made ? I know the hon. gentleman had personally nothing to do with the renting of these buildings, but I hope he will be able to give us some assurance that he will stop this system. I think that probably, individually, we would all concede that the present system is a mistake. The government have rented buildings all over the city ; they have rented some good buildings and some poor buildings, and the rents are all high. Rumour says on the street that some of the rents are very high even for individuals to pay, but taking into consideration the rate of interest that the government have to pay for money, all of these rentals are high. I think that individually the hon. minister and all other members of the House will probably agree that if the government need all this accommodation they ought to provide it in some other way. They should erect a building. There is plenty of land in Ottawa, and the government could erect a fine building at no greater annual charge for interest than the rental which they are now paying. They are paying interest on about $2,000,000 in rentals for these buildings that they are now occupying, whereas they could buy land below the Supreme Court and erect a building there. I hope the minister will give us some assurance that he will not follow the system pursued by his predecessor in this regard.

Mr. HYMAN. I promised the committee at a previous sitting to make a statement in regard to this question. I quite agree that the time has come when the government should have a definite policy in regard to making provision for the different departments of government. It requires a considerable amount of material to be got together, details of space and everything of that kind. The architect of the department is at present engaged upon the matter, and I hope before the session is over to lay before the House some plan so that we may get rid of the large payments of rent, and house each department in a building belonging to the government.

Mr. PERLEY. Is it the intention of the hon. minister to try and arrange so that he will not have to lease any more buildings in Ottawa ?

Mr. HYMAN. I cannot say that, because, in the meantime, if there are applications made by any department for more room, and it is found by the Department of Public Works that they must have room, of necessity we must rent a building. But I promise that there will be no long leases, and that there will be no leases that cannot be got rid of when we are ready to go into a new building.

Mr. PERLEY. It is not only the question of money, but the question of extreme inconvenience that is experienced by the public when a department is divided up between two or three different buildings. The minister at the head of the department perhaps knows where the various branches are, but it is pretty hard for any other person to find the branch which he wants.

Mr. BLAIN. How much is being paid for rent for the building occupied by the Railway Commission ?

Mr. FOSTER. If the minister will just read the list of rentals for which this $64,000 is paid, that would give all the information.

Mr. HYMAN. They are as follows :

Geological Museum, Sussex St.. .. .. ..$	600
French translators office, Sussex St.. ..	600
Agriculture Department, Queen St	2,250
Central basin coal shed, Slater Estate..	360
Thistle Estate, Wellington St., gas inspection and weights and measures..	550
Inland Revenue, Sparks and O'Connor Sts	6,500
Methylated spirit warehouse and laboratory—Interior Department, cor. Queen and Lyon Sts..	1,200
Marine store house, Sussex St...	360
The Ottawa Building Company, limited, No. 98 and 100 Wellington St, for Custom Department..	1,500
Molson's Bank, Metcalfe St., two flats for Labour Department..	1,200
New building for Surveyor General's staff, cor. Metcalfe and Slater Sts., Ottawa Building Company..	3,000
Interior Department, including vault, Slater and Sherwood..	366
Interior Department, Imperial building, Queen St., for immigration branch.. ..	1,950
Mounted Police, 172 Wellington St., Slater and Sherwood..	1,140
Post Office Department, Sparks St. Chambers, Slater and Sherwood..	540
Post Office Department, railway mail service, 12 Albert St., Bate & Co..	600
Rooms occupied by Department of Public Works, Slater Block, Sparks St..	480
Militia and Defence, Slater St..	11,040
Railway Commission, Queen St..	5,300
Agriculture Department, Commissioner of Exhibitions branch, the Ottawa Investment Company, limited, cor. Metcalfe and Queen Sts., No. 94 and 96..	1,000

Corry Building, Rideau St., two floors for Georgian Bay and Montreal canal survey, &c., and portion of basement.. .. $5,285
Slater Estate, 193 Sparks St., two rooms 540
Orme Building, 193 Wellington St., two rooms.. 250
The Great Northwestern Telegraph Company, cor. Sparks and Metcalfe Sts., for the D. O. C., military district No. 4, five rooms.. 500

Mr. FOSTER. The whole of that makes up $64,000 ?

Mr. HYMAN. No ; that is just for buildings in Ottawa, making a total of $47,111.

Mr. INGRAM. Reverting to the preceding item, there is an increase of $15,000. The hon. minister has not explained the cause of that.

Mr. HYMAN. That is on account of the larger number of buildings. The care of the buildings we rent as well as of the buildings we own is included in that vote, and there are more buildings now to take care of.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman stated that the policy would be to make short leases in future until the question of the erection of a larger building is settled. May I ask the hon. minister if any of the leases he has read over are long leases ?

Mr. HYMAN. The Woods building is the only one that can be called a long lease ; that has some seven years to run.

Mr. INGRAM. In the new short leases has the department done anything towards repairs or fixing up ?

Mr. HYMAN. That will come out of the vote previous to this ; this vote is simply for the rent.

Mr. INGRAM. Quite a large sum was spent by the government on the building at the corner of Metcalfe and Slater streets to put it in shape for the census department to use. In addition to that there is a large payment for rent. What I want to get at is whether the same policy has been carried out in this long list.

Mr. HYMAN. The only newly arranged building in which a large amount has been spent is the Corry building. In that there is no expenditure that we could not remove. All the other buildings are outside of the city of Ottawa.

Mr. INGRAM. Do the owners of buildings in Ottawa leased by the government have to pay any taxation to the city of Ottawa ?

Mr. HYMAN. In the only lease I have made I have insisted on having in the lease a clause to the effect that the taxes must be paid. That policy will be followed while I am in the department.

Mr. INGRAM. The taxes must be paid to the city of Ottawa by the owner of the building.

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. In view of the fact that no taxes are paid to the city did the owner of the Census building make any substantial reduction in the rent to the government ? Did the government insist on such a low rate to which they were surely entitled ?

Mr. HYMAN. The proposition the hon. gentleman makes is a perfect business one, and I presume that was taken into consideration. I did not personally conduct the negotiations for these leases. They were discussed very fully.

Mr. PERLEY. I am glad to hear what the minister says about the payment of taxes and I hope he will make a change in regard to the renting of buildings. There is no doubt that some of these leases have been made at altogether too high a price and that the government is paying more than a private individual would pay in Ottawa for the same building. I do not know who is to blame for it, in the past, but I think the hon. gentleman is right in seeing that the city of Ottawa gets the taxes from any buildings which he rents in the future. I only hope that he will see that the government does not in the future pay exorbitant rentals such as have been paid for some of these buildings in the past.

Mr. BLAIN. Some new legislation was passed by the Ontario legislature last session to the effect that all public buildings in future shall be assessed and liable to taxation. I am not quite sure of the details of the Bill but it might be worth while to look it up.

Yukon public building, $105,000.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a large sum.

Mr. HYMAN. I have all the details of the expenditure here. I shall refer to one item so that the committee will understand the reason of the large expenditure. It is on account of the salaries being very large. For instance the post office. We are obliged to pay the caretaker $160 a month, practically three times the amount we would pay here. A charwoman there gets $150 a month.

Mr. FOSTER. And a living allowance ?

Mr. HYMAN. No. Then there is lighting $1,500, fuel which is very high $2,500, and repairs and maintenance, another large item. The Public Works Department have taken over all of this work. Heretofore a part of this vote was voted by the House to the Interior Department, but now the Public Works Department have taken the whole vote and are endeavouring to exercise

as careful a supervision over the expenditure as possible.

Ottawa public buildings—heating, including salaries to engineers, firemen, watchmen, $87,000.

Mr. HYMAN. That is the usual vote for this purpose. A large amount of it of course is for fuel.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the minister give an idea of how many men there are employed ?

Mr. HYMAN. I think in round numbers there are about 60.

Ottawa public buildings—elevator attendants, $11,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How many men have you ?

Mr. HYMAN. That is increased because some new elevators have been installed. There are 20 men.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Where were the new elevators put in ?

Mr. HYMAN. One in the western block and one in the militia building.

Mr. FOSTER. What do you pay your elevator boys?

Mr. HYMAN. About $45 a month.

Mr. TAYLOR. How many elevators are there altogether?

Mr. HYMAN. 11 or 12. In this vote is included the cost of an engineer for the hydraulic elevator and of a fireman.

Ottawa public buildings—gas and electric light, including roads and bridges, $24,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. You intend doing away with the gas in the front of the buildings ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have instructed the architect to look into that. I intend to have some plan made to improve the lighting.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you generate the electric light?

Mr. HYMAN. No. It is bought by contract, all from one company.

Mr. TAYLOR. What became of the appliances that we put in ourselves a few years ago?

Mr. HYMAN. I am told that they were put in at least twenty years ago.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is not twenty years since the appliances were put in the basement of this building.

Mr. HYMAN. There was no plant put in the basement of this building for the generating of electricity. Transformers were put in and they are still in use, and I am afraid that we shall have to put in another set. With only one set of transformers, if anything goes wrong with them the House is liable to be in darkness, as happened once or twice last session.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the cost of the electric light to the government?

Mr. HYMAN. About $17,000. For the first three thousand lights we pay $2.25 per light per annum, and for all over three thousand, $2 per light, each lamp being of 16-candle power.

Mr. FOSTER. How did you come at that flat rate? You must have done it on some plan other than the rule of thumb. You must have ascertained pretty nearly the cost of generation, and fixed the rate accordingly, allowing the company its reasonable profit.

Mr. HYMAN. The power of the lamps was tested.

Mr. FOSTER. The department knows or ought to know what it costs to make each of these lights. Then, the question would come up, is it cheaper to buy the light or to generate it ? Having ascertained the cost of generation, how much profit do we pay over and above that?

Mr. HYMAN. I have not got the figures.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister look into that?

Mr. HYMAN. I will. I think it is a very proper question.

Mr. TAYLOR. You supply all the wiring and all the breakages and give $2 a light for the power?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is what I do, and I get 20 lights at $30 a year to light my establishment; that is $1.50 per light.

Mr. INGRAM. During a certain number of months the lights are not used, a large number are very little used and many, I venture to say, are never used. Is the government paying $2 per light for those which are not used at all ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is no doubt about that, just as in your own house you would pay so much a light whether you used it or not

Mr. INGRAM. There is a vast difference between the two.

Mr. FOSTER. Would it not be possible to measure all the light used, and pay for it according to the amount consumed ?

Mr. HYMAN. Undoubtedly it would.

Mr. INGRAM. This city used to have a flat rate system, and those who had lights burnt them all night without paying any extra cost, but the companies do not permit that kind of thing to be done now. They have adopted the meter system. I suppose that is more profitable to the companies.

Mr. FOSTER. It may be, but the business system, both for the company and the consumer, is that the consumer should pay for what he actually uses. A flat rate saves a lot of trouble and may be better for the consumer in some cases, but the honest way is to measure everything and pay for just what you use, especially in an immense establishment like this, where you have so many lights that are not used all the time and so many used a very little part of the year. You are paying a flat rate, and may, on the whole, not be paying over much, but what I want to get at is the actual amount used, if it can be ascertained, and so come down to the basis of cost and profit.

Mr. HYMAN. I shall be very glad to have the matter looked into.

Mr. INGRAM. Is the contract let yearly?

Mr. HYMAN. It is a 10-year contract. It is some seven years ago the contract was made.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. Does the hon. minister get sixteen candle power? I have a pretty strong suspicion that the lights are not up to that standard. I think the price is not extravagant, having some little knowledge of the cost of electric lights, but I fear the lights are not up to the power claimed.

Mr. HYMAN. The arc lights are tested by the electricians of the department.

Ottawa public buildings—telephone service, $10,000.

Mr. INGRAM. What number of telephones is used?

Mr. HYMAN. Two hundred and forty-eight.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the increase over last year?

Mr. HYMAN. About ten or twelve.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there a special rate charged?

Mr. HYMAN. $35 per 'phone.

Mr. FOSTER. What is paid in the city?

Mr. HYMAN. $45 for office telephones and $25 for house telephones.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is not that excessive? In our little town we only pay the Bell Telephone Company $15 a year.

Mr. HYMAN. In the smaller towns telephone service is cheaper. Where you have connection with only 200 or 300 'phones, as in Petrolia, the cost is less than in a city, where you have connection with several thousands.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. minister ever considered the possibility of having a system of departmental telephones on the automatic plan?

Mr. HYMAN. I have given it casual consideration, but am asked by one of the departments to take the matter up, and will do so when I have the opportunity.

Mr. FOSTER. No doubt, if the hon. minister goes into it thoroughly, he will find the automatic system very much less expensive. I am not saying that because I have some connection with an automatic patent—I have not made anything out of it—but because I have had occasion to look into it, and believe it could be used to great advantage for the departmental service. You do not require anybody to look after the central office. It runs itself and is just as true, in fact truer, than the manual switch system, because that depends on human agencies. The other is a perfectly constructed machinery which will run any number of years, which is almost unwearable, and in which everything runs automatically. It has also this other great advantage, which will commend itself to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. He often wants to talk confidentially with one of his brother conspirators in some other department—the Postmaster General, for instance. He does not want any risk of being overheard. Well, the automatic system is absolutely secret. It is impossible for anybody to break in between the two who are talking. My hon. friend can see what great advantage that is.

Mr. HYMAN. I shall look into that matter.

Mr. INGRAM. That system was here a year or two ago in Ottawa.

Mr. FOSTER. There are half a dozen systems.

Heating Dominion public buildings—fuel, $75,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Is that for buildings all over the Dominion?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. Is the contract system carried out?

Mr. HYMAN. All by contract.

Some resolutions reported.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. What business are we to take up to-morrow?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The Minister of Justice will move some Bills standing in his name, and then we shall go into supply. I understand the Minister of Inland Revenue will be prepared to proceed. If his estimates are completed, the Minister of Agriculture will take up some of his items, and, if these are finished, the Minister of Public Works will go on.

Motion agreed to, House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 24, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 74) respecting the Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Railway Company.—Mr. P. Talbot by Mr. Parmelee.

Bill (No. 76) respecting the Red Deer Valley and Coal Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 77) respecting the Canadian Agency.—Mr. Bickerdike by Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 78) respecting the Macleod, Cardstone and Montana Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff by Mr. Campbell.

BATTLEFORD AND LAKE LENORE RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. PARMELEE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 75) respecting the Battleford and Lake Lenore Railway Company.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like the hon. gentleman to explain that Bill. I do not know if it is a new Bill or an extension. I have a suspicion that it is extending a very bad Bill.

Mr. PARMELEE. I think it simply asks the construction.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think we are entitled to the explanation.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 79) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—Mr. Zimmerman—by Mr. A. Johnston.

Bill (No. 80) to incorporate the Woodstock and Lake Huron Railway Company.—Mr. A. H. Clarke.

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Ottawa River Railway Company, and to change its name to the Central Trunk Railway Company.—Mr. Piché.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the First Minister as to the cause of the delay in printing of the Autonomy Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think there has been no delay so far. I am just as anxious as my hon. friend is to have the Bill printed immediately and to take it up as soon as possible. I expect to have it at the latest on Tuesday.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I ought to say that I am responsible for some of the delay that has occurred. In consequence of an error in the description of the boundaries of the provinces, I had to get that corrected, which I did as soon as the Bill was in the hands of the Clerk of the House, and I returned it to him yesterday afternoon.

MANITOBA ELECTION RETURNS.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the First Minister had an opportunity to look into the question which I put to him yesterday as to the Manitoba election returns ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I speak subject to correction, but I believe I am right, when I say that all these returns are in the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, who is an officer of this House, and it seems to me that the procedure would be to have a motion made for his attendance here. I have been waiting for my hon. friend the leader of the opposition to return in order that I might confer with him on that point. I can see no objection to that.

CONTRACTS FOR GOVERNMENT WORKS.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved second reading of Bill (No. 51) respecting contracts for government works.

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

On section 1—tenders to be invited ; exceptions ; contracts to be awarded by the Governor in Council—

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The first clause practically re-enacts the law as we have it now ; that is to say, it provides that the minister shall invite tenders for all works of which the estimated cost exceeds $5,000, the exceptions being those works which are of immediate and urgent necessity and those of which the estimated cost does not exceed $5,000. The new feature is the second paragraph, which provides that all contracts let by tender are to be let, not by the minister directly, but by the minister under the control and with the approval of the Governor in Council. Having looked into the law, I found it necessary to make this change. As a matter of fact, contracts for works costing less than $5,000 have been let without tender, but there has been no legislative sanction for that. I am making this change so as to provide for the full approval of council to every contract that is made.

Mr. HAGGART. As the laws stands, I understand that all contracts must be let by tender.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The law as contained in 31 Victoria, chapter 12, section 20, re-enacted in the Revised Statutes as chapter 36, section 13 provides that all contracts shall be let by tender except works of im-

mediate and urgent necessity ; but in 1880 an Order in Council was passed authorizing the letting of contracts without tender in which the amount involved did not exceed $5,000. When I became Minister of Justice, on looking into the matter, I found that there was no authority for such an Order in Council, and I thought it advisable to get statutory authority for the practice. The only change is in the second paragraph, which provides for the approval of the Governor in Council.

Mr. HAGGART. It is exactly as I understood. I understood that the law in the past, except so far as modified by Order in Council, was that all works should be let by tender. The Bill is to legalize what has been done, and it is a very proper provision, with regard to some departments at any rate, that all contracts should be submitted to the Governor in Council.

Mr. INGRAM. How will this affect public works which were started three or four years ago and on which large sums of money have been spent, not by contract but by day's labour?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Any works of that kind can be carried on.

Mr. INGRAM. In my constituency several thousand dollars have been spent by day's work on a harbour ; and I do not know whether the government intend to continue the work by day's work or by contract, or whether this Bill will affect that work.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not understand that this Bill will affect a work of that kind at all, because it applies only to works under contract. The fact is, the government can spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on public works by private arrangement, by simply doing the work by day's work. The law does not prevent them. It only limits the powers of the government when they decide to do work by contract.

Mr. INGRAM. I was under the impression that any public work costing over $5,000 had to be done by contract.

Bill reported.

Mr. SPEAKER. When shall the Bill be read the third time ?

Mr. HENDERSON. To-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To-morrow.

RAILWAYS AND CANALS.

Bill (No. 53) to amend the Act respecting the Department of Railways and Canals, (Mr. Emmerson) read the second time and the House went into committee.

On section 1,

1. Section 11 of the Act respecting the Department of Railways and Canals, being chapter 37 of the Revised Stautes, is repealed and the following is substituted therefor :—

11. The minister shall invite tenders, by public advertisement, for the execution of all works, except in cases of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest, or in cases in which, from the nature of the work, it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department, or in cases where the estimated cost of the work is less than $5,000, and it appears to the minister, in view of the nature of the work, that it is not advisable to invite tenders.

2. Whenever, in the case of any work, tenders are required to be, or are, invited, the minister shall submit all tenders received therefor to the Governor in Council, and the contract for the work shall be awarded under the direction of the Governor in Council.

Mr. EMMERSON. The terms are precisely those of the Bill which my hon. friend the Minister of Justice has just explained.

Mr. SPROULE. What are we to understand by the term 'the officers and servants of the department'? Would that cover any number of men the department might employ to do a certain work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That would be the officers of the department, the regular employees of the department.

Mr. HAGGART. What are officers or servants of the department ? If this clause gives the minister the privilege of employing any number of men he pleases to do any particular work, it does away with the Act altogether.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. These words are taken from the old Public Works Act, 31 Vic., and I really do not know the meaning put upon them by the different governments. Strictly and literally they would mean all those who are in the pay of the department.

Mr. HAGGART. It ought to be limited to officers and servants who are permanently in the employ of the government. For the purpose of building a dam you might utilize day labourers who are idle part of the season, and in some cases that would be more economical, but the wording is such that it will allow the minister to dispense with a contract in every case.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As these words occur in the first Bill, for which I am responsible, and the third reading of which has been held over, I will inquire and see how far we can limit the terms of the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. Your engineers are officers and servants of the department. They might hire 100 or 1,000 men to do a work. Does that term include such men as the engineers may employ ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It would not do to confine it to the permanent officials. The main point of this is to meet cases of pressing emergencies. Take for instance the work on the Welland canal. We do not keep a permanent electrician there and consequently

we require to employ, from time to time, expert electricians to meet emergencies. If you were to limit us to the employment of permanent officials you would make it impossible for the department to secure the services of an expert who in cases where there was no permanent official, could be employed.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no limitation in the case of an emergency. You can employ then as many men as you like.

Mr. TISDALE. What is the change between the old law and the present ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It consists in this. Formerly when an appropriation was made by parliament, tenders were invited for the work, and the minister let the contract himself without going to Council at all. The intention of the amendment is merely to make it incumbent on the minister to go to Council with his contract so that it may receive the sanction of Council before it is finally awarded. I am not dealing with the question raised by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) as to the meaning of the words in my Bill, but, with the meaning of the words in the original law relating to works to be executed by the officers and servants of the department. My judgment would be that the words are somewhat elastic and I suggested a moment ago, in answer to my hon. friend from Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) that the matter might be left over for consideration when the Bill is up for third reading. In the meantime, I might inquire what has been the practice in the past and what has been the construction put upon these words during the time the law has been in force, that is, since confederation. I think this is largely a question of usage and of the construction put upon the words by parliament, and we shall be able better to express it when it comes up for third reading.

Mr. TISDALE. In both Bills ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend (Mr. Tisdale) was not here when the Bills were introduced. There are three Bills. One has reference to contracts for government works. That stands in my name. It is a Bill of general application to be observed with respect to all government works. The next Bill is one to make the Act respecting railways conform with the General Act I have mentioned. I have amended the Act respecting railways and using practically the same terms as in the other. Then there is a Bill to make the Public Works Act conform with the General Act. The effect is the same in all—to compel the ministers to come to Council to get authority to let a contract.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. minister read the clause in the old Act which was repealed—section 11 of chapter 37 of the Revised Statutes. We have not that before us.

Mr. HAGGART. Here is the clause :

> The minister shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of all works, except in cases of pressing emergency——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That simply reproduces the other.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was amended subsequently.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have the amendment here :

> The minister shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of all works, except in cases of pressing emergency, in which delay would be injurious to the public interest, or in cases in which, from the nature of the work, it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department——

Then, the change comes in here :

> ——or in cases where the estimated cost is less than $5,000, and it appears to the minister, in view of the nature of the work, that it is not advisable to invite tenders.

That was the amendment of 3 Edward VII, chapter 52.

Mr. HENDERSON. Who will decide whether the matter is one of pressing emergency or not, or whether the work can or cannot be more economically executed by the officers and servants of the department, or, according to the third exception, whether it is or is not advisable to invite tenders.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The minister has been made the absolute judge since confederation. There has never been any change.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has read section 11 of chapter 37, respecting the Department of Railways and Canals, and that is the one that, by this is repealed ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And, that at present is the law of the land ?

Mr. TISDALE. So far as railways and canals are concerned.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is amended.

Mr. FOSTER. There is nothing cited here as amended, and chapter 37 of the Revised Statutes must be the legislation on that subject, so far as the Department of Railways and Canals is concerned. That section allows works to be done without tender for any of three causes. The first is where the estimated cost is less than $5,000, and it appears to the minister, in view of the nature of the work that it is not advisable to invite tenders. Now, am I right in that respect ? If so this seems to

me a change which it is not advisable to make. There is a multiplicity of small works in the Department of Railways and Canals. If an analysis were made of the work, carried on by this department, I believe that the works costing under $5,000 would be a very large proportion of the construction work done under that department. Any one conversant with the railway system knows how many of its new buildings and that sort of thing along the railway come within a cost of $5,000. This would allow the minister to do that sort of work as he pleases, without inviting tenders. And that will result in the work being given to interested persons. It will practically shut out any competition in all that class of work, and I do not think it is healthy or right to shut out that competition. If there is a station house to be built along the line of the Intercolonial, the mere fact that it will not cost more than $5,000 is no reason why we should not have healthy competition in the building of that station. And what is true with reference to such a station is true with reference to a very large class of works under the value of $5,000 in this department. Now, parliament adopts this amendment, and it will become the rule that all that class of work will go out without tender. What is the advantage of tender? It is that you may curb unnecessary expense and secure competition, it is that money of the country should be expended as economically as possible. In the case of practically every one of these works there might be competition, and the effect of that competition would be to keep down the cost of construction. If there is any virtue in the tender system and in the economical administration of the public moneys, I think we ignore or deny that principle by this legislation. I am not in favour of extending this to the Department of Railways and Canals or the Department of Public Works. As to the other two cases, the first is 'except in cases of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest.' That, I think is all right and must be in the Bill. That is to prevent injury to the public interest in certain cases. As my hon. friend pointed out, this is absolute. Then there is the third case, 'in which, from the nature of the work, it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department.'

That is in the decision of the minister, I suppose, as to whether it can so be done. But as the clause stands, he cannot do it in the case of a $5,000 expenditure, and under the arrangements, unless he does it by his officers and servants. There would be no reason for putting that in as a second case at all unless it were contemplated that these officers and servants should be the officers and servants at the time in pay of the department; otherwise it would all come in under the third case, the $5,000 expenditure, where it appears to the minister, in view of the nature of the work, that it is not advisable to invite tenders. Now, if the contention of the Minister of Railways is allowed that he can take one of his servants and make him superintendent of the job and employ help outside the employees of the department, why, that becomes as wide as it can become. I think it is dangerous and uneconomical.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As I said some time ago, we are dealing with three different chapters of the Revised Statutes. We are dealing with the chapter which has reference to the control of government work, that was a Bill I had myself in my own name; then we are dealing with the chapter which has reference to the Public Works Act, and in addition to that, we are dealing with the chapter which has reference to government railways. That is the Bill we are now dealing with. Now, with respect to government works generally, provision was made that all public works should be let by tender, that was the original provision, with two exceptions: The first was with respect to works of an immediate and urgent necessity, and the next exception was in so far as the work was carried on by the servants of the department—I forget the exact words. Now, under the law as it stood an Order in Council was passed authorizing the minister to deal with a work in which the amount involved does not exceed $5,000 without inviting tenders. That Order in Council was passed in 1880 or 1881. Finding that there was no legislative authority for that Order in Council, I deemed it advisable to amend the law accordingly, and I did amend it some two sessions ago, but only with respect to public works, not with respect to the Department of Railways and Canals. Therefore, it is necessary now to amend the law with respect to the Department of Railways and Canals so as to make it conform with the Order in Council, and also with the general provisions applicable to the Public Works Act. The amendment was made with respect to the Public Works Act two years ago by 3 Edward VII., chapter 52, and the intention is to make that principle, which was then made applicable to the Public Works, now applicable to the Railways and Canals.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no limitation in case of emergency?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Then what seems to be necessary under that, would be to define the term 'servant and officers,' and that the minister will take into consideration before the third reading.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I thought I would inquire as to what the practice has been in

the past, not the practice of recent years, but since the Act has been in force, so as to find out how far we can make an amendment which will conform to the practice itself.

Mr. FOSTER. I would rather see the Order in Council abolished.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It never had any existence in law.

Mr. HAGGART. If I remember rightly, cases of emergency, by the rules and regulations, are decided by Council.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, by the minister. My hon. friend has the experience of a mininster in that department, whereas I have not, but I think he will find that the practice has been that the minister decided.

Bill reported.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 54) to amend the Public Works Act.—Mr. Hyman.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Excise—salaries of officers and inspectors of excise, &c., to provide for increases depending upon the result of excise examinations, $390,718.75.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Inland Revenue). There is an increase of $16,156.25, made up as follows:

	Increase.	Decrease.
Inspectors..	$ 200 00	
Collectors..	1,088 75	
Deputy collectors, class 'A'	1,088 75	
Deputy collectors, class 'B'	1,820 00	
Special class, excisemen.. ..	1,550 00	
First-class excisemen.. ..	10,100 00	
Second-class excisemen.. ..	3,017 50	
Probationary class..	2,000 00	
Accountants and bookkeepers	490 00	
Stenographers and typewriters	20 00	
Third-class excisemen..		$5,380 00
Messengers..		780 00

The aggregate amount of the increases is $22,316.25 and the aggregate amount of the decreases $6,160, leaving a balance of $16,156.25. I may say that most of these increases are in accordance with the law and the regulations of the department. The case of the inspectors, for instance, is determined by law. In regard to the deputy collectors, class A and first-class excisemen, these increases are in accordance with the regulations which have been in existence for about fifteen years.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that increase of $16,156 an increase in salaries under the regulations and not due to an increase in the number of officers?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is not due to an increase in the number of officers but last year we had what we call promotion examinations among the officers, and it is determined by the regulations that all who succeed in passing these promotion examinations receive promotion to the class to which they are entitled by the number of points they get in the examinations. The largest increase is $10,100 given to the first-class excisemen. These men were second or third-class excisemen, but having passed their promotion examination they are entitled under the regulations to the promotions which they received.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the system which the hon. minister at present carries out in reference to these widely distributed officers and the inspection of them in the performance of their duties? Have you here in Ottawa and throughout the Dominion a system of inspection to ensure that these officers are looked after in their work?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have inspectors in all the provinces. Take for example the province of Quebec; there are two inspectors to look after the head offices and the out offices. We have in Quebec five divisions. We have two inspectors to look after these five divisions. Each of these divisions has a collector who is the head of the division, but besides these officers we have also two inspectors, one for the Quebec district and another for the Montreal district. These two inspectors are obliged by the regulations and the law to go and inspect all the head offices and all the out offices in the province.

Mr. FOSTER. How often are these visits of inspection made?

Mr. BRODEUR. Every three months.

Mr. FOSTER. For each district?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, and once a month for every bonded warehouse.

Mr. FOSTER. To whom do these inspectors report?

Mr. BRODEUR. To the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Do they make their reports monthly?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, after their visits. Besides that, I may add, we have four general inspectors, one inspector of distilleries, one inspector of bonded warehouses, one inspector of breweries and one inspector of tobacco factories.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are these four inspectors located?

Mr. BRODEUR. These four are among the inspectors I have just mentioned. They have to look after the inspection of their own districts, but at the same time they have a general supervision over the whole country in their particular branches. Take the inspector of cigar and tobacco factories, for instance; he is living in the city of Montreal, he is attending to his duty there as inspector of the district, and at the same

time, once a year he is supposed to visit all the tobacco factories in the country.

Mr. FOSTER. He is supposed to; he does, I suppose?

Mr. BRODEUR. As a matter of fact he does.

Mr. FOSTER. And these inspectors report directly to the deputy of the hon. minister?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the general conditions of the tobacco industry as it comes under the observation of the hon. minister's department as regards extension or growth?

Mr. BRODEUR. The Canadian tobacco industry has increased largely of late years; in fact, about eight years ago there were only about 500,000 pounds of tobacco manufactured in this country, but now we have reached an output of nearly 5,000,000 pounds.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you mean manufactured out of Canadian product?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. Some years ago when the law was changed, tobacco manufacturers were permitted to mix foreign tobacco with Canadian tobacco to the extent of ten per cent, and in this 5,000,000 pounds are included that ten per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. How is it mixed—as a wrapper?

Mr. BRODEUR. In cigar factories it is mostly used for wrappers because the imported wrappers are more suitable than the tobacco which is grown in this country, but in the manufacture of cut tobacco they use also a quantity of foreign tobacco.

Mr. FOSTER. Personally what is the hon. minister's opinion from test as to the relative merits of foreign and home grown tobacco?

Mr. BRODEUR. I may say that I am not a smoker myself. I remember that question was put to me last year by an hon. member of this House and he was much surprised to hear me say that our Canadian tobacco was just as good as foreign tobacco. I was told so by men who had some experience in the matter although my opinion was controverted by some hon. members of this House whom I have the honour to see before me just now. I would not like to express as positive an opinion as I did last year but I am told by several competent men—I will not say that those who hold a contrary opinion are not competent—that we can grow in this country a very good tobacco which can take the place of foreign leaf.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is this growth chiefly extending?

Mr. BRODEUR. The growth of tobacco is carried on especially in the counties of Essex and Kent, in Ontario and in Montcalm, Berthier, Joliette, L'Assomption and Rouville in Quebec.

Mr. FOSTER. These are practically the only sections of the Dominion in which tobacco culture is extensively carried on.

Mr. BRODEUR. Practically. There is production also in the other counties, but the tobacco raised in them is sold on the open markets and does not generally come into consumption through the manufacturers.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister still believes in radical production for the Canadian tobacco industry.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think that the protection that was given to the tobacco industry in 1896 has had a good effect, as has just been shown, because in 1896 a very small quantity of tobacco was grown or manufactured in this country. That production has now been multiplied ten times, and I suppose it will have a good effect.

Mr. FOSTER. Is any of the Canadian leaf tobacco exported ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think there is any large quantity, although some years ago an agent was sent, through the Department of Agriculture to Belgium to find if a market for our tobacco could not be opened there, but it did not result in success. I think our efforts should be to take hold of the Canadian market, and I think we can succeed in having our tobacco properly cured and properly prepared.

Mr. FOSTER. In the meantime you will compel the Canadians to consume their own product as far as possible ?

Mr. HENDERSON. Perhaps I may be responsible for some of the remarks that have been made by the minister with reference to the quality of Canadian as compared with foreign leaf. I do not desire to say one word reflecting upon the Canadian product, but I would be glad if the department with the technical knowledge they have would be able to so assist the manufacturers and producers that they would be able to assimilate the Canadian product in flavour and taste to the imported article. While the Canadian tobacco may be as good as any in the world still its flavour is sometimes repugnant to a smoker who is accustomed to using the imported tobacco. If an article is produced in Canada more like the American article, the consumption of the Canadian tobacco will be very materially increased and that of imported tobacco correspondingly reduced. I think that is the desire of the minister, I think that is what he is aiming at. It is an admirable policy and we want to encourage the home market for our produ-

cers, but we must produce an article in our own country that will, as nearly as possible, meet the wishes of the great number of smokers in this country. My own opinion is that that has not yet been accomplished, and as the quality of the leaf is equal to the foreign leaf the difficulty must be in the process of curing. When we can so cure our tobacco as to produce the flavour of the American tobacco we will find that the consumption of Canadian leaf in this country will be very much increased.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I quite agree with the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson). I myself come from the tobacco district. I do not know whether the minister uses tobacco himself or not, but if he does I shall be very glad to take him down there and give him samples of the very best tobacco, as I believe, that is grown in the world. We grow the quality of leaf there and I quite agree with the hon. member for Halton that it is in the curing that we fall behind. I was speaking recently to a manufacturer of tobacco in my own town, an ardent supporter of the government, who told me that Canadian leaf, properly cured, is equal to any tobacco which is imported.

Mr. BRODEUR. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It is an industry which is growing very rapidly, and I must give the present government credit for fostering that industry to some extent. I believe that a great deal could be done to assist tobacco growing in our country. I know that we grow it there and our farmers have found it a profitable crop at present prices. I believe the industry should be assisted and that the farmers should be encouraged in the growing of tobacco. Under these conditions our people would be able to supply the largest part of the tobacco consumed in this country. I would ask the minister to make every effort to assist us in that district in encouraging the trade. I might also say to the hon. minister that I agree with the hon. member for Halton and that the advice I have from manufacturers there is that a great deal could be done to improve the curing of Canadian leaf. I believe that the fault with our tobacco, at the present time, lies there.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am very glad of the expressions of opinion which I have just heard from the hon. members. Since I have been at the head of the department I have taken a great interest in the question of tobacco growing and of fostering, as much as possible, the increased production and consumption of Canadian tobacco. I do not know why we should not succeed in having in this country Canadian tobacco consumed instead of foreign leaf tobacco. I think that we can produce in this country just as good an article as the imported tobacco. Perhaps we cannot, in some instances, produce a leaf just as nice as those imported from Sumatra or Havana; but there is no reason why good plug smoking and chewing tobacco should not be made entirely from Canadian leaf. It has been suggested that the curing of the tobacco in Canada has not been very good. Our producers have not perhaps been very successful in that respect; but the government has taken every possible means to encourage them to give us a first-class leaf. A few months ago we sent to the state of Wisconsin, which has a similar climate to ours, some persons to study this question with reference to how the seeding is done and how the tobacco is cured. The governor of the state was good enough to place at the disposal of our agents his extensive farm, and to show them the various processes. They have reported to the Department of Agriculture, to which the question pertains more than it does to mine; but, at the same time, I am taking an active interest in the question, I feel strongly upon it, and I am going to do my best, and the government is going to do its best, to foster this industry in Canada. We found that the seeds used in Canada were not the best, and the two agents who visited Wisconsin are now delivering lectures in some parts of the country, and are supplying better seeds to the farmers. My opinion is that we should make extensive experiments on the experimental farm here. The Minister of Agriculture has already done something in that respect. I think we should try various kinds of seeds. I am glad to see that the feeling of this House is in favour of extending the production of Canadian leaf, and hon. members may rest assured that nothing shall be spared on my part, or on the part of the goverment, to encourage that industry, which is a very important one and deserves all the protection possible. We have been asked on several occasions by my hon. friend the Speaker and by other members to establish experimental farms in the districts where tobacco is produced on a large scale. We are considering that question, and if we find a means of making experiments on the experimental farm, we may afterwards establish experimental stations in some of the tobacco-growing districts.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I want to congratulate the minister on the efforts he is making on behalf of our tobacco growers. As an illustration, I may mention that only a short time ago I asked a tobacco manufacturer in my city if there was any prospect of our Canadian leaf being manufactured into cigars, and he told me that he had made some cigars from tobacco which had been cured for about four years, and had given some of them to some expert American cigar men who had been over here, and they pronounced them the best cigars they had ever smoked. Therefore, it seems to me that there is no reason why our Canadian tobacco could not be manufactured into cigars.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have not much confidence in the production of tobacco at the experimental farm at Ottawa. I think the minister will find it to be an absolute failure owing to the frost. The experiments should be carried on in a climate not so susceptible to early frosts. The production of tobacco in this country is not the difficulty. The counties of Essex and Kent alone, along with the counties in Quebec which the hon. minister has named, would produce far more tobacco than would be consumed in this country. The difficulty is that the flavour of the Canadian tobacco is not what the great bulk of the people of this country want. Whether it is better than or not as good as that of American tobacco, I will not undertake to say; but if you are going to obtain a large consumption of Canadian tobacco for ordinary smoking purposes, you must secure a flavour like that of the American leaf. For instance, if you can get a flavour similar to that of the tobacco manufactured by Sir William Macdonald in which I understand there is no Canadian leaf, there is no reason why you cannot supplant the American leaf ; and I am sure that could be done. There ought to be scientific knowledge enough in this country to discover where the defect is and to bring about the desired result. When you do that, people will buy the Canadian tobacco, not knowing whether it is Canadian or American, and you will have a very large consumption of our native tobacco. The production will take care of itself. Although there is only a limited area in the counties of Essex and Kent devoted to tobacco growing, that area produces an enormous crop. It makes a man think well of his country to pass through those counties and see the immense tobacco crop in those small fields ; and the production is capable of any degree of expansion. But let me impress this upon the minister, that he must exert himself to assist the curers of tobacco to obtain a flavour similar to that of American tobacco ; then I am satisfied that the consumption will go on as rapidly as we desire.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not wish to express my own personal opinion as to the superiority of the Canadian leaf or of the foreign leaf ; but I have been told by many competent persons that the supposed inferiority of Canadian tobacco is a mere matter of prejudice. I have known several persons who, after having smoked for years tobacco made by Macdonald, which is made entirely from foreign leaf, afterwards tried Canadian tobacco made by some other Canadian company, and declared it to be just as good as the other. I think it is more a matter of prejudice than anything else, and I hope that every one who smokes will try our good Canadian tobacco, and that the farmers will do their best to put on the market a first-class article.

Mr. HENDERSON. The minister may be right ; it may be largely a question of taste. I am not saying that the Canadian tobacco is not as good as the American. It may be ; but that taste exists, and if we are going to have a large sale of Canadian tobacco, we must cater to the taste of the larger number. A very large number of smokers in this country prefer the flavour of tobacco made from the American leaf, and the efforts of the hon. minister should be along the line of assimilating the taste of the Canadian leaf to that of the American leaf. The moment that is accomplished, he will secure for Canadian tobacco a monopoly of the sale in this country.

Mr. BRODEUR. Some seeding has been done on the experimental farm and some small experiments made with some success, but I do not think that the frost is prejudicial in this section to the growth of Canadian tobacco. Take the county of Montcalm, which is in the same latitude as Ottawa, there very good Canadian tobacco is grown, just as good as that produced in the south. The state of Wisconsin is in the same latitude as Ottawa, why, therefore should we not produce in this section as good tobacco as is grown in Wisconsin ? The industry is in its infancy, but it is the duty of the government to protect that industry as far as possible and do everything possible to stimulate it.

Mr. SPROULE. The area in which you can grow tobacco in Canada is not at all limited. I saw tobacco grown forty years ago in districts where the frost was a great deal worse than it is to-day, and where you could not then grow wheat. There is no doubt a great deal of truth in the explanation of the hon. minister that the foreign leaf is preferred to the Canadian, simply because the people have acquired a taste for it. Let them begin to smoke Canadian leaf and they will find it just as palatable as the tobacco made by Sir Wm. Macdonald, of Montreal. I remember twenty years ago an old smoker telling me that he had smoked the Canadian twist made by the French habitant for 50 years and it was the best tobacco you could get. There is a lot of talk about the French, he said, but as long as they can make good tobacco, may God prosper them. Tobacco has been grown up in the Georgian Bay district, to my personal knowledge, for forty years, and can be grown in almost any county in Canada. But what I rose more particularly to inquire about was whether the government had made any effort at the experimental farm to ascertain whether tobacco could not be successfully grown in the prairies of the west, just as it is in the western prairies of the United States.

Mr. BRODEUR. I cannot say whether experiments have been made in the west, but I am inclined to think not. I shall be glad however to call attention to the suggestion which I think is a very good one.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand from the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) that if we could grow tobacco similar to that manufactured by Sir Wm. Macdonald in Montreal, that would settle the question at once. Is there any Canadian grown used in that manufactured by Sir William ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think the proportion is five million pounds of Canadian tobacco against nine million of foreign leaf show the increasing popularity of our tobacco.

Mr. GUNN. Does he use Canadian leaf ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, he might use Canadian leaf, but his license is only for foreign leaf. I have been told, however, that in some cases those who have licenses for foreign leaf use the Canadian leaf. They pay the same duty as on the foreign leaf, 25 cents per pound, and mix up the Canadian leaf with the foreign, but I do not think Sir Wm. Macdonald uses any foreign leaf.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. Representing, as I do, a constituency in which tobacco is very largely grown, I wish to express my appreciation of the fostering influence which the policy of this government has had on that industry. In South Essex the growth of tobacco was begun earlier than in any other county of Ontario. Before the birth of any hon. gentleman in this House, the French Canadians there grew their own tobacco, and have been smoking it with a great deal of pleasure ever since. It is not many years ago when they could only get 4 cents a pound for their tobacco and then could only sell it with difficulty, but during the past year, under present conditions, they have sold at least 3,000,000 pounds and realized some $300,000 when they could not realize much from other crops on account of the wetness of the season. The people will commend the government if the government will not only continue the present policy of protecting the Canadian leaf but also establish some experimental station in South Essex in order that the leaf may be perfected so as to suit the taste of even the most particular. In Kingsville, cigars are now being manufactured wholly of Canadian leaf and a most successful trade is expected to be developed in that line. I would urge the government to continue the work of perfecting and protecting the Canadian leaf in every way possible.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood the hon. minister to say that all these different points were inspected at least once a year. If he will turn to K—51, he will find that the Auditor General complains that the inspectors have not furnished certain information, and that Montreal had not been inspected since April, 1900. In his letter to the department of March 21, 1903, he complains that the city of Montreal has not been inspected since 1900, and no explanation is given.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is a matter which is brought to my attention for the first time and I shall inquire into it. The regulations provide for an inspection at least once a year.

Mr. INGRAM. The peculiar point about this is the remarkable fact that there has been no reply by the department to the Auditor General's letter.

Excise—to provide for duty pay to officers serving longer hours at other than special survey, $1,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The amount is small ; to whom does it go?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to pay deserving officers engaged in special service on account of the long hours, and, in some cases the disagreeable character of their work. In some cases they serve from 7 a.m. to 6 p.m., being required to be present from the time the factory opens until it closes in the evening.

Mr. FOSTER. Among how many officers is that divided?

Mr. BRODEUR. About twenty. Last year we spent about $700 on this account.

Excise—preventive service, $13,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What do the officers do for this service besides drawing their salaries?

Mr. BRODEUR. The preventive service, as my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) knows is to prevent violation of the laws and to effect seizures where violations have taken place. These officers move about the country, and, wherever they find violations to have taken place, they make seizures. I am informed that last year, about sixty seizures were made. The presence of those officers in the community has a good effect and is itself a prevention of violation of the law.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the fewness of the seizures prove that violations are few, or does it mean that the officers do not discover them.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think the violations are very few. We have first-class men connected with this service, some of whom have been with the department for many years. They are deserving men and are doing their best.

Mr. FOSTER. Do these preventive officers get any part of the proceeds of a fine?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, I think the seizing officer, if he is a preventive officer, is given one-half the proceeds of the seizure.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice that the payments made last year to informers represent a small total and were paid to but few persons. The total amount paid was $838,

so that the total value of the seizures would be only about $1,600.

Mr. BRODEUR. The penalties imposed by the judge usually are not large. They run from $5 to $100.

Mr. FOSTER. If a penalty is imposed and yet nothing can be collected, does the informer get anything?

Mr. BRODEUR. We pay, in that case, one-quarter of the amount.

Mr. FOSTER. The idea being what?

Mr. BRODEUR. It has been the custom in the department for many years. And it tends to encourage the giving of the information.

Excise—travelling expenses, rent, fuel, stationery, &c., $62,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How does the minister regulate the travelling expenses of the officers?

Mr. BRODEUR. In some cases officers must go to new places to remain for some time. If a bonded factory or brewery is started in a new place, we cannot choose a local man as officer, one who has not had experience. We have to send an officer from the department to look after the new establishment for a certain time. In that case, we pay not only travelling expenses but board.

Mr. FOSTER. How are the travelling expenses arranged?

Mr. BRODEUR. They are paid what they actually spend in travelling.

Mr. FOSTER. For which they have to give vouchers?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, as in the other departments.

Mr. BARR. How does the minister account for the increase in this estimate over last year?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have to open new offices almost every month. New breweries, bonded factories and bonded warehouses are opened, and these have to be provided for. In fact, the expense is larger on account of the increase of population and consequently in the work.

Excise—to pay collectors of customs allowance for duty collected by them for 1904-5, $5,500.

Mr. FOSTER. What does that mean?

Mr. BRODEUR. In some places, where we do not wish to appoint a regular officer of the department, we obtain the services of the customs collector, to whom we pay 5 per cent on collections up to $3,000, over $3,000 and up to $5,000, $100 per annum; over $5,000 and up to $10,000, $200 per annum; and over $10,000, $250 per annum. There is less expense than in the appointment of a regular officer.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister do that in every case where it can be reasonably done?

Mr. BRODEUR. In most of the cases where we can find a suitable officer in the Department of Customs, we generally make use of his services.

Excise—L. A. Frechette, for special translation, $100.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the special translation?

Mr BRODEUR. We have special regulations and departmental reports to be translated. Take, for example, the bulletins of the department. These call for special knowledge on the part of the translator, because of the many technical expressions used. Therefore, we secure the assistance of Mr. Frechette who is the chief translator of the House of Commons. The documents to which I refer are not tabled in this House, so we cannot get them translated by the regular officers of the House. They are simply departmental documents.

Provisional allowance of not more than $100 each to officers in British Columbia, Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, whose salaries from any government source do not exceed $1,000, $1,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. The reason for this vote is that we cannot get, in the provinces named, officers of the same class that we can get in the eastern provinces and for the same pay. As an instance, I may mention that I asked an hon. member of this House to recommend somebody for an office in British Columbia, and the party recommended absolutely refused to take the position at $500, which was the sum at which he would have to enter upon his work. Some years ago provision was made that all officers having a salary of $800 should receive $100 additional, and now we find it necessary to make this additional provision.

To enable the department to supply methylated spirits to manufacturers, the cost of which will be recouped by the manufacturers to whom it is supplied, and to pay for rent, light, power, freight, salaries, &c., $60,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This sum is to enable the department to purchase alcohol and wood naphtha for the manufacture of methylated spirits to supply manufacturers, and to pay for rent, light, power, freight, salaries, &c. The amount expended the last fiscal year was $50,645.06, and $26,466.91 for the last six months, expiring on the 1st of January last. The manufacture of methylated spirits was taken over from the bonded manufacturers and carried on by the department, as a protection to the revenue, July 1, 1888. It was known that these methylated spirits were being used as a substitute for genuine potable spirits, which was objectionable, not only from a

revenue standpoint, but as well on the grounds of injury to the public health. The duty was only 15 per cent per proof gallon as against the then duty of $1.30, and the existing duty of $1.90 on spirits. It was thus deemed necessary to take sole control of its manufacture and to supply it to responsible persons for stated purposes. Two grades were established, viz.: No. 1, consisting of about 25 per cent of wood naphtha, and No. 2, consisting of about 50 per cent. Grade No. 1 is supplied to varnish and other manufacturers who have obtained the necessary permit from the department, and who have entered into bonds, with sureties in the sum of $2,000, that such spirits shall only be used for the purposes mentioned, and in the premises described in their application. The present price of this grade is $1.10 per gallon.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you fix that price ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We take about 15 per cent profit. If we use 75 per cent of wood alcohol for which we pay $1.40 and 25 per cent of grain alcohol, for which we pay about 25 cents, we add about 15 per cent to the cost of the raw material. As I say, the present price of this grade is $1.10 per gallon. It is used for the manufacture of varnish, liquid glue, mucilage, inks, leather dressings, stove and shoe polish, soap, &c. Grade No. 2 is supplied to the trade for burning, &c., without the issue of a permit, and without entering into bonds. This is due to the fact that the percentage of wood naphtha is so large that its use for potable purposes would be impossible. The reason of the price of the latter being higher than the better grade is owing to the large quantity of wood naphtha used, which costs the department $1.40 as against 25 cents per gallon paid for alcohol. Last year we bought $43,332.55 worth, and we sold for $68,325.69.

Mr. FOSTER. Where did you get your raw material ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We used to buy it from the Standard Chemical Company.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are their works ?

Mr. BRODEUR. They have works at Cookshire, Fenelon Falls, and I think Toronto.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these all the places in which they manufacture ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Those are the only places that I remember. I think they have four or five places.

Mr. BARR. How do you buy ?

Mr. BRODEUR. A contract was made some years ago with the Standard Chemical Company when the system was introduced here. The first contract was made with the Rathbun Company, and they refused to carry it out, and we gave it to the Standard Chemical Company. I think that company is a combination of the Rathbun Company and the Standard Chemical Company, that is my impression. The contract ceased some years ago and was not renewed. After I entered the department I concluded it was not a very good system, and that it would be better to call for tenders, and we did call for tenders in the months of December and January. I am not quite sure, but I think the contract is to be awarded to some other firm.

Mr. BARR. What is the lowest tender ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $1.29. The contract was given to the lowest tenderer with one exception—I must be frank with the House —there was a tender from an American firm offering to supply an American article free of duty ; but I refused to accept that tender, and recommended Council to accept the lowest tender for the Canadian article.

Mr. FOSTER. What did you pay before ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $1.40, now we are getting it at $1.29.

Mr. INGRAM. What method did the hon. gentleman adopt in calling for tenders ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We advertised in the newspapers for tenders for the supply of wood naphtha of a certain quality, which was to be approved by the department. We advertised in all the important papers of the country. The accountant informs me that he paid for advertisements in twenty-five papers.

Mr. BARR. Were any of those papers in Toronto ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, there was the 'News,' I am informed, and the Toronto 'Globe,' of course.

Salaries of officers, inspectors and assistant inspectors of weights and measures, $63,750.

Mr. INGRAM. Is there any report published by the department giving a detailed statement of the inspections made by the different inspectors of gas and electric plants ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is a report which will be found in Part II.

Mr. INGRAM. It is a very limited report merely giving the number of plants inspected.

Mr. BRODEUR. It covers several pages of the report. I do not know whether my hon. friend has seen it or not but it is in the second part of the Inland Revenue Report.

Mr. INGRAM. I have not seen the one for this year but I have seen it in other years'. A number of municipalities throughout the

Dominion, in Ontario, at all events, are very much interested in what they call municipal ownership, and they are very eager to secure information which the inspection of these various plants will give them. The only source from which they can get that information is through the government inspection.

Mr. BRODEUR. The report, as far as gas inspection is concerned, is to be found at pages 22-52 of the Inland Revenue Report. There are thirty pages devoted to the inspection of gas.

Mr. INGRAM. Is the method of reporting now adopted the same as it has been for years ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, the same system.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the inspection of weights and measures being carried on in the same basis as it was eight or ten years ago ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, there has been an improvement in respect to weights and measures.

Mr. FOSTER. What has been done ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We thought a good way to deal with the question would be to have a chief inspector here. Some years ago we appointed a chief inspector who is looking after the work that is done by inspectors and assistant inspectors of weights and measures. He is looking after their accounts and at the same time wherever there is a complaint, he, being a practical man, goes and investigates the matter. I am doing my best to prevent a continuation of the deficit which has been met with for many years in that branch of the service.

Mr. FOSTER. What does it stand at now ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Before I took charge of the department there was a deficit of $25,000 while last year there was a deficit of $18,000. I am strongly of the opinion that both ends should come together.

Mr. FOSTER. How are you going to make the two ends come together ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have asked the inspector to look into the accounts and report ways in which more economy can be observed. I feel certain that we will be successful in reducing the deficit.

Mr. FOSTER. Are weights for the whole Dominion inspected every year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Every two years.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you find many complaints as to wrong weights and measures ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, not many, I think the law has a very good effect. I am inclined to believe that if we give that branch of the service close attention we will succeed in having a first-class service.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the hon. gentleman increased the number of inspectors throughout the country ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, quite the contrary. In some places I have even refused to make new appointments because I found it was not necessary to do so.

Mr. WHITE. Is there a uniform charge for the inspection of weights and measures ? Are the manufacturers of scales, of whom there are several in the Dominion, charged the same rate as ordinary individuals for inspection ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, they are charged the same rate.

Mr. INGRAM. In the matter of the metric system would the hon. minister explain what success he is meeting with ? The hon. gentleman will remember that last year we had Professor McLennan before the committee.

Mr. BRODEUR. As to the metric system I last year got a certain sum of money in order to disseminate, to as great an extent as possible, a knowledge of the system throughout the country. We have distributed to high schools and important schools generally metric sets in order to teach the school boys the system. It is now becoming more generally used in the schools of the country and the generation which is now growing up will certainly be au fait with it. I have been in communication with Lord Strathcona on the question, and he has kept me posted as to what is being done in England in that respect. It is not to be forgotten that last year a Bill was introduced into the House of Lords providing for the introduction of the metric system thus rendering the metric system compulsory in England. The Bill passed the House of Lords and was sent to the House of Commons but parliament adjourned before the question was decided by the House of Commons. I think the matter will come this year before the House of Commons in England. I have obtained copies of the Bill and the report of the discussion on the subject in England and I will be very glad to show these to any hon. member who would like to become acquainted with the Bill and discussions which have taken place there.

Mr. INGRAM. In pressing for the adoption of the metric system does the hon. minister meet with any opposition from any quarters ?

Mr. BRODEUR. So far we have had no strong opposition. The only representations which the department has received have been in favour of the adoption of the system.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. minister said that most of the high schools were being supplied with metric sets. Last year the hon. minister was good enough to send to the high school in my county one of the

sets. Where there is a second or third high school in the county will more than one be supplied ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly ; wherever there is a high school, whether there are several in the county or not it does not make any difference. I would be glad to supply the schools referred to by my hon. friend with one of the sets each.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am very much obliged to the hon. minister and I will be glad to make another application to him for sets.

Mr. TAYLOR. About two weeks ago I left a letter in the hon. minister's office from the head master of the high school at Gananoque. I have had no answer to it yet. I hope instructions have been given to ship the metric system set which was asked for.

Mr. BRODEUR. It must have been sent. However, I will inquire into it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I left the letter addressed to the hon. minister with the hon. gentleman's secretary.

Mr. BRODEUR. It must have been overlooked because I usually answer all letters sent to me.

Rent, fuel, travelling expenses, postage, stationery, &c., for weights and measures, including amount for purchase of standards of the metric system, salaries and other expenses of inspectors, &c., $35,000.

Mr. FOSTER. These are standards for use at Ottawa ; are they ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What do they cost ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Do you mean the metric system sets ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. BRODEUR. $8.33 each.

Mr. FOSTER. What are these standards ? Are they what you call metric system sets ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, they are metric system sets which have been imported from France.

Mr. FOSTER. How many of these are you purchasing, and what is the idea ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am giving one to each high school.

Mr. BARR. Are you sending to each school or only to those that apply ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am waiting for applications.

Mr. FOSTER. The purpose is just to educate the country up to it.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. To put it in the hands of teachers to educate the children attending the schools.

Mr. HENDERSON.

Mr. FOSTER. And when you have done the educational work, you are going to introduce the system ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Nothing has yet been decided as to that, but I suppose it will have to come. If this system is adopted in England, as is likely, I suppose we will have to do the same thing and also if it is adopted in the United States. I spoke of the movement that is going on in England and I may say that in the United States a very strong movement is being made with regard to the introduction of the system there. When it is introduced in England and the United States we will have to follow suit.

Mr. FOSTER. You do not propose to get a little ahead of them ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have not yet decided as to that.

Mr. FOSTER. It is worth thinking about.

Salaries of inspectors of gas and electric light, $25,000.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queen's, P.E.I.) What fees are chargeable by these inspectors of electric light and gas ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The average cost per meter is $1 for five years. There is a regular tariff.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the minister give us the instructions to the inspectors? What information are they supposed to supply to the department ?

Mr. BRODEUR. They have to inspect the meters which are brought to be inspected, they have in each office an apparatus to test electric light meters and those who want their meters inspected bring them there. They are inspected and stamped and certificates are given.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Are these fees paid by the consumer or by the company ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The fee is paid by the owner of the meter in all cases. If there is some difficulty between the contractor and the consumer, and the consumer wants to have his meter inspected, he asks for the inspection, and if there has been some mistake in favour of the consumer the contractor has to pay for the inspection. The same thing applies to gas meters.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Is any person appointed by the department to instruct these inspectors as to the manner in which they shall perform their duty ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, instructions are of course issued as to the manner in which the inspection shall be made.

Mr. BARR. Is there any fixed charge that they can assess the consumer.?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, there is a charge. It is set forth in the Order in Council pass-

ed January 31, 1899. For meters of the capacity of ten lights and under, 75 cents; for meters of ten lights and not exceeding 20, $1.25; for meters from 20 to 30 lights, $1.75; for meters from 30 to 45 lights, $2.25; for meters from 45 to 60 lights, $2.75; for meters from 60 to 80 lights, $3; for meters from 80 to 100 lights, $3.50. This is for once in five years.

Mr. WHITE. With reference to the item of electric light inspection, I understand that the collectors of excise revenue in small towns are expected to perform that duty.

Mr. BRODEUR. The collectors simply collect the inspection fees.

Mr. WHITE. Take the case of the town I live in. The inspector lives in Ottawa. Have his expenses to be paid by the parties asking his services if he goes to inspect an electric meter or a number of electric meters at Pembroke? Are the expenses from here to that town added to the fees?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, that is paid by the department.

Mr. INGRAM. There is very little information in this blue book based on the reports of the electric light inspectors. Nothing is given as to the amount invested in each plant, the output of gas or electric light. Supposing a man wants to obtain information, for instance as to the amount of machinery and the output of electric light and gas companies, in order that municipalities desiring to go into the ownership of these services can obtain information as to the cost, there is no information of that kind furnished in this report. What I am now asking is whether it would be possible to have a report of the inspectors giving the cost of machinery in the various gas and electric light plants and the output. I do not mean to have them go into details as to the profit and loss because that would be unreasonable, but such a report as I have indicated would be of value to the municipality.

Mr. BRODEUR. The interference of the department in the question of gas and electric light is simply for the purpose of testing the measures that are used in connected with the gas and electric light; that is the full scope of the work of our department.

Mr. FOSTER. And it is not compulsory?

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh yes, it is compulsory, every meter has to be inspected. My hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) is asking me whether we could not give in our reports the output of each company and the amount of work which they are doing and all the figures that would be given, say, in a census of those companies. That does not at all pertain to our department. What we have to do is simply to inspect the measures used by those companies. We have no means of ascertaining their output, their wealth and their revenue. That does not pertain at all to our work, we have simply to test the measures. We test the weights used by a merchant but we are not supposed to find out how much business that man is doing and what he is worth. It is the same with the gas and electric light companies, and I do not think it would be possible, certainly it would be outside the scope of the present Act, to ask for this information because we have no right to get this information from these companies.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Supposing that the inspector found that the meters supplied by the company were of an inferior quality? Would it be his duty to make a report to the department?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, it is his duty to report to the department.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Then whose duty would it be to take measures to compel the company to supply proper meters?

Mr. BRODEUR. The company is notified to see that its gas is purified; and if it does not do so, it is subject to the penalty.

Mr. FOSTER. The verdict is only as to the quality of the gas?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the state of the ledger in regard to the electric light inspection?

Mr. BRODEUR. The revenue from gas and electric light inspection last year was $50,218.25, and the expenses, $33,426.15.

Mr. FOSTER. In these expenses you include everything?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes; all the expenses in connection with the service.

Mr. FOSTER. How does the account stand in weights and measures?

Mr. BRODEUR. The expenditures last year were $84,768.82, and the receipts, $66,355.19.

Mr. FOSTER. Taking the two together you are about on an even basis. That is satisfactory as far as it goes. I have always had the opinion, and have tried to enforce it, that these are services that ought not to involve the government in any cost. They are business operations in which the revenue ought to be made to cover every expense that is incurred.

Metric system—to provide for the delivery of lectures and the publication of maps, charts, pamphlets, &c., relating to the metric system of weights and measures, $3,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Who is going to do the lecturing?

Mr. BRODEUR. No lectures have been given yet. My idea last year, when I first asked for this vote, was to send some person to deliver lectures before the various

boards of trade and such bodies as the Canadian clubs throughout the country. Last year I invited Professor McLennan, of Toronto University, to come and deliver a lecture here. He was kind enough to do so, and gave us a very interesting lecture, of which a number of copies have been distributed, and we are frequently asked to have more printed for distribution in the schools. My idea would be to have a small phamplet explanatory of the system prepared and placed in the hands of all the teachers and children in the public schools of the country. We have distributed sets of the metric system among the high schools, and we should distribute these little pamplets among the teachers and children in the lower schools. I think that would tend to popularize the system. As I have said, we may expect in a year or two to introduce and render compulsory the metric system in this country, especially if it is adopted in the countries with which we deal, such as England, the United States and Australia.

Mr. FOSTER. My impression is that you would not gain very much from a general distribution of a pamphlet among the school children; but I think it would be a good idea to distribute instructions on the subject among the teachers, so that they could give it to those who would make some use of it. I should think it would be an excellent idea to distribute among the teachers a pamphlet which would be explicit, definite, and not too long.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is part of the work I intended to do.

Adulteration of food and fertilizers, and the administration of the Act respecting fraudulent marking, $30,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Give us an idea of what is going on in that.

Mr. BRODEUR. The Adulteration of Food Act provides that food inspectors shall collect samples of food in different parts of the country every time they are so requested by the department. The samples so collected are sent either to the district analyst or to the department in Ottawa to be analysed. The result of the analysis is then published in bulletins, which are distributed to the members, and also published in our annual report. We find that a great many articles are adulterated, and my intention is to pursue a very aggressive policy with respect to these adulterations. For example, last year we had analysed some spices, most of which were found to be adulterated. The same was true with regard to jams and jellies. Samples of liquor were collected and, strange to say, most of them were found to be absolutely pure, except for the addition of a large quantity of water, which is not an adulteration under the Adulteration Act. We find that maple sugar and maple syrup are adulterated on a very large scale.

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. FOSTER. What with?

Mr. BRODEUR. With all sorts of things. Generally sugar cane and glucose are used, which are adulterations according to the Act, unless the manufacturers state on the label that the article is a compound. In some instances we have taken proceedings to obtain convictions against those violating the law.

Mr. BARR. Is it not a fact that several establishments in Montreal and other places manufacture very large quantities of what they call maple sugar from cane sugar and so on, which they ship to the old country with the result that the legitimate trade is being ruined?

Mr. BRODEUR. The chief analyst received instructions a few days ago to look into that question. It has been found, as my hon. friend has just said, that manufacturing houses are now making what they call maple sugar, but what has never seen the maple tree. It is my duty to see that these violations of the law are punished, and I intend doing so as early as possible.

Mr. FOSTER. We have had an adulteration of Food Act a number of years, can my hon. friend give us an idea as to what progress has been made in purifying the food stuffs of the country?

Mr. BRODEUR. The publication of the bulletins has had a good effect, but we shall have to follow a more aggressive policy. Last year I found that in spices the adulteration was in some cases simply horrible. I may say the same with regard to jams and jellies, but I must say, to the credit of the manufacturers, that they came to Ottawa to interview the department and agreed to take proper means to prevent adulteration in the future.

Mr. BARR. Have there been many actions taken under the Act? Last year, I believe, there was more adulteration than ever. Take for instance this manufacture of so called maple sugar, which has never seen the maple tree. Then take our jams and jellies, according to reports, the adulteration is worse in these than ever before.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am not ready to admit that the adulteration in jams and jellies is increasing, because I have the formal promise of all the manufacturers—of most of them at all events—that they will cease using glucose in such large quantities. There were strawberry jams manufactured, for instance, which were perfectly innocent of any strawberry. They were made out of apples which were boiled with some salicylic acid and glucose and sometimes hayseeds were used to make the mixture look like strawberry jam.

Mr. BARR. I am afraid we are making little progress in stamping out this adulter-

ation. Take our white wine vinegar, maple vinegar, and so on, it is well known that most of these are impure. It does seem to me that if a collection were made of these adulterations and the law vigorously applied, you would see a great improvement in a few months. But unless the law be applied vigorously, I am afraid you will not accomplish anything.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend drew my attention to the question of adulterated maple sugar. Well, since a few months we have secured five convictions.

Mr. BARR. That is a start.

Mr. BRODEUR. I hope it will go on. I am very well disposed to do my best because it is very important that our maple sugar industry should not be ruined.

Mr. HENDERSON. No doubt the information furnished by the chief analyst is very desirable and useful, but I fear a great deal of labour is spent to very little purpose, because that information does not reach the general public. What system has the minister of distributing the bulletins ? A member of parliament may get two copies and those may be the only ones that will reach his county.

Mr. BRODEUR. We are giving the bulletins to the members of both Houses and to those who are entitled to the distribution of public documents. More than that we distribute them gratuitously to all those who ask for them and send copies besides to all the vendors of the articles analysed. It would perhaps be better if a more general distribution were made.

Mr. FOSTER. How many were distributed last year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. A thousand copies of each bulletin and twelve bulletins were issued.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. This is a matter of great importance, especially to those firms which are trying their best to give the people a good article. I know of several industries that try to provide pure jams and jellies, but they are handicapped by men who are selling inferior articles at reduced prices. Would it not be wise for the hon. minister to spend a certain amount of money in publishing these bulletins in the weekly or daily papers ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The suggestion is a good one, but I would not like to accept if off hand, because the publication of these bulletins in the press would cost a great deal of money. I shall however, consider it carefully. Certainly, 12,000 bulletins is a very small number to be distributed throughout the country, and the people whom the information would most interest do not receive the bulletins at all, whereas if the matter appeared in the daily newspapers, it would reach those for whom it is intended, and would be of interest to all. I know a gentleman who put $15,000 into an industry of this kind only last year, and already he finds the inferior goods contracting his markets to a very great extent, because they are sold at low prices.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the minister's outside machinery for detecting adulteration ?

Mr. BRODEUR. In each district, we have a food inspector. Instructions are sent to these inspectors, from time to time to collect samples of the goods. Say, for instance, an inspector is instructed to collect samples of maple sugar. From a certain dealer he takes three samples. One of these is left within the vendor and the other two are sent either to the department here, or to the district analyst. And these are analysed.

Mr. FOSTER. He only collects samples as he is instructed to do so ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. He gets instructions from the department to collect samples of certain articles and he does so.

Mr. FOSTER. Are the food inspectors kept busy at that ?

Mr. BRODEUR. These men, as a rule, are not only food inspectors but excise officers also, and, when not engaged in the collection of food samples, they are attending to other business.

Mr. FOSTER. I see here in the Auditor General's Report entries showing that one Thomas Kidd is a food inspector who is paid $500 salary and $116 for travelling expenses. He has an allowance for rent of office and so on. If he only collects samples as he is instructed to do, it seems to me Mr. Kidd does not do a very large amount of work.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think his inspection district covers the whole of Ontario, west of Toronto.

Mr. FOSTER. But he cannot have done very much to cover that district, because the travelling expenses with which he is charged amount to only $116. That would not carry him very far. It would be interesting to know just how many collections of samples this inspector has made. Does he have to travel to collect these samples ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. The indications are that he did not do much travelling ; and, if not much travelling then not much collecting ; if not much collecting, then he has not done much for his salary, because I see he is confined to this duty.

Mr. BRODEUR. Many samples have been collected during the year, including a proportion from Mr. Kidd's district. Travelling in that district would not be so expensive as in others covering a larger area. In any

case Mr. Kidd's is a special case; I think my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will not find any other food inspectors but have other work to do as excise officers, inspectors of weights and measures or otherwise in connection with the department's work. Mr. Kidd is the only case and I see that he was appointed in 1890.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not a question of when he was appointed, but whether the government are spending money and not getting due service for it. The other food inspectors seem to receive small salaries, and I imagine that most of them must do something else.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is true of all of them except Mr. Kidd. I was saying that he had been appointed many years ago, and I suppose that that is the reason he has no other work in connection with the department.

Mr. FOSTER. The inspectors seem to go only when they are instructed. Perhaps the minister has not given instructions to Mr. Kidd.

Mr. INGRAM. Has not the department changed its system within the last few years? Formerly samples of food for analysis were sent to the department here and the work was done here. But I think that analysts have been appointed for different parts of the country, and samples are now sent to them.

Mr. BRODEUR. I may explain that it has been found that these food inspectors have not work for the whole year round. They are supposed to work perhaps four or five months and for the rest of the year they have nothing to do. That is why, in the appointments lately made, we have tried to appoint men as food inspectors who were already in the service as excise officers or inspectors of weights and measures. Take a man in a district where there is only one bonded warehouse? He can easily absent himself from his place for a few days and attend to the collection of food samples. I see that Mr. Kidd is simply a food inspector. But his territory is a populous one, and, though he does not seem to have travelled much, he has certainly attended to his work in that district, as the chief analyst tells me that he has had samples from that district as from the others.

Mr. LALOR. How does the minister interpret the term 'adulteration of food?' The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) has raised this point as to jam. Suppose an article is put on the market called raspberry jam. If it is in part raspberry jam but with apples used as a filler, would that be considered adulterated?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly, if it is not marked 'compound.' The law provides that if, on analysis it is found to contain any ingredient injurious to health, it is then declared adulterated. If it is not the pure article, but contains nothing injurious to health, the label must bear the word 'compound' or the party is liable to be prosecuted for violation of the law. That is the way we proceed with those violations. Take the case of raspberry jams put on the market without containing any raspberries at all. That would certainly be a violation of the Adulteration Act because they have no right to sell an article as raspberry jam if there is no raspberry at all in it.

Mr. LALOR. I am pleased with the interpretation of the minister. But I cannot see where any harm is done to the public when the article used as a substitute in the manufacture of a jam is a good article of food and not in any way detrimental to the people who buy it. Now, Canadian jams that are made and sold on the market are largely made from apple pummace, and then a certain amount of fruit is added in order that it may bear the name of the particular fruit that is stamped on the label. There is no harm at all done to the public who buy that, and I am glad to hear that it is not considered an adulteration where the substitute used is perfectly healthy and not in any way detrimental to any purchaser.

Mr. BRODEUR. If the substitute replaces absolutely the article which is named on the label, it is an adulteration. Take the case of strawberry jam. Strawberries are very scarce, and I am informed that instead of using the strawberries they are using turnips. There is no strawberry in it, and it would not be fair to allow such an article to pass without declaring it adulterated. The department declares that when a substitute is made for the genuine article, if it is not marked 'compound,' then the article is declared adulterated. If there is no strawberry in the jam at all it is declared adulterated, even if the foreign fruit is not injurious to public health.

Mr. LALOR. If the package is marked pure raspberry jam and 25 per cent of that is raspberry and the balance is apple, would you call that an adulteration?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly, the department would declare it an adulteration, because it is sold as pure raspberry jam, whereas 75 per cent of it is not raspberry.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Would it not be well to compel the manufacturer to state on the label the ingredients of which the article is composed? I do not know if that would be practicable, but it would relieve the public mind to know exactly what the article is composed of. If it was strawberry jam the people would like to know how much strawberry was in it and how much apple—compel the manufacturer to put the ingredients on the label.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed by the chief analyst that it would be very difficult

for manufacturers to comply with that condition. When an article is sold containing ingredients foreign to the article itself, then the manufacturer has to put the word 'compound' on the label, and the word has to be as prominent as the other words of the label. In that way the manufacturer can comply with the law, and that prevents a great deal of adulteration. That is what we are doing at the present time.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. With reference to the estimate, I do not think it is too large; in fact, I think it would be wise to make it larger, if by so doing you can inform people as to the kind of fruit that is put into the jams they are eating. From what I can learn, in many of the factories throughout the country, to a large extent, jams in particular are made up of most inferior fruits and turnips and glucose, and most inferior grades of these articles. However, I would like to ask, with reference to these bulletins, does the minister mean, when he says that 12,000 bulletins are issued, that each bulletin covers all kinds of food?

Mr. BRODEUR. Last year 1,000 bulletins covering each article were issued. We have twelve bulletins issued; one, for instance, with regard to milk, another with regard to spices, another with regard to jams and jellies, and so on; 1,000 bulletins regarding each article have been distributed.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The minister must see that only 12,000 bulletins for the whole Dominion would be of very little use. When you expend $30,000 in obtaining the information, that information is certainly worth distributing far and wide. I would strongly advise the minister to make a still wider distribution of the bulletins.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed that the bulletins are not distributed to newspapers. I think it would be advisable to distribute them to newspapers, and I shall give instructions to that effect. The press usually takes a great deal of interest in these matters, and I think would be glad to publish the information.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If you leave it to the newspapers, they are likely to pick out only such parts as they please and to publish a garbled statement. Would it not be wise for the department to issue a synopsis of the bulletins, and send the synopsis to the newspapers?

Mr. HERRON. Is it the intention of the department to continue the policy of prosecuting parties who sell goods marked as genuine when they are not genuine?

Mr. BRODEUR. We intend to enforce the law rigidly in that respect. Last year I found there were a great number of violations, and we must find means to prevent them if possible.

Mr. LALOR. I may inform the minister that he will find there are very few goods sold on the market to-day known as jams, for instance, that are pure. The department may go a little too far in that direction. The manufacturers of jams and jellies in this country have to compete with American and English jams, and I doubt if there is any jam sold to-day, either imported or Canadian, that is absolutely pure. For myself, I cannot see where it is detrimental to the public health if apple pulp is used along with other pure fruits. I hope the law will not be interpreted too rigidly in that respect, because it may have the effect of killing a very important industry in this country.

Mr. BRODEUR. I may say that my hon. friend is misinformed as to jams imported from England, because by the analysis we made last year we found that the jams imported into this country from England were absolutely pure. But we did not find the same thing in regard to the Canadian and American product. We not only collect samples of the Canadian product but we collect samples of goods which are brought into the country. I must say that it is to the credit of England that the jams and jellies imported from that country which we analysed last year were found to be absolutely pure.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) in reference to allowing a certain amount of adulteration. There is no doubt that there is plenty of fruit in our country and there is no excuse for the factories not producing a good pure article. I know there are factories that are doing their utmost to produce a pure article, and it would be very unsatisfactory so far as they are concerned if any adulteration were permitted.

Mr. BARR. That would be all right if the department were as watchful in connection with goods imported from England or the United States. If our producers have to compete with outside manufacturers and if we allow Americans to send goods in here without carefully watching their product it would be a great hardship on our own manufacturers.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

NICOLA, KAMLOOPS AND SIMILKAMEEN COAL AND RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 34), respecting the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company.

On section 3,

The company, as now organized, is hereby declared to be, and to have been since the pas-

sing of chapter 164 of the statutes of 1903, a body corporate and politic within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, with power to lay out, construct and operate the railway works described in the Acts of the province of British Columbia mentioned in the preamble, and with all the other powers therein set forth, so far as the legislative powers of the parliament of Canada extend, save and except only such provisions of the said Acts, if any, as are inconsistent with the Railway Act, 1903; but nothing herein contained shall affect or invalidate any action heretofore taken by the company pursuant to powers in the said Acts contained.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that the date of the Provincial Act?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, this is the Bill that went to a sub-committee and the committee accepted the report of the sub-committee.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that it raises a very important question. If there is a provincial Act, and litigation should arise under the provisions of the provincial Act, the fact that we are now declaring that from the time that Act was passed in the province the railway was a work for the general advantage of Canada, we are practically bringing it under federal jurisdiction and authority, and difficulty might arise. We would seem to be deliberately interfering with the powers of the province.

Mr. HYMAN. The Bill was carefully considered in committee; it also went to a subcommittee.

Mr. LOGAN. I was a member of the subcommittee which considered this Bill. The conditions are very peculiar as I remember it. In the first place in 1891 an Act was passed by the British Columbia legislature incorporating this company. In 1893 the company came to this House asking that this work be declared for the general advantage of Canada, but when they came here a question was raised as to whether or not the charter granted in 1891 had expired under the provision of the General Railway Act of British Columbia, which required that they should do a certain amount of work at a certain time, which had not been done. When this was brought to the attention of the House in 1903, there was a stay of proceedings until the British Columbia House had passed another Act reviving the old charter. On the receipt of a telegram from the British Columbia legislature stating that this Act had been passed, this parliament, in 1903, passed an Act declaring this work to be for the general advantage of Canada. When they came to get the Bill which was passed in 1903 by the British Columbia legislature, they found that it contained a clause which took the control of the rates out of the power of the Railway Commission and gave it to the Governor in Council of British Columbia. The question was then raised whether it was not ultra vires of the legislature of British Columbia to pass that Act, and consequently there has been some question with reference to the validity of the bonds of this company. Now as they desire to extend the line to a point on the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway, they come to parliament and ask us to pass this Act to validate their bonds and so remove any doubts about the British Columbia Act.

Mr. SPROULE. It may be that the province of British Columbia gave a subsidy and in consideration thereof reserved to themselves the right to control freight rates, but now we declare the work to be for the general advantage of Canada and bring it under the Dominion Railway Act. The rates on railways under the Dominion Railway Act are controlled by a commission, so that we take the power which the legislature reserves to themselves away from them, although they reserved it probably for a consideration. That is sometimes done as in the case of the agreement between the legislature of Manitoba and the Canadian Northern Railway. The legislature reserved the right to control freight rates in consideration of guaranteeing the bonds of the railway. In such a case, if we should declare the railway to be for the general advantage of Canada and thereby bring it under the General Railway Act, we certainly would be conflicting with their power to control freight rates, and the question would arise whether the provincial authorities or the Railway Commission would control the rates. The same question may be involved here.

Mr. LOGAN. The company has already, by the Act of 1903, been declared for the general advantage of Canada. Therefore this Bill does not affect it so far as that goes. But they ask us under this Bill for power to extend this road to connect with the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway at or near Grand Forks, and at or near Midway with the Columbia and Western Railway. We amend the second clause to read:

All powers of the company in relation to the railway which it now has authority to construct shall extend and apply to the extension authorized in section 1 of this Act.

I admit that it is a very much mixed up piece of legislation, but at the same time, as far as declaring it for the general advantage of Canada is concerned, that has been already done in 1903, in regard to the main portion of the road, and this is only continuing to the extension of that road the same provisions as were made in the Act of 1903. There did not seem to be any objection to the Bill; there were some British Columbia members present at the meeting of the sub-committee, but there did not seem to be any opposition coming from

British Columbia with reference to this matter.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know if they got any subsidy from British Columbia and if in lieu of that, the legislature retained in their hands the right to control the rates. I think that before the Bill is read the third time is should be submitted to the Minister of Justice or some competent authority connected with the government to look into it and see that we are not infringing on rights belonging to the province.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is quite clear that we are not doing that because the amending words qualify that meaning.

So far as the legislative powers of the parliament of Canada extend.

We are declaring that the company shall continue to enjoy the powers it now enjoys by authority of its provincial Act so far as the legislative powers of the parliament of Canada extend. We do not purport to legislate in any way beyond our own powers. It is possible that a province may be able to legislate with regard to a local work to a greater extent than we can. Therefore, we do not purport by this amendment to ratify any powers granted by the provincial Act in excess of those powers which this parliament can grant.

Mr. SPROULE. This brings the freight rates under the control of the Railway Commission.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. All railways subject to this parliament are under the control of the Railway Act.

Mr. SPROULE. If we control the freight rates, how can the province ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It cannot. The moment it becomes a Dominion railway, it comes within the Railway Act. However, the hon. gentleman's suggestion that the third reading should stand over is not unreasonable.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. The point involved in this Bill is that this railway having been declared one for the general advantage of Canada, it declares that from the date of the passage of the Bill providing for that the company owning the railway has corporate rights and powers. This parliament alone is seized with the jurisdiction to deal with this railway in this declaratory way. That is the view of the subcommittee, and that view was shared by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), who drafted the amendment made to the third clause, and by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), who were members of that committee.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think it is competent for us to take over any provincial railway and destroy any rights the province has in it by saying that it is for the general advantage of Canada. That is a question of law to be determined ultimately by the courts. We have had that question before this House again and again, and there seem to be no decisions that touch directly upon it. We may be within our rights or we may not. If we are within our rights, we may be interfering with the rights that properly belonged to the province when it originally granted the charter for this railway.

Bill reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 40) respecting the Niagara-Welland Power Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 71) respecting the Great Northern Railway of Canada.—Mr. M. S. Schell.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Adulteration of food and fertilizers, and the administration of the Act respecting fraudulent marking, $30,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Before this item passes, I wish to say a few words with reference to the fruit industry. In the northern part of my riding we have one of the most promising fruit districts to be found in the province of Ontario. Situated as it is at the southern end of Lake Huron, it is generally conceded to have equal advantages to those of the Niagara district. Hence I think it is important that this matter should be gone into a little more fully. When we have proper transportation facilities and proper protection, I am satisfied that the fruit industry of our country will grow and increase as it should. Thousands of barrels of apples rotted under the trees in my riding during the last season simply because the transportation facilities were not what they should be, and because the protection to Canadian fruit was not sufficient to prevent fruit coming in from foreign countries. With reference to the adulteration of jams and jellies to which reference has been made, I would like to call the minister's attention to bulletin 96 of the Inland Revenue Department for 1903, which states that the analysis of jams and jellies selected indiscriminately over the Dominion showed the following results : raspberry jam—genuine 2 ; doubtful 1 ; adulterated, 16 ; total 19. Strawberry jam,—genuine, one ; doubtful, one ; adulterated, 17. Total, 19. Plum jam, —genuine, 3 ; doubtful, 1 ; adulterated, 8. Total, 12. Peach jam,—genuine, none ; doubtful, 2 ; adulterated, 5. Total, 7. Miscellaneous,—genuine, none ; doubtful, none ; adulterated, 2. Jellies,—genuine, 8 ; doubt-

ful, none; adulterated, 7. Showing that out of 74 varieties, only 14 were genuine. When we consider that the adulteration to a large extent is by means of turnips, which can be purchased at about $6 a ton, I am sure the hon. minister will readily see the importance of making a more thorough investigation of this subject than he has done. As regards the distribution of the bulletins, I wish to again impress on the hon. minister the importance of a more general distribution, and of giving to the public a short synopsis at least of the analysis of the jams and fruits that are canned in our country, showing the results of their analysis. And also information regarding the quantity brought into the country from outside. Take for instance canned preserves, jellies, jams, &c., there were imported in nine months, in 1904, $147,256 worth, or about $200,000 worth of these goods coming to our country per annum. I sincerely trust that the hon. minister will try and provide a remedy for this. We can grow the finest fruits in this country, and it has been proven within the last year that a great quantity of our fruits never reached the market and are not likely to so long as this heavy importation goes on. Take for instance the green fruits imported into Canada, in 1903 they amounted in value to $1,033,115, leaving out of question the dried fruits. I merely call the hon. minister's attention to these matters in order to impress upon him the importance of having the bulletins showing the adulteration of food distributed more largely, and also of making more public the amount of foreign goods in this line that are coming into our country.

Mr. BRODEUR. As regards the adulteration of raspberry and strawberry jams, as I explained this afternoon, we collected samples last year and found in many instances that there were violations of the Adulteration Act. In some instances the berries were not used at all and glucose was used instead of sugar. With regard to the imports, of course, in the amount mentioned by my hon. friend are included fruits, such as bananas and oranges which are not grown in this country, and dried fruits.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I did not include any dried fruits.

Mr. BRODEUR. In any event I have no control over the importation of these goods as we cannot prevent their importation by the application of the Adulteration Act. We intend to take an aggressive policy with regard to the carrying out of this law and to spread the information among the public of the results of the analysis, so that the people may know whether the goods they are buying are genuine or not.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would it be too much to ask the hon. gentleman to exclude vegetables altogether out of the jams and jellies made in our country?

Mr. BARR. Did you find any turnips in them?

Mr. BRODEUR. We did not discover any vegetables.

Mr. BARR. They have been found, it is said, by the analysts.

Mr. FOSTER. Before this item passes, I wish to refer to two or three things that have been impressing themselves on my mind while listening to this discussion. In the first place, we are spending $30,000 per year, and it does not seem as if we were getting an adequate result in so far as the two chief things are concerned—first, the punishing of those who are guilty, and secondly, the dissemination of the results of these analysis by the department so that the people might be educated, and thus a general interest of self protection aroused which would help the department to get rid of these adulterators. You have an analytical department at Ottawa which costs $8,000 or $9,000 per year and which seems to be pretty well equipped, then you have outside resident analysts in the different cities who are available for the purpose of analysing the samples of food which may be put into their hands. You further have your inspector of food to whom a certain amount of money is paid, both as salary and travelling expenses. I suppose a good deal of analysis is done at the request of persons who send samples to the headquarters at Ottawa.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, to some extent.

Mr. FOSTER. That they do simply for their own information. Are they charged a fee?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, that does not amount to much. A man thinks there is adulteration and sends the sample for his own satisfaction, pays his fee, gets the analysis and uses it for whatever it is worth. But the analysing that is done for the purpose of detecting and punishing the adulteration of food is done mainly at the head office and by these local analysts. No less a sum than $30,000 is spent.

Mr. BRODEUR. We did not spend as much last year.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, that is the vote you are taking.

Mr. BRODEUR. Last year a vote was taken for $30,000 and we spent $20,900.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the minister did not do his duty last year, because we have had him acknowledging to-night that there is a great deal of adulteration. When parliament gave him $30,000 to detect and prevent adulteration, he sat down quietly and

only spent $20,000 of it. There is an economy which is laudable, but there is another which, in the face of a grave danger like this, is just the opposite. The aggressiveness which my hon. friend speaks about animated him but very little last year since he did not even spend the money put at his disposal.

Mr. BRODEUR. I was only there a few months.

Mr. FOSTER. What I spoke of refers to the department. Is the department doing what it ought to do with reference to these analysts in outside cities ? It gives a retaining fee of $200 and an allowance for office rent, apparatus and material, of about as much more. There is an initial expense of about $400 in each case. You have these analysts in Halifax, Montreal, Toronto, Victoria, Quebec, London, Winnipeg and Ottawa. When you incur this initial expense, it seems to me poor economy not to utilize the staff you thus retain. Now, what does the department do? In Halifax the officer retained analysed only 60 or 70 samples ; in Montreal about the same ; in Toronto about the same ; in Victoria only 26. In Quebec there was the initial expense, yet not a single analysis was made, so that the money spent was absolutely useless. In London only 9 samples were analysed. In Winnipeg the samples analysed number only 28. In Ottawa they gave the retaining fee, the office rent, the allowance for apparatus and material, yet did not call upon Dr. Valade to analyse a single sample during the year. Now, if these are the facts—and I suppose it will not be denied—we see that the department went to large expense to retain men and provide apparatus and material for the analysis of food, yet had not sprawl enough to have analyses actually made. And yet adulteration is rife in this country, as the minister has acknowledged He says he is determined to make an aggressive campaign against it. But though these manufacturers have been adulterating food, and are still adulterating, the department has not used, to any great extent, the apparatus and men at its disposal for the prevention of this adulteration. Then as to the food inspectors, the same remark applies. The department incurs the initial expense for salary and fees. It lets these officers travel a little, but not enough to collect many samples. There is a yearly expense of about $4,000 for these officers, yet the number of samples they have collected is very small. The minister will see what I am driving at—that if he is going to continue spending $20,000 in this kind of thing and have an establishment, he ought to go further and make his initial expenditure effective, even if a little more money must be spent. The minister now is like a gentleman who has an immense battery and with ammunition ready, but never loading or firing his guns, though the enemy are there and ready to be slaughtered—and deserving to be slaughtered, as he himself admits. This is a friendly criticism, and it is spoken in the hope that the minister will utilize the machinery he has provided to put down the great evil of adulteration of food. As to the education part of it, the distribution of 1,000 copies of each of twelve bulletins will not do it at all. Could not more of these be sent out with a view to arousing public interest ? No man wants to buy food that is adulterated and not worth the money that he pays for it. Yet nineteen-twentieths of the people have no idea but that they are buying good food. One way to get rid of adulteration is to arouse the intelligent interest of the consuming people to the fact that they are buying food that is either injurious or not worth what it costs them. The minister will do something now with the newspapers. I think that is a good move. An idea that suggested itself to me was that members of the House would probably be glad to assist in this distribution. If members knew that these bulletins were available for distribution, many would be glad to make up lists of people in their constituencies to whom they would like to send things, and who would be interested in the facts contained in these documents. In that way two or three hundred people might be reached in every constituency, and, with over two hundred members of the House taking an interest in it, the distribution would be very wide and, probably, very effective. Then the schools might be utilized and the boards of trade might be utilized. I should think that secretaries of boards of trade would be glad to distribute these bulletins. The best of trade is honest trade, and, beyond doubt, legitimate traders would be in favour of stopping adulteration and, in the general interest of trade, have nothing sold purporting to be pure food that was not actually pure. For my part, I have no objection to men selling or buying a mixed article, provided it is not sold under a false name. I believe that the prevention of adulteration of food is one of the most important subjects we can take up among the minor subjects in connection with our public policy. We had a discussion the other day on the prevention of tuberculosis. The carrying out of the reform in that direction would save life. The prevention of the sale of adulterated food saves life and promotes health. If the government is going to take this matter up at all, it ought to take it up with energy and purpose. It ought to terrify the evil-doer and arouse the victims to a sense of what is going on in the way of dissimulating, under false names, what I dare say in many cases are very noxious articles of food.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am glad that this discussion is taking place with regard to the adulteration of food. When I came into the department, I tried to acquaint myself as much as possible with this question, and

became much interested in it, and I have ever since been studying the best means of carrying out this very important law. There is no doubt that the adulteration of food is a very serious evil in this country. I trust that it is being gradually lessened, but at the same time if we do not continue to put forth efforts to stamp it out, it will become very serious again. I understand how important it is that we should take every means to prevent this evil spreading. My hon. friend has mentioned the fact that very few samples have been sent to our district analysts during the last year, and he argues therefrom that we have not done our duty. He must not forget, however, that most of the analyses, perhaps seventy-five per cent of the analyses that have been made during the past year, were made at the head office in Ottawa, instead of being made by the district analysts. It has been found very convenient indeed to have the analyses made here instead of by the district analysts, who are generally occupied with their own business. Take for example a doctor who has to look after his clients, he cannot devote the time which he ought to take in making an analysis of the samples which are sent to him. Perhaps some other analysts are in the same position. Then it has frequently been found that it was better to send the samples here to be analysed by the head office in Ottawa. Moreover, we have in many instances found different results from analyses made of the same article in different parts of the country; an analysis in the west may not give the same results as an analysis in the east though the article is the same. There is another thing to be considered, and which has been pressed upon my attention. Some of these officers do not devote much time to that business, and occasionally they get the analysis done by some one else. But we have to pay these district analysts a certain amount for each sample they analyse, besides the retaining fee which is given them. This makes it very expensive, much more expensive than to have the same samples analysed by our officers in Ottawa. The analysis made here does not cost anything, because the officers are paid a yearly salary; Mr. McGill, for instance, gets $1,800 or $2,000, and some others a lesser amount. So the Auditor General's Report does not give a fair idea of the number of samples which have been analysed during the year, because a great many other analyses are made besides those made by the district analysts. I have already mentioned that about seventy-five per cent of all the samples are analysed here at the head office of which no record is made in the Auditor General's Report. I may repeat what I have already said, that I intend to pursue a very aggressive policy with regard to the adulteration of foods. I have had several communications with boards of trade and with the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, which latter organization is taking a great deal of interest in this question. They have been good enough to mention the fact in their reports that we are trying to do our best to repress this evil, and it is my intention to pursue that policy rigorously.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all right so far as it goes, and that brings me to what I had in my mind but did not speak of before. You never can get as authoritative an analysis from one of your district analysts as you can from your central authority here. You must be better equipped here than any district analyst can be, with all your skill, and your knowledge, and your accumulation of experience. If I were living in a distant part of Canada and wanted an analysis made, I would send the sample to the central office here rather than to the local analyst, who might be busy with his own affairs. Then there is the cost of transporting all these samples back and forth, there is constant communication between them and Ottawa. Why in the world with your central laboratory here in Ottawa, should you pay a retaining fee to the district analysts and these allowances, with $100 rent for the office, and his apparatus, and cost of material, when you have right under your nose, in your own central organization, all these things much better equipped ? The amount that you spend on these men far distant for retaining fees would more than pay all the expenses of transit of your samples from these distant parts here to Ottawa, and the communications that take place. It seems to me the best method would be to abolish all these outside offices, whose work can only be partial and ineffective, and cannot have the authority of the central analysis. Do all your analyses at the central laboratory, and you would thereby save a good deal of money which now seems to be spent without much result. I am not saying anything against these district analysts. This practice has grown up with time. A man is justified in taking a retaining fee if he finds a department which is willing to give it to him. But the whole question is, having so much money, what is the best way to expend it, and it does not seem to me it is the best way, while you have a properly equipped laboratory here and able to do the work, that you should have these outlying offices where the business must be indifferently well done under the best circumstances, and where little of the work is done.

Mr. BRODEUR. With regard to these district analysts, I am inclined to take very much the same view as the hon. gentleman. In fact I may mention that several vacancies have occurred during the last year that we have not found it advisable to fill. In Quebec, for instance, I think the analyst has resigned and he has not been replaced, the analyst in St. Hyacinthe has not been

replaced, so also in Winnipeg. I think there are four vacancies now.

Mr. FOSTER. I would make about five more.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, it is very hard sometimes to dismiss men who have been for many years in the service. Take Dr. Valade here in Ottawa, I think he has been nearly twenty-five years in the service. Perhaps the time has not arrived to do that, particularly since some of these men were appointed before this government came into power. I will take into consideration the suggestion that has been made. The hon. gentleman sees what I have done so far. I have refused to replace officers although I was pressed in several instances to do so when vacancies occurred for that very reason. I have not had much experience, because I have been only a short time in the department, but I am inclined to the belief that the suggestion which has been made by the hon. gentleman is absolutely correct and it is one which I have followed in so far as vacancies are concerned.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend does not wish to act harshly with these officers keep them at work until they die.

Mr. BRODEUR. But they cost money.

Mr. FOSTER. They do.

Mr. BRODEUR. Suppose that instead of sending samples to Mr. Macfarlane we sent them to Dr. Valade, we would have to pay Dr. Valade for each sample analysed. It is better to have them analysed by Mr. Macfarlane.

Mr. BLACK. I would like to endorse everything that has been said by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in regard to the centralization of these samples. In the medical profession we adopt a rule like that in almost every province. I know that in my own province we do. While medical men, of later years, are equipped with the microscope and a great many of them make a study of bacteriology, yet the best and nicest way is to send to the provincial bacteriologists for our analysis. In cases of diphtheretic membrane and in the finer tests of urinalysis, we do not depend on the microscope or the tests of individual members of the profession however well we may think of our ability, because we know that at the central office greater expense has been gone to with the object of providing finer and nicer instruments and better results are obtained. I think that in the case of adulterated foods which is one of the most important questions that this House can consider, a question that affects the health of almost every family that buys these foods—and tons and tons are bought every year—it is very important that steps should be taken to find out to what extent adulteration is practised, and I am sure that no better step could be taken than by centralizing this service and providing it with the finest equipment that can be obtained. The adoption of this plan would make the service much more effective and better in every way.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to put one or two questions to the hon. minister of Inland Revenue in connection with this item. The first one I would like to ask is how it is that so many analyses are made of products obtained from retail dealers when the department could attack the fountain head and find out what was in these foods without having to go to thousands and tens of thousands of retailers throughout the country ? The factories that turn out jams are very few in number, they can be counted on the fingers of one hand, or at most of two hands. Eight or ten analyses would show what these jams contain. Why should each retailer who is selling the products of these factories, the contents of which he does not know, be subjected to this analysis and test when the analysis could just as well be made of the article when it leaves the factory ? It has the maker's name on it. The maker should be held responsible for the ingredients that are in the article named. Take the question of spices, for instance ; spices are generally put up in cans or packages. The man who puts them up is the man who should know what they contain. If he does not know he does not know his business. Why should every retailer throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion be subjected to having his spices analysed, when the number of dealers in spices could be counted on the fingers of one's hand, or two hands ? Why should a thousand or ten thousand samples be taken and analysed when by going to the makers or those who mix or produce these spices the whole thing could be shut off at the fountain head ? It appears to me that the department covers too wide a field in endeavouring to shut off the stream at its outlet instead of endeavouring to shut it off at its source, because it is a well known fact that the principal place at which adulteration takes place is the factory. As to the matter of jams, this is a subject, of course, which is rather sweet, but to return to them I would like to ask the hon. minister if the basis of jam is turnips or carrots, it is classed as adulterated under the laws that govern the department. I think I am in a position to state that the basis of American jams is the articles named. Turnips particularly constitute the basis of jams. The turnip is a harmless article, but any one can see that when jams are sold at seven cents a pound, as they are mostly, they must be constituted of something other than fruit and sugar, because the labour, the package that contains the jam and the fruit and sugar cannot be brought together, put into the package and sold for seven cents a pound.

It is a self-evident fact that there is something else besides fruit and sugar in the jam that brings down the price. I have been consulting the returns in regard to the export of turnips which go to prove that in American factories these articles enter largely into the production of jams. During the past year there were exported from Canada, 1,085,000 bushels of turnips of a value of $107,000. Of this quantity, 1,067,000 bushels went to the United States. These, I am informed and I think correctly informed, are sent almost invariably to the jam factories of the United States. That may be a lamentable fact, but nevertheless I believe it is a fact. Now, we re-import from the United States a large quantity of jam and jellies, which, no doubt, to a considerable extent, contain these ingredients. I would like to ask the hon. minister, if, when these goods are analysed, the fact that they contain turnips or carrots is sufficient to bar them as adulterated foods. They are certainly not what they are represented to be, and if they are not what they are represented to be it would appear to be the duty of the department, if they want to put into general use only pure foods, to stop all goods that will not pass the test at the border. They should not be allowed to come into the country. You should not then attack the retail dealer who perhaps had nothing to do with the importation, who has had nothing to do with the making of them and who is not able to tell of what they are constituted. Therefore, I submit this proposition that any adulteration that takes place in the country takes place in the factory or the institution that puts up these goods or manufactures them. That is one point. The next point is that if it is sought to bring into the country articles which are impure, the proper place to stop them is at the border line. They should not be allowed to come into the country, but they should be stopped when they are being imported. That would not then throw the onus upon thousands and ten thousands of retail dealers throughout Canada when they actually do not know what the goods contain and who cannot correctly find out without going to a great deal of trouble. I submit these points to the hon. gentleman's attention. I believe that these are facts. If they are not, I would like him to point out to me wherein I have misstated the facts. I hope that in the future the department will attend more to confining their efforts to the source of the trouble instead of attacking the various branches of trade. I think the hon. gentleman would be conferring a great benefit upon the trade of the country if he would prohibit factories that offend against the law by manufacturing that class of food and turn it out, although they do it under a false name, rather than attack the retailer who is perfectly innocent and knows nothing about the contents. He is the man who generally has to suffer and the manufacturer seems to escape. I commend these points to the hon. gentleman's attention, and I hope he will reply to them.

Mr. BRODEUR. With regard to the collection of samples from the retailers and the wholesalers, I agree, to a certain extent, with the remarks made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockshutt). I gave instructions some time ago that in future we should collect these samples on a larger scale from the manufacturers and the wholesalers. We find, however, a very great difficulty in obtaining samples from the manufacturers. They do not pretend to have them for sale, and we have some difficulty in collecting samples from them, but the suggestion made is certainly a good one, and I think that instead of going only to the retailers, we should also collect samples, when it is possible, from the manufacturers and the wholesalers, because if we succeed in impressing upon the manufacturer the fact that if he sells adulterated goods it will be published broadcast; then, I suppose, he will become much more anxious to sell only pure goods. We must, at the same time, remember that the wholesalers are not absolutely free from blame, because it happens sometimes that after the goods have left the hands of the wholesalers or manufacturers, they are mixed up with other materials, and the retailer then becomes responsible; but we must not forget that when we collect samples from the retailer. he gives us the name of the manufacturer, which, as my hon. friend may see in the report which he has before him, is also published. If the manufacturer has sold adulterated goods to the retailer, he is exposed to having his name published as it is in that bulletin. It has been said also that turnips are used on a large scale in the manufacture of jams. The chief analyst informs me that he has never found any turnips in the goods that he has analysed. I do not pretend to say that they are not used.

Mr. BARR. Does he say that in goods either from the United States, Canada or Great Britain, he has never found any turnips?

Mr. BRODEUR. What we have found is particularly apple pulp instead of strawberries or raspberries.

Mr. BARR. But in the jams?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is apple pulp which the chief analyst informs me he has found most in the jams that are adulterated. At the same time, this is certainly a violation of the law, because when I buy strawberry jam I am supposed to have strawberries, and if, instead of finding strawberries, I simply find apple pulp, to which has been added salicylic acid, coal tar dye and some other things like that, it is certainly a violation of the law. Jam is supposed to contain fruit, sugar and water, and

we sometimes find glucose instead of sugar, coal tar dye, salicylic acid and apple pulp. It is a very serious thing that manufacturers should put on the market goods in that condition, and even try to sell those goods as pure strawberry jam. I think the time has arrived when we should adopt an aggressive policy to prevent such things being sold in the future.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. With regard to the turnips, it was to the American trade particularly that I referred, not to the Canadian packers. I am not in a position to state what Canadian packers use.

Mr. BRODEUR. If we have samples directly from the wholesalers, I think we would reach that violation of the law. That is why I thought, in order to reach the source of the evil, we should go to the manufacturer and the wholesaler.

Mr. BARR. I thought my hon. friend told us there were no roots or turnips in the jams analysed ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I thought my hon. friend referred to the goods manufactured in this country. I do not know that they are using turnips in the United States.

Mr. LALOR. I would like to ask the minister how he manages in connection with imported jams, catsups, &c., from the United States ? How do you treat them in regard to adulteration ? I may say that the gentlemen who are talking about turnips in jams are not very well posted in the jam business. I think that when the minister tells us that apple pulp is more generally used, he is nearer the truth than the gentlemen who talk of turnips.

Mr. BRODEUR. We simply reach them in the same way as we reach the Canadian product ; an American sample is just as liable to be condemned and declared adulterated as a Canadian.

Mr. BARR. I think it is a most unfortunate thing for us in this country to put the screws on the Canadian manufacturers and allow the Americans to bring in goods that are not pure. We thought we had it from the minister that there were no roots found in the American importations that were analysed. I understand from a good authority that the Americans are using roots, and that they are underselling our Canadian manufacturers in different lines of this business, with the result that the Canadians are almost going out of the business, whilst the Americans are sending in their impure goods. I contend that the importations, even from the British islands, and particularly from the United States, should be very carefully analysed, and it should be placed beyond a doubt that we are not receiving from the American side, competing with our manufacturers, impure goods ; imported goods should be even more carefully analysed than those manufactured in this country.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the result of the examination of goods from foreign countries ?

Mr. BRODEUR. As far as jams and jellies are concerned, as I said this afternoon, all the goods which were imported from Great Britain were found genuine. The chief analyst informs me that there were very few samples of American goods which were sent to be analysed, and in fact his impression is that there is a very small quantity of American jam used.

Mr. BARR. Have many American goods been carefully examined ?

Mr. BRODEUR. A few were analysed. The chief analyst is not very sure whether some have been examined, but, at all events, we have collected samples, and where we find American goods we certainly buy them to get them analysed just as we do the Canadian product.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Let me call the minister's attention to the fact that $49,000 worth of these goods came from the United States. If only a very small quantity of these were analysed, it is very unfair to analyse the Canadian products so strictly. I might also call the minister's attention to the fact that of the $30,000 voted last year for the purpose of gathering and distributing information over $9,000 was not expended. Would it not be wise, after gathering the information, to spend part of that money in distributing it broadcast ? Then, I might ask the hon. minister if the officers of his department have the privilege of going into any factories in the country and examining food products ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. The chief analyst has visited several factories in this country, and has also attended some congresses outside in order to meet American chemists and get information from them on the important question of analysing food products.

Mr. LALOR. I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Customs is not in his place tonight when this interesting discussion is going on. I believe the chief cause of this trouble about adulteration is that there is not sufficient duty placed on the goods that are imported into Canada. If you sit down at almost any hotel table in this country, you will find that the catsup on that table is imported from the United States ; and the same thing applies largely to all other table condiments. That applies even more to the west than it does to the east. If the government will place a much higher duty on these American goods and then enforce the law against adulteration, I believe the Canadian manufacturers will be only too glad to give the Canadian people better and purer articles.

Mr. BRODEUR. If my hon. friend refers to the figures of the census, I think he

will find that the quantity of these goods imported does not at all compare with the quantity produced in the country. I know that considerable quantities are imported into the Northwest and British Columbia, but a very small quantity is imported into the eastern provinces, where the fruits are produced.

Mr. LALOR. I may inform the hon. minister that over $200,000 worth of this class of goods were imported last year. Not one dollar's worth of these goods should be imported. They should be made in Canada, and they can be if the government will put a sufficient tariff on them.

Mr. AMES. I would like to ask the minister a few questions. How many collectors in the employ of the department are giving their entire time to the collection of samples of articles supposed to be adulterated ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is only one who is devoting all his time to that work. The others are excise officers. We have ten food inspectors.

Mr. INGRAM. What is this man's name ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Thomas Kidd.

Mr. AMES. Are the samples collected by Mr. Kidd and the others who are partial inspectors, examined locally, or are they sent to the central bureau here ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Most of the samples collected last year were sent to the central office here.

Mr. AMES. Are the legal processes in regard to the adulteration of food initiated from here and carried on from here ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, instructions are given from the department here to take proceedings.

Mr. AMES. How many proceedings have been taken during the past year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No actions have been taken, but a large number of persons whose goods have been found to be adultered have paid the penalty imposed upon them. That penalty generally consists in the payment of the cost of the analysis, besides which we publish their names in the bulletin with the statement that their goods are adulterated. If they do not pay the cost of the analysis, then proceedings are instituted against them.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. About what is the cost of the analysis ?

Mr. BRODEUR. From $11 to $20.

Mr. AMES. I certainly agree with the hon. member for North Toronto in advocating the strengthening of this department. With its present inadequate staff it seems to me that no work of a far-reaching character can be undertaken. Apparently the work is left in a large measure to the local municipalities, who are only able to make prosecutions when they can prove that the food which has been analysed by them contains something deleterious to public health, which is very difficult to prove. For this reason the local authorities are unable to proceed. The work of protecting the public against fraud in the way of adulterations should be carried on chiefly by the Inland Revenue Department, but that department is very inadequately equipped for the great work it has to do. Looking over the reports which have come from the various analysts located at Halifax, Montreal, Toronto, Victoria and elsewhere, I find that there are practically but three substances which these local analysts have analysed—fertilizers, syrup and milk.

The analysing of fertilizers may be very useful, but does not create protection to the public health, and it is a work which seems to me to belong more especially to the Department of Agriculture. As for the analysis of milk, most of our cities are provided with a better way for detecting impure milk than the government of Canada. In Montreal we have a perfectly adequate system and I think that our local board of health looks after this very carefully and thoroughly. I would commend to the hon. minister, if he has not already adopted the system, to follow the same system in obtaining samples for the department. Our inspectors in Montreal are authorized when they suspect that milk which is being sold or about to be sold is adulterated, to stop the vendor, take a certain quantity of milk from his can and put it into two bottles, which are then sealed in such a manner that the seal cannot be tampered with.. One bottle is left with the milkman and the other is brought to the department and analysed. If it is found that the milk is below standard, the case is taken into court, and if the accused is not satisfied with the verdict, he is entitled to produce his own bottle and have a second analysis made. It generally turns out that the second analysis is identical with the first, so that he is practically self convicted. There is a great amount of adulteration in many articles of food at present in Canada, as we have discovered through our local analyses in the board of health at Montreal. For example, large quantities of candies are sold which are coloured by matter that may not be injurious, but certainly is not helpful to public health. We have made frequent analyses of ketchups, and have found that almost any ketchup analysed would stain a cloth which was placed in it, showing that it must contain dye stuff of some character, which is certainly not good for the human system. Other analyses of food stuffs are of a similar character, but being only a local board we have found it very difficult to proceed against those who sold the adulterated goods unless we were prepared to prove that the adulteration rendered the com-

modities injurious to the public health. Therefore, I would point out to the hon. minister that he has a very large field in which to operate, and if he can see his way clear to strengthen his department so that he may have inspectors to visit all parts of Canada and inspect not only the goods in process of manufacture but also samples of the goods in the packages, he will be conferring a great benefit on the community. Goods in the process of manufacture could be inspected by the same methods I have described in the case of milk. Goods in packages bearing the name of the maker carry their own identification. I do not think there is any department that calls at present more loudly for adequate enlargement so that the health of the people may be protected.

Mr. BERGERON. There is one subject to which I would like to call the attention of the hon. minister and which I think is germane to the subject in hand. I refer to patent medicines. This country is infested with patent medicines more or less good. Is there any inspection of these when they are put on the market at first or are they inspected now and then? I have a case in mind which happened in the latter days of December in Montreal of some people who were almost poisoned by a medicine called Stearn's headache powders. These powders are sold freely to any one who wants to buy them in all the drug stores. They are, I believe a most injurious medicine. They are supposed to be a very quick remedy for headaches, and must contain, I imagine, some very strong ingredients, and probably some poison. It is well that we should be very particular about the food we buy, but we should be still more particular about the medicines sold to the people and take some precautions to see that no medicine is likely to have a very injurious effect on those who use it. I would ask my hon. friend what protection, if any, he is prepared to give the public against patent medicines, which instead of doing good are doing harm ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There has been some agitation amongst physicians to have the packages or bottles containing patent medicines stamped with the formula of its contents. I may tell my hon. friend that there is a great difference of opinion on that point. We have the doctors on the one side and the druggists on the other. The druggists claim that that would be injurious to their trade. We are entitled under the law to collect samples of drugs and we do it very frequently, and when drugs are adulterated the same course is followed with regard to them as with regard to food.

Mr. BERGERON. I know that the doctors and druggists are not at one on that question. Many doctors are opposed to patent medicines and would rather give their own remedies, but the druggists find a great profit in selling those medicines. But since my hon. friend has all the machinery requisite in his department, would it not be possible for his chief analyst to have patent medicines collected and analysed and declare whether they are injurious or the reverse ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed by the chief analyst that it would be very difficult to do that, so far as patent medicines are concerned, because as long as they correspond with the specifications it is almost impossible to declare them adulterated.

Mr. LALOR. Would it not be possible to find out whether they are pure or adulterated before they are freed from the customs and when the entry is being made to take them out of customs?

Mr. BRODEUR. That might perhaps be a good plan, but it would require an army of officers connected with all the different ports to inspect samples of all the goods entered. I am sure it would be a very costly experiment.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the department had any analyses made of fertilizers in New Brunswick? There are very serious complaints regarding the quality of fertilizers sold in that province. I have heard it said that farmers are very frequently defrauded, and if the department has any power to apply a remedy in the matter I would like to see that power exercised.

Mr. BRODEUR. Under the law persons selling fertilizers are obliged to have them analysed every year, sending samples to the office here for that purpose. I should be surprised to learn that fertilizers are sold that are not being properly analysed.

Mr. GUNN. In the case of a conviction, who is liable, the manufacturer or the wholesale dealer ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The man in whose possession the goods have been found and against whom conviction is secured. Any question between him and the manufacturer is a matter with which the department has nothing to do.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like again to refer to the question of the fertilizers in New Brunswick. Recently I had a conversation with a gentleman who resides in that province, and he informed me that it is a matter of very serious complaint in that province with the farmers that they are getting a very impure article, in fact, not at all what they ought to get for their money. I would like to know whether the department takes cognizance of this and whether analyses of fertilizers such as are there are made, and what the results are.

Mr. BRODEUR. The chief analyst tells me that no complaint has been made to the department concerning fertilizers sold in New Brunswick. But if the hon. gentleman

(Mr. Henderson) can give us information on the subject I shall be glad to look into the question.

Mr. HENDERSON. I will give the minister privately the name of my informant.

Mr. LALOR. I have looked up the report of trade and commerce for 1904, and I find that pickles, sauces and catsups have been imported to the amount of no less than $371,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is a pity that Canadians do not consume Canadian goods.

Mr. LALOR. I quite agree with the minister, and I would go farther and say that it is a great pity that the government of this country does not put a duty upon these goods that would cause the Canadian goods to be consumed. But these adulterated goods are brought into the country and sold at such prices that our manufacturers cannot sell pure goods in competition with them. so, our manufacturers, to compete with this immense quantity of adulterated goods have to adulterate their own goods to a certain extent. The hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Crockett) has brought the matter of fertilizers before the House, and I am glad he has done it ? I do not believe that there is any commodity in which there is such a field for swindling the farmers as in fertilizers. The time has come when commercial fertilizers must be used in this country. In the United States they are being used to an enormous extent. If there are any goods that ought to be analysed and in respect of which the people should be protected against fraud, they are commercial fertilizers.

Public Works—chargeable to income—harbours and rivers—N. S., Apple river, wharf, $3,000.

Mr. PERLEY. I would like to say a word in a general way about these wharfs before we go on with the item. I find, in my own experience, a good many wharfs are built in places where they are absolutely useless. I should be glad if the minister would give some promise that all these wharfs that he is going to ask votes for to-night will be such as can be of use to those engaged in navigation and not merely to please individuals residing or having interests in the locality. I would draw the minister's attention to the fact that some peculiar expenditures are made out of votes given for wharfs. In the Auditor General's Report with reference to the harbour improvements in Glace bay, it appears that some of the money voted was used to construct an earth railway embankment and trestle approach to the coal pier and to put down a sufficient number of railway tracks thereon for the accommodation of traffic. I find that the Auditor General makes comment upon this expenditure as not being properly made in accordance with the vote. I think his objection is well taken. It looks as if the expenditure was made in the interest of one corporation there; and money voted for the construction of a wharf should hardly have been used for such a purpose. I know there is a wharf across the river in Hull, I suppose it cost $40,000 or $50,000, but I do not think the minister will say that that expenditure was justified by the amount of traffic done on that wharf. I hope he will assure the committee that he is not going to ask us to vote money to spend on wharfs that are going to be of so little use as that.

Mr. HYMAN. As regards the policy of the government in the erection of wharfs, I can assure the hon. gentleman that the department will take the greatest care in the expenditure of money. The circumstances under which wharfs are being constructed may be very different in one part of the country from those in another part. A wharf that might not be deemed necessary in the province of Quebec in a certain place where communication is largely by railway, might be necessary in another part of the country, on the great lakes or on the ocean, in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, where there is no railway communication ; the expenditure might be justified in one case and not in another. In the particular case to which the hon. gentleman refers, I suppose, the Dominion Coal Company wanted to erect a wharf, and a wharf was also desired in the public interest. Therefore we made a business arrangement with the coal company, they erecting the wharf and we paying a certain amount of the cost. In that case we made provision towards building a wharf, because we knew that the public interest would be served by it. The company got what they want and the public are getting what they want from the construction of this wharf.

Mr. PERLEY. The explanation of the minister in that particular case seems to be satisfactory. I believe that the present acting minister has every intention of confining these expenditures to public purposes. I would like to ask him if the government has any policy with regard to the building of these wharfs, where to place them, and how much to expend upon them? I notice that last year there was a wharf built at a place called Lake Nominingue, in the province of Quebec. Now that is an inland lake somewhere about a hundred miles from the Ottawa river. There is nothing there I know of that the Department of Public Works has anything to do with. That is one reason why I ask if the government has any settled policy in building wharfs. I can understand the building of a wharf on the Ottawa river, which is a boundary between two provinces, but I cannot understand why the Department of Public Works should build a wharf at this little lake called Nominingue, in a little place away back in the bush. It is the terminus of a railway, it is true, but at the

same time it is an entirely provincial matter.

Mr. HYMAN. What is the cost of that wharf ? Have you got it there ?

Mr. PERLEY. $2,000 or $3,000. I am asking what the Dominion government has to do with building a wharf of that kind in the back woods ?

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken if he thinks we should only build wharfs on boundaries between provinces, or on the great lakes. It is the duty of the Public Works Department to build wharfs wherever they are required. That has been the policy of the Dominion government for many years. The hon. gentleman will understand that we cannot lay down any hard and fast rule with regard to these matters. As I have already tried to explain, a policy that might fit one province would not fit another. Those of us who are living where railway communication is easy must not forget that there are other places where there is no communication at all except by water. It is the duty of the government to take all these matters into consideration. We cannot lay down a hard and fast policy, I do not think the hon. gentleman himself could suggest any policy that would be better than to make expenditures wherever they are required in the public interest. We must consider every case on its merits, inquire into the character of the work, the cost of the work, and try to meet the needs of the people so far as we can according to the funds at our disposal.

Mr. MORIN. I believe the hon. minister said that wharfs are built wherever they are needed. I can tell him that he is very much mistaken. Would he tell me what is going to be done with regard to the pier at a place called Disraeli, in the county of Wolfe, for which $5,000 was voted last year ? Does the minister know anything about that pier, or does he care to know ? If he wants to know the history of that pier I will be glad to tell him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. MORIN. At that place there is a small stream flowing into a river. There is a dam below the mouth of the stream, and when the gates are shut the water rises in the dam and overflows into the creek, which is called Black creek. The people built a bridge over that creek some fifteen years ago. Last year the member for the county of Wolfe, I suppose it was that hon. gentleman, began to move in the matter. I must say that I honour that hon. gentleman's spunk. He got this government to vote $5,000 to build a pier, and that pier, I suppose, was intended to accommodate a steamboat. Now, Sir, where is the boat ?

Mr. HYMAN. I give it up.

Mr. MORIN. There is no use for a boat, and there is no water to float a boat. I can tell the minister what was done. The people who live there are joking over this matter. The municipality gave a contract to parties to fill up this creek from one bank to the other, about 600 feet, with stone and earth, in order to make a roadway. Now that is the way that certain individuals blindfold the government. It is perfectly right ; if I could blindfold the government myself I would do it, because municipalities have as much right to get help from the government as railway or steamboat companies have. I asked for a bridge once and I was refused. If you ask for $5,000 to build a bridge they will not listen to you. But, the hon. gentleman just pulls the wool over the government's eyes, asks for a vote and it is given to him. If the hon. minister will send his engineer there he would be able to ascertain what the conditions are. I suppose the money will not be paid until the work is done. If he sends his engineer there to oversee the work he will find nothing but a pile of stones. That is only a sample of it.

Mr. HYMAN. I may say that the items under discussion now are wharfs in Nova Scotia. I have no objection, of course——

Mr. MORIN. I do not blame you.

Mr. HYMAN. I have no objection, of course, to the discussion wandering far afield from the subject before the chair. As to the particular subject brought up by the hon. gentleman, I have no notes. Wharfs in Quebec will be reached in due time, and I would be very glad to give whatever explanation is possible in regard to the awful state of affairs the hon. gentleman has been depicting.

Mr. INGRAM. In view of the fact that the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) is absent, and as he is familiar with the Nova Scotia items, I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Public Works that we take up the Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick items, because, by doing so, we will make better headway than if we attempt to continue the consideration of the Nova Scotia items.

Mr. HYMAN. Why ?

Mr. INGRAM. For the simple reason that hon. members on this side of the House are not well acquainted with the requirements of Nova Scotia. Unfortunately, our friends on the other side of the House have assisted in preventing us from getting our friends from that province to assist us in the discussion of these items.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. When does the hon. gentleman expect to get any of his friends from Nova Scotia to help him to discuss these items ?

Mr. LEFURGEY. We are prepared to discuss the Prince Edward Island items.

Mr. HYMAN. If hon. gentlemen opposite will allow these items to pass, I will be very glad to allow one item to stand, on which any discussion can take place. The Department of Public Works have a large number of estimates to pass. I am sure I have tried to meet the convenience of hon. gentlemen opposite as far as possible in putting through items. If they will allow these items to go through, we will allow one item to stand on which any discussion can take place, and then we will take up the votes from Prince Edward Island.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The hon. gentleman might take up the Prince Edward Island items now, because the Prince Edward Island members are all here.

Mr. HYMAN. I know several hon. members on this side of the House who stayed here at great personal inconvenience just for the purpose of being here when these estimates are under consideration. I notified them this afternoon at three o'clock, asking them to stay, and now that they are here, I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite will not press the request which they have made.

Mr. INGRAM. Do we understand hon. members from Nova Scotia are going to take part in the discussion of these items? I have no recollection of anything of that kind ever having occurred in the House. I think it is really unreasonable to expect the opposition to take these items up in view of the absence of the hon. leader of the opposition, who is the only man who understands the requirements of Nova Scotia.

Mr. HYMAN. It is a piece of nonsense for me to attempt to pass these items if hon. gentlemen opposite persist in their objection. If they say that they do not want the items to pass, it is impossible for me to go on with my estimates.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the hon. gentleman under his hand the information in regard to Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. In that case, I think we would make better headway by proceeding to the consideration of these items.

Mr. HYMAN. There is no doubt of it. We will not make any headway at all if hon. gentlemen opposite simply say that they will not go on with these estimates. I think, considering the number of estimates the department has to put through and the very fair offer I have made, that we should leave one item on which all the items may be discussed, hon. gentlemen might consent to the passing of these items.

Mr. BARR. We do not know any item to hold them up on.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK.

Mr. HYMAN. Hold them up on any item you like, and discuss any of them afterwards.

Mr. BARR. The hon. minister tells us that they have no policy whatever in so far as wharfs in Nova Scotia are concerned. They have built them here, there and everywhere, and they do not intend to give us any information in regard to them. We are unfamiliar with these estimates, but the hon. gentleman wants to run them through. We have our forces here from Prince Edward Island, and we are prepared to go on with the Prince Edward Island items, and intelligently vote on them if a vote is required. We cannot hold ourselves down to one item, because we might pass the item in regard to which we require an explanation. Surely the hon. gentleman must have some policy in regard to wharfs in Nova Scotia, if they are to be anything more than local works or works of general advantage to the whole Dominion.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend (Mr. Barr) hardly understands the suggestion of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works did not mean that the reservation of one item should confine the discussion to that one item. All these items are embraced in one resolution, and if you allow one item to stand, then the resolution as a whole will stand, and when subsequently he moved that the last item be carried the whole of these items will be open for discussion. That is what he proposes, so that my hon. friend does not have to pick out any one of them. He will be able to discuss any one of these items.

Mr. BARR. We are just where we were. Here is item 131, which we ask to be allowed to stand, but that request has been refused.

Mr. LANCASTER. It seems to me that the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) is a fair and reasonable one. I cannot see that the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Public Works, as emphasized by the hon. Postmaster General, does the government a bit of good. It is not the same thing to have a discussion on one item when it goes through at some future day, because in five or ten minutes the whole thing is over. The only hon. gentleman on this side who has any knowledge of Nova Scotia is the hon. leader of the opposition, who is absent tonight. It is well known why he is absent, and I do not think it is right or fair for the government to pass these items in regard to Nova Scotia. The hon. leader of the opposition has had an affliction in his family which the government must know of, and which has taken him away. He would be here except for that, and he is the only hon. gentleman on this side of the House who has any intimate knowledge of affairs in Nova Scotia. There is plenty of work for

this committee to do during the short time that we ought to continue to-night. We do not wish to be a party to obstructing the estimates of the hon. Minister of Public Works. We want to do this thing in a friendly way suitable to the convenience of hon. members, but the hon. leader of the opposition, being away, and the occasion of his being away being what it is, as is well known to the House, I think the hon. Minister of Public Works ought to comply with the request of my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram), who is the whip in charge of the opposition to-night in the House, and who, I think, is making a very reasonable proposition. We ought not to attempt to deal with any of the items in this resolution, but we should go on to the estimates for New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.

Mr. HYMAN. I do not wish to appear discourteous in any way, I am satisfied that we should go on with the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island items, but I feel, at the same time, that I have been really discourteous to hon. members on this side. The hon. member for East Elgin says that he has never heard the members on this side speak on these items. I am sure that the minister when putting through items should have the members for the constituencies with him to answer questions regarding the locality, the necessity for the work, &c. I do not see anything improper in that in any way; it is the members' duty.

Mr. INGRAM. If I have hurt the hon. gentleman's feelings, I am very sorry.

Mr. HYMAN. My feelings are hurt-proof.

Mr. LOGAN. I must protest against this proceeding in the House. There are 18 members from Nova Scotia.

Mr. LANCASTER. All on one side.

Mr. LOGAN. That is your fault, not ours. There are 17 members from Nova Scotia in the House I believe, to-night. I know that three or four of them intended leaving to-day for their homes, but they were kept here to-night because these items were coming up. We are not like the Ontario and Quebec members who can go home every week end; we are kept here from the opening to the end of the session. My hon. friend from Elgin is not serious in saying that a member supporting the government should not be here. Take for instance the very first item, that for Apple river. Apple river happens to be in my constituency and the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) does not know any more about Apple river than does the hon. member for East Elgin.

Mr. LANCASTER. Oh, yes he does.

Mr. LOGAN. He has never been within 50 miles of Apple river.

Mr. LANCASTER. Say that when he is here.

Mr. LOGAN. Pardon me, I happen to be the representative of the county, and know very well its requirements; I know whether the wharf should be built there, I know the people living there and I do not think that any one could have a better knowledge of the locality, nor could give better reasons why the wharf should be constructed than the representative of the county, your humble servant. We have stayed here to discuss these items and to give the explanations which will be called for from the opposite side. Is it fair and reasonable that simply because the leader of the opposition is not here——

Mr. BARR. My hon. friend does not say that he should be here.

Mr. LOGAN. The circumstances under which he is away are painful, and we do not like to press the point quite so much as we otherwise might, but, at the same time, I think the minister has made a reasonable proposition, that we should take up some items, reserving, if you like, those for Halifax county, which the leader of the opposition formerly represented, and with which he is familiar, but do let us go on and discuss these items to-night and be courteous on both sides. We all know the painful circumstances under which the leader of the opposition is absent.

Mr. INGRAM. The Minister of Public Works has no cause for complaint so far as his estimates are concerned; we have treated him liberally.

Mr. HYMAN. I am not kicking,

Mr. LOGAN. He is not kicking, we are kicking.

Mr. INGRAM. I think the suggestion we have made is a reasonable one, and I know that so far as Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick are concerned we will make very good headway. It is a well known fact that the more members that are present, the better progress is made with the estimates.

Higgin's shore pier—works of reconstruction and repairs, $1,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Will the hon. gentleman explain?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queen's, P.E.I.). Would the minister explain?

Mr. HYMAN. It is a revote. Ordinary repairs to the existing wharf.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What work has to be done?

Mr. HYMAN. Facing timber 200; crossties, 1,000 feet; fender-piles, iron, 1½ tons;

stone lifting on side, gravel filling on roadway. It is purely departmental.

Miminegash—extension of breakwater and cribwork revetment at inner end, $4,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This work is purely departmental work that the officers of the department recommended as being necessary. There is a cribwork revetment 120 feet by 12 feet wide and 6 feet high. There is an extension of the breakwater outward past a shoal, represented to be necessary to make the harbour safe of approach.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Will it be done by tender or by day work ?

Mr. HYMAN. The chances are by day work.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Is it the policy of the department in all repairs to breakwaters and wharfs and buildings to proceed by day work instead of by tender ?

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman will understand that there is great difficulty in small works of this kind in getting any one to tender, the difficulty being that the repairs that are necessary cannot be ascertained until probably some of the planks are removed. Within the last few days I had a case of calling for tenders for a work of this kind for a large amount, and it was impossible to have tenders because we could not give specifications; it simply said 'for renewal' and contractors either refused to tender or made their tenders upon the basis of an entirely new work. The policy is the same as that which has always been carried out by the Department of Public Works in works of this character.

Mr. MARTIN. Will this sum put it in good repair ?

Mr. HYMAN. That is the report of the officers of the department.

McPherson's cove, wharf, $9,000.

Mr. BARR. Is that by tender ?

Mr. HYMAN. That is by tender ; it is under contract at the present time. This is to complete.

New London—repairs to breakwaters, &c., $3,500.

Mr. HYMAN. Merely repairs to the existing wharf.

Mr. A. MARTIN. This is a very important wharf on the north side where harbours are not very numerous and where they are hard to approach. I know something about these harbours and spending small sums of money on them is almost money thrown away. Money has been voted several times for this New London harbour, but storms have carried the works away. I hope this vote will be sufficient to put the harbour in a permanently safe condition. I would like to know whether this is let by tender or by day work.

Mr. HYMAN. Of course the minister must be guided very largely by the reports of his engineers in matters of this kind. The report of the engineer was that this harbour was damaged by a storm in November, 1904. The vote was less, but this amount was put in simply to carry out the engineer's report to put the wharf in good repair.

Mr. MARTIN. Was the work let by tender before ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, the original work.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Who is the superintendent of the work ?

Mr. HYMAN. P. McCallum.

Point Prim Island, P.E.I.—wharf, $5,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The amount put in the estimates is only $5,000, but on further investigation it was found that the work will be larger than was anticipated, and I have given instructions to the engineer to examine further before proceeding.

Mr. A. MARTIN. This was in the estimates last year. Is it put here merely to figure up a large sum against the island, or is the work to be proceeded with ?

Mr. HYMAN. The vote was in the supplementaries last year. Then reports came to me that the cost of the work would be rather larger than I cared to ask the House for, and I am now trying to see if we cannot reduce the estimated cost.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The right of way was purchased for $350, and I understand that the total cost of the approaches to the wharf was $396.04. This matter has been before the House on three or four different occasions, and the work is a very important one and should receive the immediate attention of the department. Point Prim Island is a long distance from any shipping port and is sadly in want of this wharf.

Mr. HYMAN. The fact that the item is in the estimates is proof that the government intends to go on with the work, but the cost is larger than we anticipated, and I am obtaining further information before asking parliament to supplement the vote.

Mr. A. MARTIN. The engineers of the government have been down there on more than one occasion, especially before the last elections, and the department ought now to have all the information it requires regarding the character of the work. I do not see the use of putting in a vote of $5,000, as was done last year and is now being done, and then telling the House that the department are waiting for the engineer's report, when the engineers have been down there and made their examination and ought to have reported. Surely if this wharf cannot be built for $5,000 and the govern-

ment intend building it, they should ask a larger vote.

Mr. HYMAN. We cannot increase the vote now in the estimates except by bringing down another item, and I desire to know what the wharf will cost before I ask for another vote. I do not want to begin a work that will cost $30,000 when only $5,000 are available.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it the intention of the department to go on with the work ?

Mr. HYMAN. If it be found to cost $30,000, I shall have to seriously consider whether I should ask for more money or let it wait. I hope we will be able to do the work for $15,000, but the estimates of the engineers are not entirely satisfactory, and I want to be certain before proceeding.

Repairs to piers and breakwaters, P.E.I., $6,000.

Mr. A. MARTIN. There are several works on the island which require immediate attention. One is the harbour at Mount Stewart in which I know the hon. gentleman from King's county (Mr. J. J. Hughes) is interested. That harbour requires dredging and also a little more wharf accommodation. The village is a growing one and has quite a large trade. If the minister can see his way clear to putting that harbour in repair, he will be doing a very necessary work.

Mr. HYMAN. I shall ask my engineer to take a note of the hon. gentleman's representations. My hon. friend will understand that this is not a vote for dredging but simply for repairs. Has the wharf he refers to been transferred to the government ?

Mr. A. MARTIN. I believe it has.

Mr. HYMAN. If not transferred to the government, we do not repair it.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Would it not be in the same position as some wharfs you are building in Nova Scotia ?

Mr. HYMAN. When we build any wharfs in Nova Scotia, the title is with the government.

Mr. A. MARTIN. This is in the same position.

Repairs to piers and breakwaters, P.E.I.—creosoted timber, $5,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is to enable the department to buy a certain amount of creosoted timber, so that we will be in a position to make repairs quickly.

Mr. INGRAM. Did you purchase any last year ?

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Mr. INGRAM. Has any action been taken for the purchase of the material ?

Mr. HYMAN. We have given the order.

Richmond Bay, P.E.I.—reconstruction of wharf near Grand river ferry, $5,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is for the work of reconstruction and repairing.

Rustico harbour, P.E.I.—breakwater on Robinson's Island, south side of entrance to harbour, $11,000.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I understand that last fall a vessel went ashore there by reason of the channel having filled up with sand. Investigation was made by the government engineers to ascertain the cause, and the hon. minister will no doubt have some information on that point. If the filling in was caused by the construction of this breakwater, the breakwater may not have been put in the right place. Last fall a vessel went ashore there and the loss was attributed to the channel shifting. I understand an investigation took place, and that perhaps the minister has information which would enable him to state whether the disaster arose through the construction of this work, or in what other way.

Mr. HYMAN. We have no information in the department as to the cause of the accident. I understand that this is a very difficult harbour. The object of this work is to produce, by the process of scouring, a channel which will always remain. The work is undertaken on the report of the engineer of the department which favours this as the proper way to carry it out.

Mr. INGRAM. There would appear to be two entrances to this harbour as there are two items.

Mr. HYMAN. There are two breakwaters, one on the north side and one on the south.

Mr. INGRAM. There is an item here of money paid to the King's Printer and charged to this work. What is that for ?

Mr. HYMAN. For printing the specifications.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Rustico harbour is one of the most important harbours on the north side. I see that this money was voted last year. I placed a question on the order paper as regards dredging done in Rustico harbour, and the minister, in reply, stated that there was none.

Mr. HYMAN. That is right.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I visited the place several times, and there was some dredging being done, but not by the usual dredge. Whether the Minister of Public Works has any knowledge of it or not, there was dredging there. Rustico harbour is in one of the most thickly settled parts of Prince Edward Island, and the people have been there a long time, many of them being French Acadians. There are many fishermen among them, yet they have no harbour or wharf accommodation. Their toil is very severe,

and some facilities for the pursuit of their avocation should be provided. For the last four or five years work has been done by day labour, and so badly done that the first storm swept it away. I hope that this time not only will a contract be given, but that the work will be promptly advertised and that there will be no delay.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to go back for a moment to Richmond bay, reconstruction of wharf, and ask the minister if he proposes to let that contract by tender ?

Mr. HYMAN. I think the present intention is to do it by day's work. I see in the memorandum before me all the items with estimate of cost. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lefurgey) heard me say that we advertised for tenders, but had no satisfactory response.

St. Peter's Bay—breakwater on east side of entrance to harbour, $7,500.

Mr. INGRAM. We would like some explanation about this ?

Mr. HYMAN. Tenders were called for, and some were received, but none of them satisfactory. Some ten days or two weeks ago, the resident engineer was asked to submit new plans and specifications, and on these, tenders will be called for.

Mr. LALOR. I am a new member of the House and not thoroughly posted in the rules, but I think there is not a quorum present.

Mr. HYMAN. I think the hon. member (Mr. Lalor) will find that there is a quorum ; twenty make a quorum and there are more than twenty members present.

Summerside harbour—breakwater, $20,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. In what year was this work first before the House ?

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lefurgey) has had a number of opportunities of discussing it. I think it was in 1899 that the matter was first brought before the House. The contract for the work was let in 1900.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I think it first came up in 1898.

Mr. HYMAN. I am only judging by the date of the contract.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Were tenders received for the work in 1898 ?

Mr. HYMAN. In 1900.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What was the cause of the delay for those two years ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have heard the hon gentleman discuss this subject several times. But, I shall be glad to go over it again. The hon. gentleman knows the situation there. There was a great question as to the character of the work to be constructed in that harbour. It is a very long breakwater—2,300 or 2,400 feet, if I am not mistaken—and a difficult work. After a certain progress had been made on the contract, the engineer of the department reported that it was questionable whether the character of the work being done in the shallower portion would be suitable for the whole work, and the contract, therefore, was not gone on with. A settlement was made with the contractor and the work has remained in that position ever since. So far as the department is concerned, I asked not only the engineer of the department, but the deputy to visit the work to see how it was standing the ravages of the ocean. The hon. gentleman knows that this is a very exposed place, and he knows that such a work as this has to be carefully considered. I have not fully persuaded myself that it would be in the interest of the public, or of the people of Summerside to make the rest of the work of the same character as that already done. I had hoped to visit Summerside last year, but was unable to do so. I have engineers making a full report as to the matter, whether we dare continue that work in the way it has been begun. There are few works of this character, and I am sure the hon. members from Prince Edward Island would not like to see a work gone on with that would be in danger of early destruction by the sea.

Mr. LEFURGEY. From the minister's standpoint what he has said may seem a plausible excuse for not finding out in the first place whether the work, as designed, would fulfil the purpose for which it was intended. It seems to me that the time from 1898 or 1897, when the plans were prepared and the matter brought before this House up to this year, is ample for the department to make up its mind. Now, in 1897 or 1898 when this work was called for, the department must have investigated and found that there was a necessity for it. The department must have reasonably satisfied themselves through their experts that the work would accomplish a great benefit to the harbour of Summerside. They must also have found out the class of work that would be required, and the conditions to which this breakwater would be subject to. They must have found out before asking for tenders that the work would be reasonably suitable to withstand the sea, and frost, and so forth. It seems to me that the department, after calling for tenders and getting a tender for $54,000, have been very lax in the pursuance of their duties in not pressing this tenderer to continue the work, or take it out of his hands and have an investigation in a year or two after the contractor had failed to proceed with this work. Now, we find that the contract was let in 1900, and here we are in 1905, and the minister comes and explains that he has sent a man down three or four years after the work has been

stopped to find out if the work is corroding, if it is standing the weather and the sea.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman says three or four years, as a matter of fact he went down in March, 1904.

Mr. LEFURGEY. If the minister will look up the 'Hansard' he will find that we have been questioning the minister in respect to this Summerside breakwater ever since 1900. There was no work going on in 1904.

Mr. HYMAN. We stopped the work in 1904.

Mr. LEFURGEY. In 1900, when I was running an election in the county of East Prince, there was a flaring poster, as I have already told the House, published broadcast through the streets of Summerside, announcing that a breakwater would be built, and that from $15,000 to $20,000 per month would be spent on this work, and what a great boon it would be to the workingmen of Summerside. This work has been promised for years and years, and no further progress has been made. If it is the policy of this government to revote a work three or four years in succession to find out whether the class of work recommended by the department will stand the weather, then the public works of this country will be in a very bad state before we get anything accomplished. Now, I find that votes have been passed every year since 1898. I believe we figured it up a year or two ago and found that the votes and revotes for a contract that was originally to cost $54,000, amounted to $108,000 in the session of 1903. I think we had a vote last year and now we find another vote this year; so that altogether for a work that was originally to cost $54,000, we have voted over $150,000. All this time we find our Liberal friends in that province pointing to this aggregate of votes and saying: See how great an amount of money we are getting for public works in Prince Edward Island. I want to point out how the people of Prince Edward Island are being fooled in the matter of public works. In the estimates of last year there was a paltry sum of $13,000 for public works in Prince county, and I find that this year, of that $13,000, $10,400 is a revote—only $2,600 has been spent in the county of Prince during the last year. I am not objecting to the minister's estimates with regard to the amount of money voted for public works in the county I have the honour to represent. But I must insist upon the department proceeding with some degree of speed on the public works which are admitted by them to be required for the benefit of the shipping of that county. I would like to know from the minister whether they intend to build this work, if a new plan has been put before the government, and whether they will call for tenders for this work in the near future. I have received by the last mail letters from people in Summerside asking whether this work is to be continued.

Mr. HYMAN. I should be very sorry to remove anything from the estimates which would deprive the hon. gentleman of an opportunity of getting off the speech he has made on several occasions. The work is exactly in the position I have told him. I cannot alter the conditions. If it is found that a work can be constructed there of a character that will stand and serve the purpose, that breakwater will be constructed. The engineer has been asked to report; and when we get his report the department will decide what to do.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Will the minister tell me how they propose to go on?

Mr. HYMAN. By a new contract, by making plans and specifications for a work which will be of a character to ensure permanency. It is unfortunate, I acknowledge, the hon. gentleman has some grievance when he says that over $100,000 have been voted, and so little has been spent. He objects because a certain vote has been a revote.

Mr. LEFURGEY. It is to blind the people.

Mr. HYMAN. I quite concede that the people of the county have been blinded. But let the hon. gentleman possess his soul in patience. We will have the work investigated. I have no desire to delay the work if it is necessary. This is a very long work, some 2,900 feet, and it is necessary that it should be made of a permanent character when it is undertaken.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I think the department should now be seized of the knowledge whether this breakwater is going to be built, and how it is going to be built. Surely the people of Summerside ought not to be obliged to wait another year for that breakwater. Will the minister assure me that plans and specifications will be prepared, and tenders called for, and the work proceeded with in the spring?

Mr. HYMAN. There is no hon. gentleman to whom I would like better to give such an assurance. But I cannot give an assurance of that kind after the statements I have made that it is necessary for the department to be perfectly sure of the charaster of the work which they contemplate constructing there, in order that it may be of a permanent character. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that there are great difficulties, it is a large undertaking. He knows that a breakwater of that length reaching out into deep water requires to be carefully considered. I can only give the hon. gentleman the assurance that I will have reports from the engineers, and when we are satisfied of the proper

character of the work to construct there, we will go on.

Mr. LEFURGEY. There is no doubt the minister will find that they can put a breakwater there that will fill the bill.

Mr. HYMAN. There is no doubt that we could put a breakwater there that would fill the bill, but it would possibly cost $200,000 or $300,000. The question of cost comes in.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Then it is a question of cost?

Mr. HYMAN. Very largely.

Mr. LEFURGEY. May I ask the hon. minister what length they would go to in constructing a breakwater in Summerside harbour?

Mr. HYMAN. The good faith of the department is shown in entering into the original contract in 1900. The amount of that contract was $55,000. I do not think that the extension of a work of that character all the way could be carried out for that money. It is a question of cost, and we want to be sure before we proceed with the work. If, having a vote for $20,000, I entered into a contract for a work that would cost $150,000 or $200.000, I would be very seriously critcised in this House.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I think the hon. gentleman said last year that the amount that would be required to complete that work satisfactory would be in the neighbourhood of $150,000. May I ask the hon. gentleman if, in case the department find that a useful work can be constructed for that amount of money, we can have his assurance that the work will go on after a careful investigation has been made? I presume they have the details of this work in the department, and if he decides that it can be advantageously proceeded with at a cost of $150,000, will the hon. gentleman give us the assurance that it will be gone on with?

Mr. HYMAN. I am sorry I cannot give the hon. gentleman that definite assurance. I do not think I would be justified, with a vote of $20,000, in entering into a contract for a work that would cost $150,000.

Wood Islands—protection of southern breakwater from scour, $750.

Mr. A. MARTIN. There has been a good deal of money spent on this harbour.

Mr. HYMAN. It is quite a large work.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I know it. I am perfectly familiar with the work. I suppose the hon. minister has some information on that point?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Before we pass from this item of $90,000 for Prince Edward Island, I would call the attention of the hon. Minister to the harbour of Belle River, on the southern side of the island, where there is a great deal of business done. I think a small appropriation, perhaps $4,000 or $5,000, would put that harbour in a very efficient condition. I think there are some reports in the hon. gentleman's department in regard to Belle River. I think that a sum was voted some years ago, or was proposed to be voted, for the improvement of that harbour. This is a section of the country in which a good deal of business is done, and if the hon. gentleman would give his attention to the matter, and look at the reports in his office, I think he would come to the conclusion that an expenditure such as I have suggested is necessary at this point.

Mr. HYMAN. I have asked the engineer to examine the reports in regard to that harbour.

Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick—Campbellton—wharf extension and repairs, $50,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the hon. gentleman give us a little explanation about that?

Mr. HYMAN. This work is under contract. The contract was let on the 11th October, and amounted to $35,300. In addition to that, the department were called upon, as the result of an arbitration, to pay $35,000 for the wharf. It is only fair to tell the committee that from the information the department have it will be necessary to ask for another vote in the supplementary estimates. The wharf at Campbellton is not at all sufficient for the amount of business that is being done there. There is the boat service by the south shore, which it will be imperative practically to provide a landing for. In addition to that, the number of boats loading lumber every year and the shipping generally are increasing to such an extent that the department will be justified in asking the House for a further vote, on which this whole work can be discussed.

Mr. CROCKET. What will the total cost be?

Mr. HYMAN. The amount of the contract which has been entered into is $35,300.

Mr. INGRAM. There may be some other questions to be asked in connection with that item.

Mr. HYMAN. There will be a new vote, and it can then be discussed.

Some resolutions reported.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. INGRAM. I know that Monday is private members' day. Perhaps the hon. minister can tell us, if private members get through with their business, what the government propose to do after that?

Mr. HYMAN. Private members' work will be taken up, and if we get through with that we will go into supply.

Mr. INGRAM. On what items ?

Mr. HYMAN. I cannot answer that, but it will not be on the Public Works estimates.

Mr. INGRAM. Could any of the ministers say what estimates they will discuss ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is a difficult matter. If the hon. Minister of Agriculture is here, I think he will go on with his estimates, but I would not like to be bound down to saying exactly what we will go on with. It will be private members' day, and I suppose it will be taken up with private members' business.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 27, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Dominion Annuity Company.—Mr. Bole.

RIGHTS OF THE PROVINCES.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I intend to ask the attention of the House to a very grave matter ; and, if necessary, to put myself in order, I will conclude with a motion. The very important matter to which I propose to call attention has reference to provincial rights, particularly the rights of the province of Manitoba, and I regret very much that neither the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) nor the late premier of Manitoba (Mr. Greenway), who has now a seat in this House, is in his place. It is largely because these hon. gentlemen have not chosen to call the attention of the House to this matter that I do so to-day. I think I can best bring the question immediately within the view of hon. members by reading a translation of an article that was published in 'Le Soleil' of Quebec, on February 11.

Mr. EMMERSON. Read the original.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I will read the original, but for the benefit of the Minister of Railways, I will translate it ; I am quite competent to do both. 'Le Soleil,' which claims to be under the personal control of the Prime Minister and to speak for him, in its issue of February 11, made this declaration :

We declare once for all that 'Le Soleil' is the organ of the Liberal party, and by that fact is under the direction and absolute control of Sir Wilfrid. The supporters of Sir Wilfrid, and those who affirm themselves to be such, are begged to take notice of the present declaration.

On February 17, that paper, in an editorial, discussed the rights of the province of Manitoba in this way :

In proportion to her big sisters Manitoba will count as little more than a large county.

This is one of the reasons invoked by Manitoba's delegates to obtain an enlargement of her territory.

There is another. Quebec and Ontario have extended their limits, the one to the west, the other to the east, to attain on the north the shores of James bay.

Manitoba aspires to the shores of Hudson bay, on the northeast. It would be necessary to withdraw her boundaries several hundred miles towards the north, to cut the districts of Saskatchewan and Athabaska, and encircle that of Keewatin.

Manitoba is asking for treble her existing territory.

This enlargement is hardly possible.

The district of Saskatchewan opposes it, at least the part directly interested.

The finances of Manitoba in their actual state are not made to attract the free residents of the districts. Manitoba has a debt of $4,000,000. The school legislation of the little province is not of a nature to attract the immigrants who people the districts. The Northwest has its separate schools. Manitoba has abolished them.

Every good act has its reward, every bad act its chastisement.

Manitoba will remain lowest with her pretentious law.

In other words, a threat is here held out by the Quebec organ of hon. gentlemen opposite that Manitoba is to be kept in her inferior position, as compared with the other provinces, as a punishment because she chose to vindicate her provincial rights. She is to be denied territory, and worse things than that are to befall her. Again I say I regret the absence of the Minister of the Interior and the late Prime Minister of Manitoba. Among the laws of this country is a very important Act called the Dominion Lands Act. Reading from the Revised Statutes of 1886, I find that section 23 of that Act, under the head of School Lands, says :

Sections eleven and twenty-nine in every surveyed township throughout the extent of the Dominion lands, are hereby set apart as an endowment for purposes of education, and shall be designated school lands ; and they are hereby withdrawn from the operation of the clauses of this Act, which relate to the sale of Dominion lands and to homestead rights therein ; and no right to purchase or to obtain homestead entry shall be recognized in connection with the said sections, or any part of them.

Sections 24 and 25 provide how these lands shall be sold. Subsection 3 of section 25 says :

All moneys, from time to time, realized from the sale of school lands shall be invested in

securities of Canada, to form a school fund, and the interest arising therefrom, after deducting the cost of management, shall be paid annually to the government of the province or territory within which such lands are situated, towards the support of public schools therein; and the moneys so paid shall be distributed for that purpose by the government of such province or territory in such manner as it deems expedient.

Now, from the statement which was made to all Canada the other day, we must infer that the Dominion Lands Act is to be changed, and that in the province of Manitoba these school lands, which are now consecrated to public schools, not to separate schools, are to be sold, and the proceeds distributed in an entirely different way. That follows from the statement made here the other day, and on behalf of Manitoba I protest to-day against any such change in the law, or any such chastisement being meted out to that province as is proposed by this organ of the government. That organ wants Manitoba chastised because of certain laws which that province has passed in connection with the school lands, and yet this same organ is the mouthpiece of this government, of which the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) is a member, and of which the late premier of Manitoba (Mr. Greenway) is an ardent supporter. If any wrong has been wrought to the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba in connection with the school question, is not that due to the Minister of the Interior and the late premier of Manitoba? They it was who caused the Manitoba legislation now complained of to be enacted. It was the Liberal party which passed it, and did so in the interests of that province. Yet to-day we have the Dominion government, of which these gentlemen are the mainstay, threatening, through its leading organ, to chastise Manitoba because of that very legislation. That organ says to the province of Manitoba: You shall not extend your bounds, you shall continue in the lowly inferior position you now occupy. On behalf of that province, and because these gentlemen are not here to raise their voices in its behalf, I raise mine.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I raise my protest because the proposal about to be made here is of a most far reaching character. Not only the school lands of Manitoba, but the whole educational fund of that province, is to be changed by a general Act, which must follow from what was said here the other day. I draw the attention of the right hon. gentleman to this. If these important changes are to be made on the lines laid down by him, then it follows that remedial legislation is in order as concerns Manitoba. The argument is an a fortiori one. Remedial legislation must follow, and it will be introduced in this House by the right hon. gentleman who warned the country against such legislation eight years ago. There is this prospect for Manitoba, that all her schools lands are, in every probability, to be diverted this very session of parliament to other purposes than those to which they are devoted to-day by a general Act amending the Dominion Lands Act. Furthermore the Manitoba school funds are to be diverted by legislation which must follow as a logical sequence from the statement made the other day. Logically the right hon. gentleman is bound to introduce a Bill remedying the school grievances of the minority in the province of Manitoba, and yet these very so called grievances are due to the Minister of the Interior of this government and his friend (Mr. Greenway) who, I am told, is to be his immediate successor in this government. It was to give these hon. gentlemen an opportunity here to repudiate this language, to say they could not be parties to any such legislation, that I brought this mattter up to-day; and in all probability the absence of the hon. the Minister of the Interior from this House ever since the beginning of this session and the absence of the hon. member for Lisgar, (Mr. Greenway) to-day are due to their desire to shirk their manifest duty in connection with this matter. The hon. the Minister of the Interior was here only for a moment the other day, and his absence no doubt is due, as well as that of the other hon. gentleman, to what is in the immediate future in store for them. If what was foreshadowed the other day is to happen, it must follow that those school lands are to be diverted from their present purpose and a Remedial Bill introduced this session, and the party, which claims to be the defender of provincial rights from one end of the country to the other, is to-day doing nothing to prevent the shackles being put on the provinces of this great and free Dominion. These provinces are to-day free, and my right hon. friend must know that if there is one thing which the people who breathe the free air of the prairies, the people of the great west, value, it is their political liberty; and if the right hon. gentleman insists on shackling these people in connection with the dispossession of their school lands, he will make a great mistake. He apparently does not understand the genius of the western people if he thinks that by aid of any constitutional argument, he can interfere with the school lands of the province of Manitoba. I leave the case for the present but may have to return to it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But I shall wait until the Minister of the Interior is in his place. Again I call the attention of the right hon. gentleman to the absence of a number of his ministers from this House. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Sutherland) is not here. I regret that he is ill, but the constitutional practice is that when a minister is not able to take his place in

the House he ought to vacate the position, both in his own interest and that of the country. The hon. member for London, (Mr. Hyman), who is discharging the duties of the Minister of Public Works, is contravening the constitution every day under the circumstances.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh !

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Hon. gentlemen opposite laugh, but they used to attack the late government about this very thing. I regret that the Minister of the Interior, (Mr. Sifton) was not in his place at the time when these provincial rights which he held at one time to be most dear to the people of Manitoba, were being assailed. I recollect when that hon. gentleman came down to the province of Ontario and told the people of Haldimand that of all things the people of Manitoba did not want separate schools or remedial legislation imposed upon them. He came to the province of Ontario for sympathy on that score and he got it. But now if we are to believe the right hon. gentleman's organ, all that is to be taken back, the school lands are to be diverted from their proper purpose, and the hon. gentleman is bound, if he carries out what he promised, to introduce this session, an Act to remedy the school grievances of the minority of Manitoba. If any such thing be attempted, the wrong will be done, provincial rights will be taken away, and to-day, in the absence of the two hon. gentlemen to whom I especially referred, I rise to protest against the policy outlined by the right hon. gentleman in connection with these matters. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). One could hardly imagine that any hon. gentleman would rise to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of inflicting on us such a ramshackle—if I may use such an expression—delivery as we have had from my hon. friend. He has given us a very modern exemplification of the old story of Don Quixote tilting against wind mills. My hon. friend is becoming every session more and more quixotic in his views and methods. Take this item which he has just read from the 'Soleil' and on which he has built so unwarranted a conclusion that the government contemplates introducing a Remedial Bill to amend the law of Manitoba. There is not a scintilla in the article of the 'Soleil' which can warrant any such conclusion. The whole thing is manufactured—I will not say wilfully—but if not, I know not how to characterize in what manner it was manufactured. Where is there a single word to warrant what the hon. gentleman sees there ?——

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I did not say that it was there.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend admits there is nothing there to warrant his outbreak. The whole thing is in my hon. friend's own mind, and it is from his own mind alone that he has evolved the notion that this government contemplates any such thing as introducing a Remedial Bill for the province of Manitoba. That is the only authority he has for his remarks this afternoon. The thing is too absurd for consideration. My hon. friend professes to have his soul harrowed by the prospect he contemplates. Let me tell him once and for all that the government since 1896 has never contemplated introducing any Remedial Act affecting the province of Manitoba and does not intend doing so.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What about the school lands ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I may say to the hon. gentleman that the government has not contemplated and does not contemplate to introduce any law to amend the School Law. Is that categorical enough for the hon. gentleman?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. You cannot change the School Law without changing the Dominion Lands Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Then I will make my answer more categorical yet. The government has not contemplated, does not contemplate and will not contemplate any amendment to the Dominion Lands Act. I do not understand what the hon. gentleman is aiming at to-day. If he has any object it must be to try and create a false impression to arouse prejudices somewhere. But the hon. gentleman began by expressing his deep regret that the Minister of the Interior and the hon. member from Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) the former premier of Manitoba, were not in their seats. Why, Sir, it would have been very easy for the hon. gentleman to secure their presence in their seats if he wanted them to be present. Why did he not notify them that he wanted to bring before the House some question requiring their presence, and which required them to make some defence to charges that he intended to bring against them. Did the hon. gentleman notify the Minister of the Interior that he wanted him here to-day? Did he notify the hon. member for Lisgar that he desired his presence here to-day? I am in the judgment of the House when I say that the hon. gentleman, when he intended to bring charges against the members of the House, wilful and deliberate charges, has not had the manliness to notify them that he intended to do so. As to the 'Soleil,' I have no interest whatever in that newspaper, financial or otherwise. It generally supports the government, but sometimes opposes it. If the hon. gentleman expects me to be responsible for anything that is published in the 'Soliel,' he is asking more from me than one would ask

from any other member of parliament. The hon. member may be responsible for what appears in the Toronto 'World,' I have not had the same connection with the 'Soleil., I have nothing to do with the article in the 'Soleil,' which I had not read and had not heard of until it was read on the floor of the House.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman is trying to draw a red herring across the track. This newspaper which declares it is his organ, and he has not repudiated it, says that the province of Manitoba is to be chastised because of its pretentious school law, it is to be chastised by the right hon. gentleman and his party, and the chastisement is in evidence now before all the people. Manitoba expected that her boundaries would be extended, and she expected that the Minister of the Interior would be here to see that her boundaries were extended, but Manitoba is being chastised to-day, as the organ of the right hon. gentleman says, because of her pretentious school laws. They are not pretentious, they are constitutional, she had a right to make them, yet she is to be chastised to-day. The right hon. gentleman said practically the other day that the province was entitled to have its boundaries enlarged, it was entitled to be put on an equality with the other provinces. All over the country the statement has been published that Manitoba is being chastised because of her manliness in connection with public schools. The right hon. gentleman says he does not propose to interfere with the Dominion Lands Act. He does in substance, he does in a certain measure which I know of, where it is all outlined that the public school lands and the public funds in relation to education are to be interfered with. It may be in a special Bill, but the intention is to make laws in that direction. What follows then is this, that in the way the right hon. gentleman aproaches this question he is making flesh of one and fish of the other ; certain provinces are to enjoy certain school lands and others are to be denied them. If that is not an injustice and an interference with the lands of the province, I do not know what it is. The right hon. gentleman is trying to get away from this question in saying that he does not propose to introduce remedial legislation. He is bound to introduce it if there is anything in the constitutional argument he made here the other day. There is nothing in that constitutional argument, but there is a great deal in the constitutional argument that Manitoba is entitled to remedial legislation. If that is true, I will have to put up for the present with the trivial reply of the right hon. gentleman; but before two weeks are over, before another week is over, he will sing on the other side of his face. He will find that the people of Canada are in favour of the maintenance of provincial rights; they are not in favour of a paternalized autonomy like that which the hon. gentleman proposes. The people of this country believe in provincial rights as they have been defined and won out by the province of Manitoba. Again I say that the hon. gentleman is attempting a revolution, and the Minister of the Interior ought to be in his place here to-day, since these things are being done in the department over which he presides. The hon. gentleman asks why I did not notify the Minister of the Interior? Am I the Minister of the Interior's keeper? If he is not in his place, where shall I have to go to find him? It is not for the right hon. gentleman to say to me that I should notify this man or notify that man; let them be here to look after themselves.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington). The hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) who has just resumed his seat, may not be the keeper of the Minister of the Interior. But there is a rule of courtesy recognized in this House which requires that when an hon. member intends to bring up a matter pertaining particularly to any department, the minister presiding over that department must be notified. Ministers have all sorts of reasons for not being in the House. Deputations wait upon them from time to time, as we all know. We know not why the Minister of the Interior is not in his place to-day; but there is this much about it, it is a small thing and a mean thing for the hon. member for South York to make these remarks without having intimated to the Minister of the Interior that he desired his presence here. Now I desire on this occasion to enter my protest against such interruptions and interjections, on the Orders of the Day being called, as have been made by the hon. member for South York. If there is anything calculated to stir up strife and trouble in this country it is speeches such as that hon. gentleman has delivered, and articles that appear in his newspaper. If hon. members in this House would treat the question which the hon. member for South York has introduced, with calmness, with candour, with that liberality which no doubt they all possess, there would be no danger of producing that storm and that inflamed condition of the public mind which appears in the party press and among the people, which we see to-day, and will see throughout Canada. Now, the hon. member cites the case of Manitoba. I am not going to dwell on that, I merely say that so far as I am concerned, as a member of this House supporting the government, the question of schools in the province of Manitoba is a settled question. There is no analogy whatever between the conditions of Manitoba and the new provinces which are to be admitted in to the confederation; I say this now, although these are matters which will more properly come up when the Bill is read the second time. But when we per-

mit a province to come into this confederation, we permit it to come in on such terms as this House deems proper and equitable. It was so with the other provinces, and, I presume, will be so with the provinces that are to come in. Mr. Speaker, I only rise to protest against interjections and interruptions by hon. members such as those of the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) who seeks both by his voice in this House and by the newspaper, which, fortunately or unfortunately, he controls, an inflammatory condition of indignation in the country. I think that, when the Bill is before us and when discussion is proper, then the hon. member for South York can enter any protest he sees fit. But, until that time, it is much better for the House and the country that we should remain silent on the subject.

Motion (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjourn, negatived.

STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I.—SNOW BLOCKADE IN MARITIME PROVINCES—DELAY OF MAILS.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (Prince, P.E.I). Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the attention of the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) through the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to the condition of the mail service in Prince Edward Island. I received on Saturday a despatch from a resident of Tignish saying that, in answer to communications addressed to the postmaster of Charlottetown they have received absolutely no information as to the carriage of the mails, and the people throughout the district have now undertaken the service themselves, and the mails have been started by sleighs sent out by private individuals. It seems to me that this is very unsatisfactory, and, I should think, an illegal method of handling the public mails of this country. I will ask the right hon. First Minister to bring this subject to the attention of the Postmaster General and have some inquiry made into it. And, if the train service is so blocked that the mails cannot be brought through by the trains a service should be established by means of sleighs under official auspices, so that His Majesty's mails may not be entrusted to private individuals as they have been.

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Min- of Marine and Fisheries). I beg leave to communicate to the House a despatch I have just received :

Charlottetown, P.E.I., 27th Feb.

Steamers last crossing twenty-fourth ultimo, ice blockade still continues ; tried dynamite Pictou barrier Saturday, found useless ; 'Stanley' unable to get past Cape Bear. No crossing at Capes since twenty-third instant. Boats cannot overcome lolly, broken ice and deep snow ; railway blocked for two weeks.

A. LORD,
Agent.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). Apropos the subject raised by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Lefurgey), I beg to inform the House and the country that the snow-blockade which has for some time existed on the Intercolonial—or that portion of it in the province of Nova Scotia—has been raised. I had communications to-day stating that the trains are now moving in and out of Halifax, and also between Sydney and Truro—so that the road is completely free. The Dominion Atlantic line which is the line running between Halifax and Yarmouth, had been closed for a week or ten days. Even the highways are entirely impassable. With the assistance of the Intercolonial and the using of the appliances of that road, the Dominion Atlantic has been opened up, and trains are now running over it. The blockade, of course has been a very great drawback to the business interests of the maritime provinces. Regretful for the past, I shall endeavour to make such arrangements as are possible with the clerk of the weather to prevent a repetition of such a stoppage of Intercolonial trains.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.). In reference to the question raised by the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Lefurgey), I might say that I made representations to the Post Office Department some time ago and was informed that the postmaster at Charlottetown had full power to employ teams to convey the mails when the trains were stalled—full powers to have the mails brought through by any means he thought advisable in the public interest. I have no doubt at all that the postmaster at Charlottetown is using the power intrusted to him to the best of his judgment and ability.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I do not wish to make this a subject of controversy. But, as I have a message from a resident of Tignish, I might read that to the House, and possibly it may satisfy hon. gentlemen as to my position :

Tignish, P.E.I., Feb. 25.

A. A. Lefurgey, M.P.,
Ottawa, Ont.

Mails started by private individuals without notice. Whear insolently answers. No explanation. Bring up demoralization before orders of day. Agnew wired Yeo to-day.

So, it would appear that the postmaster at Charlottetown had been appealed to in the matter and the people had received no satisfactory explanation of his conduct, and consequently had to use conveyances of private individuals to deliver the mails.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

Mr. HAGGART. I would ask the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) when the Bills establishing the provinces

of Saskatchewan and Alberta will be printed ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I expect they will be printed to-day or to-morrow.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). The Bills were placed in the hands of the clerk of the House on Thursday last.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 34) respecting the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 33) respecting certain patents of Jean Effront—Mr. L. P. Demers.

MOLSONS BANK.

House in committee on Bill (No. 14) respecting the Molson's Bank.—Mr. Ames.

On section 1,

Mr. CAMPBELL. I may just say that when this Bill was before the committee there was some opposition to it on account of the question not being settled as to whether the shareholders had authorized this change. Since then I have received a telegram from the general manager saying that the shareholders were notified and authorized the change at a special general meeting called for that purpose.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SOVEREIGN FIRE ASSURANCE CO. OF CANADA.

House in committee on Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Sovereign Fire Assurance Co. of Canada—Mr. E. F. Clarke.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Mr. Chairman, before you report the Bill as the hon. Minister of Finance is in his place—and I am very glad to see him here looking so well—I wish to call his attention to the general insurance question, and particularly to the question which has arisen over in the United States. I am only going to take a moment because I would like to discuss this matter with him later on in the session, but I wish to give him notice to-day that a very serious question has arisen in the United States in regard to life insurance as controlled by private companies. He must know, as every one, I imagine, knows, that it came out the other day in the city of New York that the great Equitable Life Insurance Company of that city, that now controls five hundred millions of money in trust for its policyholders, is absolutely under the control of one man, who, with his family, owns $75,000 of the paid up stock of $100,000 which gives him the control of that company.

It has been pointed out by very important men in the United States and by the great newspapers of the United States that an effort was being made in New York by great capitalists represented by Harriman Gould and the great bond house represented by Mr. Schiff, of New York, to control this company and that they were willing to give $5,000,000 of ready money for the controlling interest in the shares of the Equitable Life. This has proved to be a matter of supreme interest to the people of the United States, that a few men with a very small capital could control the immense reserve fund for the benefit of the policy holders. It is proposed there now—and we will have to do the same thing, we will have to change our insurance laws—to enact that the policy holders shall have a great deal to say in the disposition of these immense trust funds, and I take this opportunity of calling the attention of the minister to it. I trust that, if not this session at a very early date, we will be able to cope with this great question, because if there is one thing of importance in connection with an insurance company it is that the trust moneys which are there for the security of the policy holders ought to have the best possible administration. I do not think the best administration of these funds can be secured when it is possible for their management to fall into the hands of two or three men who by controlling the shares of the proprietary company are free to do what they like with great funds of this kind. It is openly charged by the leading newspapers in the United States to-day that Harriman and Gould are anxious to get control of the Equitable Insurance Company in order that they may play ducks and drakes with the $500,000,000 of trust money which is the absolute property of the policy holders, in order that they may use it for their great railway propositions, and we are in danger of reaching the same condition in this country. I trust that later on some proper provision will be introduced into our General Insurance Act for the protection of the policy holders.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The proper protection—shall I say the adequate protection—of the moneys which are invested in the hands of the various insurance companies of our country, must always be a question of the utmost importance, and if at any time there may be doubt as to whether our legislation is sufficient on that point I am sure that my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) or any other member would be only doing his duty in bringing the matter before the attention of the House. I hope it will be found, on an examination of the general insurance law and of the charters of the various companies, that our legislation in Canada is not open to the objections which might be taken in the case of United States companies. However, if there are some companies as to which that criticism might be offered, I quite admit

that it is a proper subject for consideration. I think that, in the main, our insurance legislation, both with regard to the General Insurance Act and to the charters of the various companies, is in a very sound position. If, however, anything can be done to improve it, I am sure as Minister of Finance that I shall be glad to accept suggestions from any part of the House so that so good a purpose may be carried out.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADIAN CANALS CORPORATION.

Mr. W. S. CALVERT moved the second reading of Bill (No. 72), to incorporate the Canadian Canals Corporation.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would like to have a little information in regard to this Bill. I presented a petition from the county council of the county of York protesting against it, and I would like the hon. gentleman to make a little explanation so that the municipalities, if they are interested, can attend the meeting of the Railway Committee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, the promoters of this Bill are asking for an Act permitting them to build a canal and railway combined. It is to commence on the Georgian bay and to cross over to Lake Simcoe, about 16 miles. Lake Simcoe is 131 feet higher than Lake Huron, and they intend to build a ship railway to raise the ships that 131 feet. Lake Simcoe is about 25 miles in length and they propose to build a canal about 99 miles in length and then another ship railway, which will be about 1¼ miles in length. Lake Simcoe is 466 feet higher than Lake Ontario and by these proportions of railways, together with the canal, they expect to be able to connect the Georgian bay with Lake Ontario, a distance of 72 miles. It is anticipated that it will save about 618 miles in a round trip. The cost is estimated to be about $45,000,000. I would like the Bill to go to the Railway Committee to be discussed there.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

RED DEER VALLEY RAILWAY AND COAL COMPANY.

Mr. ARCH. CAMPBELL moved second reading of Bill (No. 76), respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if this is our old friend?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, it is a very old friend, a very dear friend.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 73), to incorporate La Compagnie du Chemin de fer Montreal, Quebec et du Sud.—Mr. Gervais.

Bill (No. 74), respecting the Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Railway Company.—Mr. Talbot.

Bill (No. 75), respecting the Battleford and Lake Lenore Railway Company.—Mr. Lamont.

Bill (No. 77), respecting the Canadian Agency.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 78), respecting the Macleod, Cardston and Montana Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 79), respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—Mr. Zimmerman.

Bill (No. 80), to incorporate the Woodstock and Lake Huron Railway Company.—Mr. A. H. Clarke.

Bill (81), respecting the Ottawa River Railway Company, and to change its name to the Central Trunk Railway Company.—Mr. Piche.

QUESTIONS.

CIVIL SERVANTS' GUARANTEES.

Mr. CHISHOLM asked:

1. When did the Post Office Department begin to guarantee the bonds of the postmasters and mail carriers of the Dominion?
2. Are the civil servants in the outside departments, other than the postmasters, dealt with in the same way?
3. On what principle is the levy made on the postmasters?
4. What amount of money has been collected from the postmasters each year, and what is the total amount up to date?
5. What amount of losses has been sustained by the Post Office Department; and what has been the total net gain or loss to the Post Office Department?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (for the Postmaster General). The question doubtless refers to the assessment system inaugurated in 1898 by the department. It does not apply to all civil servants in the outside service of the Post Office Department, but only to employees in city post offices and to railway mail clerks, porters, transfer agents and other civil service employees who are actually engaged in the work of handling the mails. The rate of assessment is forty cents on each one hundred dollars of insurance required. The amount of such insurance is in accordance with the following scale: Every accounting postmaster, the revenue of whose office is under $2,000 a year, is required to give security to the extent of $800. Where the revenue exceeds $2,000 a year, but is less than $5,000, the insurance required is $1,200. Where it exceeds $5,000 but is less than $10,000 a year, the insurance required is $1,600. Where it exceeds $10,000 a year but is less than $15,000, the insurance required is $2,000. Where it exceeds $15,000 a year but is less than $25,000, the insurance required is $2,500. Where the revenue exceeds $25,000,

except in the cities of Montreal and Toronto, the insurance required is $3,000. In the case of the cities of Montreal and Toronto the insurance required is $5,000. Each postmaster of a non-accounting post office is required to give $200 security, and if the estimated revenue of his office does not exceed $100 a year, it is optional with him to give bonds or to accept the assessment system. The assessments since the inauguration of the system have amounted to the following :—

For the year ended 30th June, 1899	$12,773 48
For the year ended 30th June, 1900	8,479 93
For the year ended 30th June, 1901	8,930 02
For the year ended 30th June, 1902	10,088 52
For the year ended 30th June, 1903	11,970 25
For the year ended 30th June, 1904	10,891 71
For the seven months to 31st January, 1905	215 25
	$63,349 16

Out of this sum the department has paid in re-insurance and ascertained losses the sum of $19,909.51, leaving a balance of $45,992.68 to the credit of profit and loss account.

CONSUMPTION OF BINDER TWINE.

Mr. SINCLAIR asked :

What proportion of the binder twine consumed in Canada is manufactured (a) in Canade ; (b) in the United States ; (c) in other countries ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The only way I can answer the question is as follows : The imported binder twine entered for consumption in Canada during the year ended 30th June, 1904, was :

	Lbs.	Value.
From United States	12,623,608	$1,459,113
From other countries	4,380	591

The binder twine manufactured in Canada, according to the returns for bounty purposes, from 1st September, 1902, to 30th June, 1904, was 16,165,048 pounds.

ST. ANGEL HARBOUR.

Mr. PAQUET asked :

1. How much was expended last year for the deepening of a harbour at St. Angel, in the county of Nicolet ?
2. At the request of whom were those works undertaken ?
3. Does the government purpose to continue those works ?
4. What additional amount would be needed to complete the harbour in question ?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. $11,723.18.

2. On the report of the assistant engineer of the department.
3. Yes.
4. $12,000 will be required to complete the deepening of the channel to 8 feet at low water across the Lake St. Peter's flats, at the mouth of the Nicolet river into Nicolet harbour, and for rip-rapping the jetty protecting the channel through the flats.

INSPECTION OF GAS AND ELECTRICITY AT THREE RIVERS.

Mr. PAQUET asked :

1. Who is the inspector of gas and electricity at Three Rivers ?
2. What salary is attached to that office ?
3. During the past year how much was the cost of that office, including the expenses of travel ?
4. To what sum did the receipts during the same period amount ?
5. Is the inspector supplied with an office and its accessories ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Inland Revenue) :

1. Joseph Ulric Dufresne.
2. $500.
3. $65.95.
4. $128.25.
5. He has an office in the public buildings at Three Rivers, which is provided with the necessary accessories.

ALEXANDRIA POST OFFICE.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Ingram—asked :

1. When was the contract for the new post office at Alexandria, Ontario, let, and when will it be finished and fit for occupation ?
2. Does the contract specify any date of completion ? If so, when ?
3. What is the cause of the delay, and who is paying the rent of the temporary premises, the government or the contractor ?
4. Who is the contractor ?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. On the 23rd of October the contract for the erection of the building was completed. The building is expected to be ready for occupation about the 1st of May.
2. Yes ; the 15th October, 1904.
3. The delay is due to the contractor. No rent is being paid by this department for post office premises.
4. Joseph Bourque.

PORT STANLEY HARBOUR.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Ingram—asked :

1. Has the harbour work at Port Stanley been let ? If so, when, and to whom ?
2. Were tenders called for ?
3. If so, from whom were tenders received, and what were their amounts ?
4. Was the lowest tender accepted ?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. No.

2. Yes.

3 & 4. Several tenders were received, but as the contract is not yet awarded, it is considered not in the public interest to disclose the amount of the tenders at present.

RONDEAU HARBOUR WORK.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Ingram—asked :

1 Has the harbour work at Rondeau been let? If so, when, and to whom ?
2. Were tenders called for ?
3. If so, from whom were tenders received, and what were their amounts ?
4. Was the lowest tender accepted ?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. No.
2. Yes.
3. Several tenders were received, but as the contract is not yet awarded, it is not considered in the public interest to disclose the amount of the tenders at present.

TORONTO HARBOUR WORKS.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Ingram—asked :

1. Were tenders called for on or about the 2nd of November, 1904, for the piling and breakwater at the eastern gap, Toronto harbour ?
2. If so, how many tenders were received ; who tendered, and what were the amounts of the tenders ?
3. Was the work then awarded ? If not, what is the reason that the work was declared off, and not then let ?
4. Were tenders called for the same, or substantially the same, work on or about the 26th January, 1905 ?
5. How many tenders have been received in response to this last advertisement ?
6. Is it true that the minister has referred these tenders to the chief engineer ? If so, why ?
7. Has any tender been accepted ? If not, what is the cause of the delay in awarding the work ?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. Yes.
2. Five ; but as no contract has been awarded, it is not considered in the public interest to make known the tenderers or amounts.
3. No ; the price of the lowest tender was considered too high.
4. Yes.
5. Five.
6. Yes ; as he required the opinion of his executive officer on the same.
7. No ; as further inquiry in the proposed method of doing the work is considered necessary from a public standpoint.

RETURNING OFFICER FOR SELKIRK, MANITOBA.

Mr. NORTHRUP—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Was the occupation of the returning officer appointed for Selkirk, in the province of Manitoba, in the last Dominion election, at the time of his appointment, that of bar tender ?
2. If not, what was his occupation ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The information of the government is that the returning officer for Selkirk in the last Dominion election is a clerk.

APPOINTMENT OF JOSEPH LEMIEUX.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. Has Joseph Lemieux received an appointment in connection with the lightship service ?
2. If so, when was he appointed, to what locality was he assigned, and what wages are paid him ?
3. Did the said Joseph Lemieux, prior to his appointment, make charges against the Quebec agent of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and ask for an investigation of the same ?
4. Was such investigation granted ?
5. If so, has any report been brought down ? If not, what was the reason the investigation was not proceeded with ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes.
2. 26th July, 1904 ; steward in lightship 'Anticosti' ; wages, $45 per month.
3. No.
4. Answered by No. 3.
5. Answered by No. 3.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND FISHERIES.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN asked :

1. To what extent, if any, have the fisheries of Prince Edward Island advanced within the last decade ?
2. Who are the officers charged with their supervision, and what are their duties and salaries ?
3. Have any new ones been appointed ? If so, what are their names, duties and salaries ?
4. Has the government any plan for the development of the deep-sea fisheries of Canada? If not, why not ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. The value of the fisheries is practically the same.

2. J. A. Matheson, inspector of fisheries ; salary, $1,200 per year. J. B. Macdonald, assistant inspector ; salary, $1,000 per year. W. C. Hobkirk, fishery overseer ; salary, $550 per year. John Davison, fishery overseer ; salary, $200 per year. James A. McCormack, fishery overseer ; salary, $200 per year.

The duties of the inspector and assistant inspector relate chiefly to the enforcement of the fishery laws. They also direct and control the work of the overseers, and at the end of each season furnish the department with a full and detailed report of the season's fishing operations.

The overseers act under the instructions of the inspector in enforcing the fishery laws.

3. The assistant inspector is a recent appointment. The remainder of the question is answered by No. 2.

4. The general policy of the department embraces the development of the deep-sea fisheries.

MOUNT STEWART SHIPPING FACILITIES.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN asked :

1. Have any representations been made to the government in reference to the shipping facilities at Mount Stewart, Prince Edward Island ?

2. Is the government aware that the wharf accommodation is deficient, and that dredging is needed in order to carry on increasing trade?

3. Has the government any engineer's report in respect of the condition of this shipping place ?

4. What does the government intend to do in the premises ?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works). There are no papers to that effect in the department, but orders have recently been given to the district engineer to report at once on the conditions of the harbour.

CAPTAIN THOS. THOMPSON.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

1. Upon whose recommendation were the services of Captain Thomas Thompson, preventive officer at Port Bruce, Elgin county, dispensed with ?

2. Is his removal from office the result of any neglect of duty on his part ?

3. If not, what is the cause of his removal from office by the department ?

4. Is it the intention of the department to appoint a preventive officer at Port Bruce ? If so, when ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. The services of Thomas Thompson, preventive officer of customs at Port Bruce, were dispensed with by Order in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Customs.

2. His removal from office was not on account of any neglect of duty.

3. He was removed from office because the maintenance of a customs officer at Port Bruce was not considered necessary in the public interest.

4. It is not the intention of the Customs Department to appoint a preventive officer at Port Bruce.

GRAIN SURVEY BOARDS.

Mr. H. B. AMES (Montreal, St. Antoine) moved :

For copies of all petitions and correspondence between the Boards of Trade of Toronto and Montreal respectively, and the Governor in Council, in reference to the appointment of Grain Survey Boards, under the authority of the Grain Inspection Act, at Toronto and at Montreal ; and for copies of the Orders in Council whereby the aforesaid appointments were made ?

He said : It is incumbent upon me, Mr. Speaker, to state as briefly as possible, my reasons for asking that an order of this House be issued for the return I have just specified. This House will remember that last session there was passed a Grain Inspection Act. That Act was considerably amended in committee and finally passed. Clause 32 provides for the formation of a Grain Survey board, to be a sort of court of appeal from the decisions of grain inspectors in cases of dispute as to quality. That clause reads as follows :

The Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the Boards of Trade of Toronto and Montreal respectively, may appoint for any eastern division or district a grain survey board to be composed of such number of fit and qualified persons as in each case may be considered necessary or defined.

Then follows some immaterial matter about the powers of the board, but I want to point out the way in which that clause has been interpreted by the department. That clause was not in the Bill as originally drafted, but was inserted on the demand of the Boards of Trade of Montreal and elsewhere, speaking more particularly for the corn trade associations. About three weeks after this Act was passed, the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce wrote to the secretary of the Montreal Board of Trade as follows :

The Act of course provides for the recommendation by the Boards of Trade of fit and skilful persons to compose the Grain Survey Board, and the full provisions of the Act must be complied with before the new Board is in a position to act. Your Board of Trade will do well to make their recommendations so that they may be considered by the Governor in Council as early as possible.

In conformity with these instructions, and the evident interpretation put upon the law by the Deputy Minister of the Department of Trade and Commerce, the Montreal Board of Trade recommended the appointment of Mr. James Carruthers, retiring president of the Corn Exchange Association, Mr. H. D. Metcalfe, Mr. E. S. Jacques, Mr. C. B. Esdaile, and Mr. A. G. Thompson. At the same time the Toronto Board of Trade, after consultation with the grain people, made ten recommendations, and there were also recommendations made by the Board of Trade of Winnipeg. The government accepted the entire ten names submitted by the Toronto Board of Trade, but did not see fit to accept those sent in by the Montreal Board of Trade excepting three, namely: Messrs. E. S. Jacques, C. B. Esdaile and A. G. Thompson, and saw fit to add three additional names not recommended by the Montreal Board of Trade, thus making a board of six, upon which the Montreal Board of Trade had not even a majority. As soon as this was known in Montreal the members of the Corn Exchange Association met and passed the following resolution :

Resolved, that the Montreal Corn Exchange Association has learned with great surprise that the government has seen fit to disregard in part the nominations made by the Board of Trade for the Grain Survey Board at this port;

That the Association holds that, according to the inspection law, the nominations of the personnel of said Board rests with the Board of Trade, and it protests against, and resents the action of the government in disregarding the nominations remitted to it;

That the association protests the more strongly against the said action of the department because there is a strong belief among its members that Messrs. Carruthers and Metcalfe were not recommended by the Department of Trade and Commerce for appointment on the Survey Board because, in fulfilment of the instructions of this Association, they opposed before the parliamentary committee at Ottawa certain clauses of the draft Bill making the chief inspector's decision final, and that Messrs. Crane and McFee were recommended by the department for appointment for the reason that they opposed before that committee the expressed views of the Association in this regard.

The reason I have moved for the papers is to ascertain whether these resolutions and petitions were presented to the government, and whether the government saw fit to give any explanation to the Corn Exchange Association and the Montreal Board of Trade. The Board of Trade and the Corn Association claim that they were unjustly treated upon two grounds, as they set forth in their resolution. First, upon the legal interpretation of clause 32. I am prepared to admit that that clause is susceptible of divers interpretations, but when it was suggested, as I understand it was by the boards of trade, they supposed it to mean that the recommendations should come from the several boards of trade, and if it means anything else it means what those who suggested the clause did not intend it to. Evidently from the letter of the Deputy Minister of the Department of Trade and Commerce, quotations from which I have read, that was the interpretation put by the government themselves on that clause. The resolution of the Corn Exchange Association points out that they consider themselves aggrieved by the course of the government and pretend that the government did not act legally in the matter. And they base this claim on the fact that the clause makes provision that the appointees shall be those who will be recommended by the Montreal Board of Trade. But they still further protest that certian nominees were unjustly discriminated against. The five gentlemen who the Montreal Board of Trade recommended were gentlemen who stood very high in the estimation of those interested in the corn trade and the business circles of Montreal. They had served on the previous Grain Board and had given every satisfaction. Mr. Carruthers had just laid down his position as president of the Grain Trades Association, and Mr. Metcalfe was a well known and highly respected member of the same organization. Why these gentlemen should be struck off the list of recommendations and others substituted is at least hinted at by the resolution passed by the Grain Trades Association. They say they have reason to believe that Messrs. Metcalfe and Carruthers were struck from the list because they had the temerity, on the invitation of the government to come here and make certain strictures on the draft Bill as presented before parliament. And, because they made these strictures, their names were struck from the list of those supposed to be fit and skilful persons to carry the law into effect. They came simply as delegates. They came bearing resolutions passed unanimously—or practically unanimously; there were two dissentients—by the Grain Trades Association. They came not expecting that such actions would be to them a cause of disappointment or punishment. So, I think some explanation should be given to the commercial circles of Montreal as to these appointments. I would not for a moment be understood as stating that the gentlemen who were appointed by the government were not fit and competent persons for the position. Messrs. Crane, McFee and Morris are thoroughly good men, and that we all admit. But they are in no wise better fitted for the position than are those recommended by the Board of Trade and the Grain Trades Association; and we in Montreal cannot see why the government should discriminate and strike out the names of some who were recommended. As I have stated, in Toronto, the entire ten recommended were accepted; in Winnipeg all those recommended were accepted. I was informed by a gentleman to-day that when Hamilton made recommendations, they were accepted. And we would like to know why Montreal, in this particular case, should have been treated in this exceptional manner.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no objection to the production of the papers in this matter. They will be brought down at a very early day, because, I believe, they are already in the Department of Trade and Commerce. I would observe, however, that it is impossible for the government to accept the interpretation the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) has given of the Act he has quoted. Section 32 of that Act reads as follows:—

32. The Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the Boards of Trade of Toronto and Montreal respectively, may appoint for any eastern division or district a grain survey board composed of such number of fit and skilful persons as is in each case considered necessary or convenient, and such board shall have the powers——

—and so on, I understood my hon. friend to say that the government was bound to accept the recommendations which were

made by the Board of Trade. I must at once dissent from that interpretation. It cannot be admitted that the government will simply fill the part of a mere recording clerk for the Board of Trade. When recommendations are made to the government by the Board of Trade, the government is bound to consider the fitness of the persons proposed, but naturally would accept those recommendations unless there was cause to the contrary. At all events, that is the interpretation we have given to the statute, and I think that interpretation will be accepted by parliament. In this case the recommendations made by Toronto were accepted without dissent. So were the recommendations made by Winnipeg. But some dissent was expressed to the recommendations made by the Montreal Board of Trade. I do not mean that the fact that Messrs. Carruthers and Metcalfe were passed over would indicate anything against those gentlemen. I do not think it would be fair to imply or accept anything of that kind. But the Minister of Trade and Commerce informs me that these gentlemen have been passed over for good and sufficient reasons, which will appear upon the face of the papers when they are brought down.

STEAMSHIP COLD STORAGE—THERMOGRAPH RECORDS.

Mr. HENDERSON (Halton) moved :

For copies of all thermograph records of temperature taken on board Atlantic steamships during the calendar year 1903, stating : (1) name of steamship ; (2) date when thermograph was put in chamber ; (3) date when the steamer left the report ; (4) whether chamber was (a) cold storage ; (b) cool air ; (c) mechanically ventilated ; (d) ordinary, or whether the record was taken on deck or other place where the natural temperature of the air would be registered, unexposed to the sun's rays ; (5) where practicable, in what part of the chamber the thermograph was placed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). There is no objection to the motion, but I understand that it will take a very long time to prepare this return.

Mr. HENDERSON. This information was moved for last year, and was brought down. But it is not in the possession of the clerk of routine and records—it is not available to members of the House. I am under the impression that the whole matter is in the hands of the Department of Agriculture.

Motion agreed to.

FREIGHT AND STORAGE CHARGES—SYDNEY INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY STATION.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queen's) moved :

For a return showing in detail all the collections for freight and storage at Sydney Intercolonial Railway station for 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903 and 1904 ; giving the names of shippers and consignees ; a description of the merchandise ; where from ; weight of each package : the amount received for storage, and from whom. Also a reference to the authority under which storage has been collected ; the rate, and by whom fixed. Also any refunds for freight and storage, and to whom paid.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I am informed by the Railway Department that it is not customary to furnish such information as is asked for by this motion. It involves private business. Moreover, I am informed it will take almost a year to prepare such a return. I would advise my hon. friend (Mr. A. Martin) to allow the matter to stand and have a conference with the Minister of Railways. Perhaps the minister can give the hon. gentleman the information he wants.

Mr. A. MARTIN. The reason I have moved for this return is that I have received letters from parties, who complain that there is discrimination in freight and storage charges, some parties being charged more than others. I do not know any other way to get that information. If the order is too large, perhaps we might shorten it by making it apply only to one year.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend were to have a conference with the Minister of Railways, perhaps they could agree upon a form in which the motion could be carried.

On motion of Mr. Clements, the debate was adjourned.

BOUNDARIES OF MANITOBA.

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

For copies of all petitions, memorials and resolutions from the legislative assembly of Manitoba, the executive of that province, and any correspondence relative to the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba to the west or north.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would ask my hon. friend not to move this to-day. The correspondence is not complete yet, but it may be completed next Monday. Allow it to stand.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If any correspondence is received between now and then, will that be included ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose we will have it before the discussion of the Bills ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not see any connection at all between the Bill now before the House and this question regarding the province of Manitoba, I cannot see that they have any relation whatever. It is intended to have the correspondence complete as soon as possible, probably this week.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is it not a fact that the province of Manitoba has asked some of this very territory which it is now proposed to include in Saskatchewan ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I think therefore the question is pertinent.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think it is, because the legislature of the Northwest Territories has passed a resolution against such a grant of their territory.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. They have also passed a resolution favouring the incorporation of a portion of that territory in the province of Manitoba.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, and I can inform my hon. friend that this territory is not at all included in the boundaries of Saskatchewan.

Mr. HAGGART. The right hon. gentleman has introduced this very subject in his speech introducing the Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly, I introduced it to say that we could not grant the prayer of the province of Manitoba, because the province of Manitoba asked for a certain portion of the territories under the jurisdiction of the Northwest legislature, and the legislature had refused to grant such territory. At the same time, I stated there was a portion of territory north of Lake Winnipegosis and Lake Manitoba as to which the legislature had expressed no objection to granting it to Manitoba. But we have reserved this, it is not included in the boundaries of the new province. Therefore it has no relation at all.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I still hold that Manitoba has an interest in the territories to the west, which are still territories and not provinces. Manitoba has been looking forward all along to acquiring them, and I believe the Minister of the Interior has made statements to that effect, that some day Manitoba might look forward to including a portion of the territory of Saskatchewan. I think correspondence of that character is in the possession of the government, and we ought to have it in connection with the new Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

COLD STORAGE OF FISH.

Mr. ALEXANDER MARTIN moved for :

A return showing the number and location, cost and earnings, of the cold storage establishments called 'bait freezers,' of maritime Canada ; together with the returns, duly certified, of all such institutions, since 1900 ; the names and the salaries of all superintendents, officials and keepers of same ; and the amounts in pounds of the different kinds of fish therein stored ; the amount of bait from them used by bona fide fishermen, and the names of the same; together with all such information as may permit of the thorough examination of the question of government assisted refrigerators.

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE. I must inform the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. Martin) that some of the documents he asks for cannot be laid on the table. I am informed that the names of the fishermen are not on record. I do not know what the latter part of his motion means. Of course, the government has no objection to producing whatever papers can be produced, but the latter part of his motion cannot be complied with. I might suggest to the hon. gentleman that he call at the Department and indicate what papers he desires to obtain. The Department will furnish him with a list of those that can be produced. Let the motion stand in the meantime.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of the report of Mr. Matheson relating to the alleged fraud in payment of fishing bounties.—Mr. Ganong.

For copies of all correspondence, letters, reports, petitions, memoranda, in possession of the government, or any member or official thereof, relating to the location and erection of a railway station at Grand View, on the Murray Harbour branch of the Prince Edward Island Railway—Mr. A. Martin.

For a return showing the total number of officers, civil engineers and other employees now engaged in the surveys of the Transcontinental Railway, and works connected therewith, under the Transcontinental Railway Construction Commission ; the name and place of residence of each of the above persons at the time of his appointment ; and the functions and salaries of each of the above.—Mr. Gervais.

For a return showing the business done in the Exchequer Court of Canada, under its admiralty jurisdiction, since the Admiralty Act of 1891 came into force ; giving by districts, (1) the number of actions instituted ; (2a) the number of interlocutory applications, and (b) trials ; (3) the amount involved.—Mr. A. H. Clark.

LABOUR UNION LABELS.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 10) respecting Labour Union Labels.

On section 7,

Mr. GUTHRIE. When this Bill was last in committee, the question was on an amendment proposed by the hon. member for St. John and Iberville (Mr. L. P. Demers), to the effect that the word 'incorporated' should be inserted in subsection A of subsection 1 of the Act. That motion was not disposed of at the time the committee rose and asked leave to sit again. I would like to draw attention to that clause of the Bill before it is passed over, or before any other clause is taken up. Now objection was taken seriously by many members that a labour union or association acquiring rights under this Bill to register trade marks or designs of their own, were not amenable to the common law, or to the

law of the land, statutory or otherwise. The hon. member for St. John and Iberville cited in support of his contention the case known as the Metallic Roofing Company of Canada vs. The Local Union No. 30 Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers, International Association, and others, which is reported in the Ontario Law Reports, volume 5, 1903. In that case it was certainly held by the Chief Justice, Sir William Meredith, that under the title of the Local Union No. 30 Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers, the union could not be sued. That case however went to the Court of Appeal, where it was dealt with on the 23rd of January last, and the Court of Appeal distinctly held, in the case reported in the 'Ontario Weekly Reporter' of February 7th, 1905, at page 35, that while the union might not be sued under its title of Metallic Roofing Union, still it could be sued in a representative action; taking for instance the executive committee of the union and suing them on behalf of themselves or of all the members of the union. The decision of the Court of Appeal in Ontario in this respect is fully borne out by the case cited by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) in introducing this motion, the case commonly known as the Taff Vale case, reported in 1 Appeal Cases, 1901. The learned law lords who decided it held that the union could be sued whether registered or unregistered, and I assume that registration in England is equivalent to incorporation in this country. For instance, Lord Macnaghten in deciding that case says:

> I have no doubt whatever that a trades union, whether registered or unregistered, may be sued in a representative action if the persons selected as defendants are persons who from their position may be taken fairly to represent the body.

The judgment of Lord Lindley in the same matter reads as follows:

> I have, myself, no doubt whatever that if the trades union could not be sued in this case in its registered name, some of its members (its executive committee) could be sued, on behalf of themselves and the other members of the society, and an injunction and damages could be obtained in a proper case in an action so framed.

I maintain therefore that whether registered or unregistered, incorporated or unincorporated the union is amenable to the laws of the land. There is no association, no union or no individual who can escape liability merely by means of the assumption of a name not registered or not incorporated. It is so in reference to many other associations. Take an ordinary club, a hockey club, a cricket club, a sporting club or a club of any kind unregistered and unincorporated; surely no one will argue that the law of the land cannot reach the membership of such a club in an ordinary action for damages or an action of tort or contract. They are all amenable to the law and the law will reach the members of any trades union. I might call the attention of the House to the fact that in the first section of this Bill the expression 'labour union' means 'any and every association of working men or of working women, or of working men and working women.' Two or more people may form such an association. All they would have to do would be to associate themselves either in writing or verbally, but, I suppose, for more precision it would be an association with some articles of agreement in writing. What does the Bill ask? The Bill asks that such an association be allowed to designate its own work. That is all. Employers have their trade marks and their registered designs. They apply them to their goods. They have property in these trade marks and these designs, but the labour union or organization asks for no such privilege. It simply asks that a stamp be placed on the articles manufactured to show that this article has been manufactured by a certain class of labour. That cannot deteriorate the value of the goods and the label cannot be placed on the goods without the consent of the manufacturers. There is a clause which I may say is somewhat objectionable in the Bill as drafted. It is the clause to which attention was called by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart)—clause 10. That reads as follows:

> Nothing in this Act contained shall enable any suit, action, garnishee, interpleader or other proceeding to be brought, had or maintained against a labour union, except for the purposes of this Act.

I do not think that clause, when properly read, is of any force or effect whatever. It gives no power to the union nor to any individual to seek redress against the union and I believe that the Bill would meet all that is asked for if that clause were eliminated. In consultation with various members of the Dominion Trades Congress they have stated to me that they will be quite satisfied if that clause of the Bill is eliminated. The elimination of that clause will do away with any question as to their liability or responsibility in a suit. I look upon this matter as a simple request from a large body of the working people of this country to have a designation of their own placed upon the goods which they make. Their object, in the first place, is certainly to determine their own goods. Their object in the second place is to prevent fraudulent labels being placed upon goods to deceive the public or to deceive themselves with the idea that these goods have been made under what we know as union conditions. There are people who will buy goods made by union labour and none other and they have the right to do so if they so desire. It enables those people to protect themselves in their purchases. The statement emanating from the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, which has been supplied to all

members, probably, of this House, to the effect that no fraudulent labels exist is untrue because fraudulent labels are placed on goods. I do not know who places them there, but I have seen several fraudulent labels that have been taken from goods and which were placed there to lead the public to believe that the goods were manufactured under union conditions, probably that they might meet with a more ready sale, when, as a matter of fact, the goods were made under non-union conditions. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the question of incorporation is not a question which we have to deal with in this Bill at all. There is an Act of this parliament, chapter 131, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, which provides for the reigstration of trade unions known as the Trades Union Act. Some unions have become registered under that Act, but that Act does not in any way involve or affect the question which arises in the present Bill. This Act was passed in order to legalize certain transactions or agreements between certain members of the labour unions and their employers, which, but for this Act might have been looked upon as Acts against public policy and therefore void in the eye of the law. In order to meet that condition of things this Trades Union Act was passed, but this Trades Union Act or the registration under it is not at all affected or brought into the discussion of the Bill now before the committee. In reading the clauses of that Act you will find it applies to the funds of the union, to the property which they may hold and to actions which may be brought against them in respect of the property they may hold, but to say they should be registered under this Act or incorporated, as the amendment moved by the hon. member for St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers) says, is to my mind an unnecessary provision. There is no provision in the Act for incorporation. There is no provision in any Act I know of for the incorporation of these unions. The unions do not ask for incorporation. They are now amenable to the law. Then why not grant them the small request which they ask, to place a label designating their own work upon the goods which they manufacture, which label can only be placed there with the consent of the employees. I am most heartily in sympathy with this measure, I think it should be passed without amendment, and that there should be no condition of registration or incorporation attached to it. There is no necessity for such a condition ; it only makes the law more cumbersome, more expensive, more involved for the unions who make a very very simple request to have their own labour properly designated.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. There is one thing to which I desire to call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) who has just taken his seat. He has said that labour unions are not incorporated and do not seek incorporation; I desire to know what particular unions he refers to. Does he speak of the Dominion at large or of one particular province?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I know of no unions which are incorporated and which use labels. In fact I know of none which are incorporated unless they are registered under that Act in Canada.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. The object of my observation was to point out to my hon. friend that in Nova Scotia they have a labour union which has been in existence for a great many years, which has probably a better record than any other labour union in the whole Dominion—and I say this without any disparagement to the record of any other labour union—I refer to the Provincial Workmen's Association, to which nearly all miners engaged in coal mining in Nova Scotia and many others as well belong. This is an incorporated body; it has been incorporated for many years and not only is the parent order incorporated but nearly all the various lodges throughout the province of Nova Scotia are incorporated bodies in accordance with the laws of Nova Scotia. These are the facts so far as my own province, with which I am more particularly familiar, in matters respecting labour administration is concerned.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. For the sake of information I would ask the meaning of the provision here in subsection 3. We have the words :

The expression minister means the Minister of Agriculture——

I would like to know the meaning of the other words, included in the section.

——and does not include the deputy minister unless herein expressly provided.

Why are these words added?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I do not see any object in the words myself. I was looking over the section and I think they could be eliminated.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think that would be better.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Mr. Demers (St. John and Iberville) moves to add the words at clause 1, 'duly incorporated.' The clause would then read :

The expression labour union means any and every association of working men or of working women or of working men and working women, duly incorporated.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) has given us to understand that the unions at the present time are amenable to the law. If so, what would be the objection to their being incorporated ?

Mr. GUTHRIE. The only objection is that incorporation causes trouble and expense, and the unions do not ask to be incorporated. If they are amenable to the law, as I submit they are now, there is no object in incorporating them. They can be sued, their property seized and sold, and in the well known case of Krug and the Labour Union Committee at Berlin, they have been restrained by injunction. I maintain that all bodies are amenable to the law whether registered or incorporated or not.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. The statement of the Minister) of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick when the Bill was being considered in committee had, I have no doubt, something to do with prejudicing the minds of the members of the House. At page 709 of 'Hansard,' in answer to a question by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) the minister said :

> I must confess that I have looked only somewhat hastily over this Bill and I should be glad now if the promoter would point out to me any similar legislation in any country. There is no such legislation that I know of anywhere, and there are some provisions which it would be my duty to oppose when we reach them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I made a statement on the second reading of this Bill that there were 41 states in the union that had legislation on this question. I did not make that statement without knowing that it was correct, but I have taken the trouble to go over the whole of the statutes of the different states and I have compiled a list, because it is a very important thing to know that for this legislation there is a precedent in so many states of the union. I find that my original statement was correct. The Minister of Justice may at any time see copies of the statutes which I have in my desk. Some of these have been enacted since 1888, and are actually operated to-day on the very principle of the provisions of this Bill. Another thing is that in not one of these states where this same legislation is operative, are the unions compelled to incorporate. There is no provision at all for their incorporation; in fact there is special provision in the state laws against the necessity for the incorporation of trades unions. I submit that the statement that if it was agreed that there was no such legislation in any other part of the world it would prejudice the consideration of this Bill. That is a great mistake as I have said. I have a list before me of similar Acts of the states of Alabama, California, Arizona, Colorado, Kentucky, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin. These laws are all operative under the very provisions of this legislation that we are now asking this House to pass, and in not one of these state laws is there any provision for incorporation. I mention that because I have no doubt that many members were anxious, and I think that the minister or any member of the House was perfectly right in wanting to know whether such legislation exists.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is the hon. gentleman sure that the organizations in the states he has named do not register under the State Laws ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. There is a special provision in the Bill that it shall apply to unions unincorporated. I have made investigation into this matter and I presented this case to the men interested in this legislation. They do not want me to support this amendment; they do not see why they should not have the right to register a label without being compelled to enter into an incorporation, and I will be compelled to vote against this amendment.

Mr. HAGGART. I was listening attentively to the observations of the hon. gentlemen opposite. The evident object of the Bill, although I have not paid much attention to it, is to incorporate a body of men for a specific purpose; for the sole and only object of having a label. The hon. member says they are liable anyway under the common law. That is true. If a dozen or two individuals own a political paper in a county town and do not choose to incorporate, they are all liable to any person who brings an action against them; but how would you like to bring an action against five or six hundred members of a labour union or association?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Bring the action against the officers.

Mr. HAGGART. You cannot bring an action against the officers.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. It has been done repeatedly.

Mr. HAGGART. If the objection to incorporation is the cost, why not register the association, which will cost only $2 or $5. I do not know what the object of the Bill is entirely ; but we all agree that if there is any benefit in the union label, the possessors of that label should receive the benefit ; but we do not intend to give them the benefit if they cannot be made liable under any counter action. Clause 10 of the Bill provides that nothing in this Act shall enable any suit to be brought against a labour union except for the purposes of this Act.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. We are willing to strike that out.

Mr. HAGGART. It may be, as the hon. gentleman states, that there is legislation

of this kind in thirty different states of the union ; but let him be certain that there is not in those states some simple system of registration or incorporation which may render unions liable. It seems anomalous legislation to give a union corporate entity for one purpose only—the purpose of owning and using a label. That is the objection I have to the Bill. I have no objection at all to the members of labour unions receiving the benefit of their skilled work, and drawing the attention of the public to it by using a label, but let them be in the position of all other corporations of being liable.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. When this Bill was under consideration before, I confessed my ignorance of any similar legislation in any other part of the world. I appreciate the fact that the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill stated that there were thirty-one states in the union in which similar legislation existed ; he also stated that there was similar legislation in England. I cannot profess to be familiar with the laws of the various states of the union ; but as his statements surprised me somewhat, I asked him to be good enough to give me some reference to the states where I could find similar legislation. He did not do so ; but I find in a report of the labour bureau of Washington a statement of the labour laws of the different states. I have not examined the legislation closely ; but my impression, which is confirmed by the very book which my hon. friend has sent to me, is that in all of these states registration is necessary. My hon. friend says that a union can be sued through any member of the union ; but my hon. friend is aware that there is no such thing as a representative action in any province where the civil law prevails ; and, moreover, there is no known system of law under which a representative action can be taken in a penal case. If there is a penalty, there cannot be a representation ; it is contrary to the most elementary principle of criminal law. It seems to me that it was agreed, when this question was last considered, that the Bill should be made applicable to all incorporated associations and unions, and that it was allowed to stand over in order that I might amend those sections which would need to be amended in order to make it apply only to such. It has been said that there are no incorporated unions, but I know that the ship labourers' union of Quebec is incorporated.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Does not the law of Indiana distinctly include unions, whether incorporated or unincorporated ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not seen that, but I find a paragraph requiring a statement to be filed with the Secretary of State, and requiring the persons who seek to file the registration to give the name of the union and the name of the chief official connected with it. Protection is provided for by those who may be improperly dealt with as a result of that legislation. It does not seem to me that there is anything of that sort in the Bill we have here.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I submit there is sufficient protection in this Bill.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the meaning of the word 'company?'

Mr. GUTHRIE. Voluntary association. The law of the state of New York does not provide in any way for incorporation. It says that a union or association of employees may adopt a device in the form of a label, &c., for the purpose of designating the pro- registration or incorporation. It does not provide for registration. The law of Kansas is almost identical. There is nothing in it about registration or incorporation. It provides that whenever any association or union of workingmen have adopted for their protection any label or trade mark announcing that the goods to which such labels are attached were manufactured by the members of such association or union, it shall be unlawful for any corporation to counterfeit or imitate such labels or trade marks. There is nothing there about incorporation or registration.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is it not a fact that in that very state no association can have any legal existence unless registered?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I have looked into that very question and I failed to find anything to compel any union or association to register.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Let me read the law of Indiana :

> The label, wrapper, mark, name, brand, stamp or device used or intended to be used by any union or association of workingmen or women, or both, whether incorporated or unincorporated, for the purpose of designating such goods or merchandise as are the products of the labour of the members of such union or association, may be registered, as provided in this Act, and receive the protection herein provided for.

Amendment agreed to.

Sections 7, 8 and 9 carried.

Section 10 struck out.

Section 11 and 12 carried.

On section 13, label not to be attached without consent of owner of goods.

Mr. HYMAN. I move that this clause be amended by inserting the words 'in writing' after the word 'consent' in the third line.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Merely for information I would ask the promoter of the Bill what is meant by the sixth clause?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. When the Bill was put into my hands this clause was not

drafted. I explained to the men who wanted this legislation that perhaps a union, which had agreed with a company that a certain label should be used, might subsequently have difficulties with the company, and the company would have large quantities of stock on hand marked with that label. The manufacturer might not then be able to sell his goods unless this provision were put in for his protection. This protects his business from being interfered with on that account.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In the event of an agreement being made between the employees and the manufacturers, that in consideration of their giving him the use of a label he should give them increased wages or shorter hours and they should subsequently withdraw his right to use the label, his obligation to pay the increased wages or give the decreased hours would continue.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. When a manufacturer enters into an agreement with a union the contract is a voluntary one and the manufacturer must provide for his protection when the contract is made.

Bill reported.

Mr. SPEAKER. When shall the Bill be read the third time ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. At the next sitting of the House.

Mr. LENNOX. It cannot be read the third time now.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Has the hon. member (Mr. Lennox) any objection ?

Mr. LENNOX. Certainly I have.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Let him state his objection.

Mr. SPEAKER. If there is objection taken the Bill cannot be read the third time.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the committee stage a stage of the Bill, or are the committee and third reading one stage ?

Hon. PETER WHITE. With reference to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, of course, I do not desire to call it in question at all, but I would point out to the House that the third reading of a Bill may be taken upon the same day upon which it is considered in Committee of the Whole, provided the House so decides. If the House decided that the third reading should be given to-day, that could be done.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It does not require unanimous consent ?

Mr. WHITE. That is the point.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The rule is that two stages cannot be taken on the same day except by unanimous consent, but the committee stage is not a stage.

Mr. WHITE. What I wish to point out is that a Bill must have three separate readings on different days. But, when the committee stage is taken, the third reading may be taken when the House so decides. That is, the fact that a member objects does not prevent the third reading.

Mr. LENNOX. But a member can object and have the question voted on..

Mr. SPEAKER. Perhaps the matter had better be dealt with in that way.

Mr. RALPH SMITH moved the third reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903, AMENDMENT.

House went into Committee on Bill (No. 2), to amend the Railway Act, 1903.—Mr. Lancaster.

On section 1,

1. Section 227 of the Railway Act, 1903, is amended by striking out the word 'or' in the third line and substituting therefor the word 'and,' and by adding after the word 'expedient' at the end of the section the words 'but wherever in any such portion of a city, town or village a railway crosses a highway at rail-level, the said speed of ten miles an hour shall in no event be exceeded, unless the company provides, by a watchman or gates at such crossing, protection against approaching trains for persons using the highway.'

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). This Bill was referred, at my request, the last time it was before the House, to the Railway Committee. I understand it was considered there and that the committee reported against it. I cannot see how the House can do otherwise than support the committee.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). I do not think the House is bound to support the committee, particularly if the committee did not do what was quite right in the matter. I might point out, to begin with, that the Bill did not go to the Railway Committee by the unanimous consent of the House. Several of us on this side protested and I think, rightly protested, that measures to change the public laws of the country should be dealt with on the floor of this House. Bills proposed by the government or by anybody with whom the government are in sympathy, or with whose legislation they are in sympathy, are dealt with on the floor of the House. Take for instance the Bill that has just passed. No one suggested that that should go to any committee. The Minister of Agriculture is the minister mentioned in the Bill, but no one suggested that it should go to his department for consideration. And quite right ; the Bill should be dealt with on the floor of this House. I will point out also that this House has never dealt with the merits of this Bill. Last ses-

sion it dealt with a Bill something like this, but more objectionable in the opinion of the railroads and the people supporting them. This Bill has not been dealt with, but was referred, against the arguments of those who promote it, to the Railway Committee. And it has been dealt with there, as those who opposed the sending of it there expected it would be, in a very curt and careless way. I think I can convince the minister that no such respect as he seems to think should be had for this Railway Committee in regard to a public Bill of this kind. And, the first reason is that, though the counsel for the railways acknowledged that an amendment to the law should be made, it was not made by the Railway Committee. Mr. Chrysler, for whom we waited for three weeks to come before that committee and tell us why this Bill ought not to pass, admitted, as proposed in the first part of this section, that the word 'or' should be struck out and the work 'and' inserted. Yet, the Railway Committee did not do this. They did, I suppose, what they thought they were expected to do, and decided to report against the Bill. The government sent the Bill there, and I suppose the committee thought they sent it for that purpose. I am within the judgment of hon. members who were present in that committee when I say that the counsel for the railways made a very poor argument in support of the case of the railways and against the people, and that he was obliged to concede that the word in the section should be 'and,' not 'or.' That arose in this way: The Act provides that the track shall be fenced or protected. Everybody knows that it should be both fenced and protected, because the Supreme Court has decided—as hon. members have heard stated pretty often—that 'fencing' is fencing against adjoining owners, and has nothing to do with the highway. The section here proposed is to preserve the rights of travellers upon the highway—if the word 'traveller' is the right word to use;—the people who are properly, and in the exercise of their just rights, using the highway. 'Fencing' has nothing to do with this. It would have to do with protecting the track along the property of adjoining owners, with a view to keeping cattle off the tracks. The counsel for the railways had to frankly admit—if that can be called a frank admission which is dragged out of one—that the law ought to be changed, that this had nothing to do with fencing at the highway, and that even if there was an order of the Railway Commission for the protection of the highway, the railway companies could evade it because they have to fence 'or' protect, not fence 'and' protect. They have to fence against adjoining owners and then protect as the Railway Commission orders. I hope we shall not be obliged to confuse the two matters covered by this section. We ought to consider separately the first portion and strike out the word 'or' and insert the word 'and.' I do not know whether the minister would desire me to go on with the discussion of the other matter, or whether he will consent to deal at once with what I have suggested.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think the matter was referred to in the committee and was discussed, though I was not present in the committee. But I would like to see the decision of the committee approved of by the House.

Mr. LANCASTER. What the committee did was this: One gentleman after another spoke on the measure, there was a full hearing, and in the course of his remarks Mr. Chrysler made that admission. Then the chairman of the Railway Committee said, let us discuss the rest of the Bill first. Finally the chairman of the committee put the question as to whether the preamble should be adopted, some of us said, yes and some said, no, and he thinking that more said no than said yes, and the yeas and nays being called for, the preamble was declared lost. Then the committee reported here that they recommended that the Bill be not passed. I am not finding fault with what the committee did on that point of changing "or" to "and" in the way they had the Bill before them. But what I insist on is that public Bills should be dealt with in this House and not sent to this committee, which is a mere cul de sac, as I have said, a place that leads nowhere. The fact that we went into Committee of the House upon this Bill to-day without any order having been made about it on the paper, is proof of what I say that public Bills must be dealt with on the floor of this House. However, I do not want to be discourteous to the Minister of Justice, but I am saying what I said in the Railway Committee. But the Minister of Justice seems to think that simply because a committee reported against this Bill we should adopt that report. Let me ask him where that will put us. Parliament requires that public Bills affecting the laws of the country shall be dealt with in committee, in Committee of the Whole House prima facie. Now what is the use of sending a Bill to a special committee and then to sit here like so many wooden men, and say that we have nothing to do with it, having sent it to a committee—it is true, it is not the right place to send it, but we thought there was a special reason why it should go there, being a Bill affecting railway corporations, we thought they had a right to be heard, and so we sent it there that the committee might have plenty of opportunity to know what the railways thought about it. But having done that, we must now sit still in this House and adopt the report made by that committee and never scan it at all. Let me point out this to the Minister of Justice, very little attention is paid to these public Bills when they go into the Railway Committee, because

everybody knows that the Bill is going to be slaughtered when it gets there. In the Railway Committee twenty-three members voted for this Bill and sixty-one voted against it, not half the Railway Committee, not one-third of this House, not one-third of the members of this House voted against this Bill. The Minister of Justice may say, why did only twenty-three vote for it ? Let me tell him that more than twice as many voted against sending it to the Railway Committee, the members of this House did not want it to go to the Railway Committee, and a good many more of them voted that we should not send it to the Railway Committee than bothered about attending to it in the Railway Committee.

Now what is this ? This is changing a public law. The argument against this Bill in the Railway Committee was limited to this ; when counsel for the railways thought that we should deal with every individual case separately and on its merits, on the ground that the individual cases were distinct, that no two were alike. You would have had to deal separately with each question of a railway crossing. You would have thought from his argument that this Bill applied to all railway crossings in Canada, while as a matter of fact it is limited to a very small proportion of railway crossings. But the secret of the matter is this : The Railway Commission sits there as a court deciding these cases as a judge would, and the municipality is put to the expense of a law suit with regard to every crossing. The railways know very well that municipalities will therefore make as few applications as they possibly can. More than that, the cat was let out of the bag by the gentleman appearing on behalf of the railways when he said that my Bill was mischievous because it made the company pay the expense of this protection, even if it was necessary, Mischievous ! Mischievous for any representative of the people in this House to contend that when a railway creates a dangerous condition which did not exist until the railway went there, the railway should be at the expense of minimizing that danger as much as possible. That is the sort of language we hear in the Railway Committee. No hon. gentleman in this House would dare to say it was mischievous legislation. But the counsel employed by the railway companies who go to that committee, where we are sent against our will, when we are advocating a change of the law in the interests of the people says that the legislation is mischievous. When we ask him wherein the mischief lies he says because it puts all the expense upon the company. He does not conceive that the municipalities suffer any injury at all. My Bill is limited to tracks running on a rail level, my Bill is limited to cases where danger is created by the company. The municipalities are the original proprietors, the railway company is only a licensee paying no rent to the municipality. Prima facia, the municipality has a right to that highway, they use it for public purposes. My Bill however was limited to cases where danger is created by the company, who have the option if they wish, but think they ought not to be put to this expense, of making a bridge or of passing underneath through a tunnel. But because it is of more expense to them to go over by a bridge or underneath through a tunnel, and because they wish to avoid that greater expense, they characterize as mischievous the legislation proposed by an hon. member of this House making them liable for the danger they create. We are told it is mischievous to say that a railway should be held responsible for a danger that did not exist before the railway went there, notwithstanding that the railway is allowed to run freely in the interests of colonization, notwithstanding that the municipality is not allowed to say whether it shall cross their highway or not—realizing that in the interest of the country you must allow them to run on a level, more or less. If they run on the level, it is because it is to their own interest, and because they can run there for nothing, without being at the expense of making bridges or tunnels, and having a law changed which existed since 1857, and which involved the principle of declaring that in this particular class of cases they shall not exceed ten miles an hour without furnishing protection. Yet when anybody goes there and says this principle should be put into practice, this legislation should be passed—because by a decision of the Supreme Court it amounts to nothing as it stands—the argument of the Minister of Railways opposing this measure in the Railway Committee was that it was not necessary to have this amendment—he did not say so, but his argument was that the section was not necessary. His argument was that it was not necessary to have this section, He said that the Railway Commission, under other sections of the Railway Act, can deal with these matters as individual cases and that it is not necessary to deal with the thickly peopled portions of cities, towns and villages where the track runs at the level of the highway as a general thing. But, while he said that he did not suggest striking out the section. The section which I am amending says that there should be a different state of affairs in respect to thickly peopled portions of cities, towns and villages. The section that I seek to amend reads as follows, and there has been a provision of this nature in the law since 1857 :

> No train shall pass in or through any thickly peopled portion of any city, town or village, at a speed greater than ten miles an hour, unless the track is fenced or properly protected in the manner prescribed by this Act.

In 1903, we added some words to make sure that the Railway Commission would still have power which they have under the

other sections of the Act. By the other sections of the Act, as pointed out by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, the Railway Commission can deal with all these cases individually and he suggested—and counsel for the railways made the same suggestion—that they could deal with a certain class of cases that might be more dangerous than others. But, it never struck the hon. minister that I am now dealing with a certain class of cases of a peculiarly dangerous character, and that my proposed legislation is limited to these cases. Since 1857, parliament has thought that there should be a limitation imposed in regard to thickly peopled portions of cities, towns and villages. The Supreme Court, having decided that fencing meant fencing against adjoining owners of the track and that that was enough where the Railway Commission had not ordered a special protection, it is open to some of us in this House to provide either that the Supreme Court decision shall no longer apply, but that there shall be some general protection provided in the class of cases mentioned in the section, something that you do not have to go to the Railway Commission for particularly, or else strike out the section. If I believed what the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals contends for, I would move to strike out that section. But I do not admit that we should not have that special protection without having to ask for it in every case from the Railway Commission, and therefore I want to amend the section and make it practicable. If I am wrong in my view, this section should be struck out because in the view of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals it is not necessary for the reason that you can get all you want individually from the Railway Commission, that having put into the Act some other sections which give you the power to go to the Railway Commission and get a special order in these particular cases you do not need this particular law. You do need it if you are not going to have a special suit against every railway in every case. Things are said in the Railway Committee by counsel for the railways that no one would say in this House. It was said there that all you had to do was to write a letter and the Railway Commission to make a special order in some particular case and they would make it. The Railway Commission have not been very well organized since they were established. They have not broken their backs in getting away with the work that has been put upon them since 1903. They have not made a great deal of progress in dealing with matters before them but they have made enough progress to issue a lot of hard and fast rules governing every poor man who goes there to get his rights. You cannot approach them under these rules which I hold in my hand unless you come according to the etiquete there laid down and yet we listened in the Railway Committee of this House to such statements as this: All you have to do is to write a letter. The rules of the High Court of Justice of Ontario are no more technical than these are. You have to state your claim in the same way, you have to prove service, wait for an answer and reply to that answer. You have the Exchequer Court practically so far as practice goes and in so far as every one of these crossings is concerned. Then, it is stated that there should be some rights in regard to this particular class of cases in all cities, towns and villages, and I invite the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to seriously consider whether he is properly acting as Minister of Justice in this matter in assisting the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals or the railway corporations in frustrating legislation of this kind. Some remedy is required. It does not do to have the people of the small municipalities, the cities, towns or villages of this country obliged to go and make a special application in regard to each particular crossing to the Railway Commission. These cases are all alike. I point out again to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that the Bill which I introduced last year has been altered in two important particulars. Objection was taken to the Bill which I introduced last year because the Bill covered the incorporated limits of cities, towns and villages instead of being limited to thickly peopled parts. I have limited the Bill now before the House. Last year the Bill was objected to because I limited the protection required to watchmen, it being held that gates might be a better protection than watchmen. I have conceded that point. I have complied with two out of the three objections raised. Then there arises what I might call a constitutional question as to whether the people are to have their rights on the highways declared by parliament, by people who are entrusted with that question, or whether such legislation is to be delegated to a Board of Railway Commissioners who are not elected by the people and who are not responsible except to the government who appoint them. Under these circumstances I think the hon. Minister of Justice might suggest some way in which that could be accomplished if he thinks it can be accomplished in any better way than under this amendment. If he thinks it fair that there should be protection afforded to these people does he think it is fair that in respect to every little crossing in every little town coming within the certain limited class that I have described, you should have to make a special application to this Railway Commission and be subjected there to what?—to what counsel for the railway companies suggested, an order being made that this House would never make and which it could hardly constitutionally make that the municipalities should pay part of the expense.

Railways incorporated and built under the law indicating to everybody that they are properly protected in some way where they cross the highway at rail level in thickly peopled portions of cities, towns and villages, and the Railway Commission not elected by the people, having no general power to amend the law would be practically changing the law by saying that as parliament does not deal with that question, as parliament does not insist that this matter must be carried out, we do not suppose that parliament is unanimous in the opinion that the people have the rights that are contended for and we will say, seeing that parliament votes down a Bill of that kind, that they have as much right to pay part of the expense as the railway has. As the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is in the House and knowing that he cannot always be here in the evenings—I am not finding fault with him because he cannot always be here in the evenings—I would like to ask him if he does not think some remedy for the existing condition of things should be carried through by this parliament.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER. All I have to say to my hon. friend is that rightly or wrongly this matter has been referred to the Railway Committee and the Railway Committee has passed upon it. I may say that the invariable rule of the House is to adopt the report of its committees, unless there are strong reasons shown to the contrary.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is not that limited to private Bills ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I see no reason why the same rule should not apply to public Bills. If a Bill is of such a character that the House thinks it advisable or proper that it should be referred to a committee of the House and the committee reports upon it, it would be expected that it would adopt the report of such committee. I cannot see any reason why there should be a difference in this respect between a public Bill and a private Bill. Whether it be a private Bill or a public bill, the moment the House has thought proper to refer it to a committee, the rule has been that the House should abide by the decision of the committee. It is not binding upon us; we can do the reverse, but it is a safe rule.

Mr. LANCASTER. What about the merits of this Bill?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The merits of the Bill were dealt with by the committee to which it was referred.

Mr. HAGGART. It is about six o'clock and as this is almost the last order of a private nature that is on the paper, and as we could hardly conclude the discussion on it to-night even if we did come back, I do not see the absolute necessity of calling us together to-night. I suppose the government are not ready with any of their work to go on.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, yes, we are always ready. This is a private member's day, and if there is a desire on the opposition side to adjourn I have no objection. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to and progress reported.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is the House not going to sit to-night?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that is the wish on the opposite side of the House, for a very laudable object, that there should be no sitting of the House, and I therefore move that the House do now adjourn.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 28, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 83) respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 85) respecting the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—Mr. Harty.

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES AUTONOMY BILL.

Mr. SPROULE. I desire to ask the right hon. the First Minister if any special instructions have been given regarding the number of Autonomy Bills to be printed ? We received one each this morning, and were informed that we could not get any more. It is very desirable that a large number should be printed, because there are many applications for them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The government have no objections to printing a sufficient number.

INSPECTION AND SALE OF SEEDS.

House in committee on Bill (No. 7) respecting the inspection and sale of seeds.—Mr. Fisher.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). When this Bill was before the committee last, some hon. gentlemen took the ground that clause 11 went further than my explanation of what I considered

to be its purpose. I said I would submit their suggestions to the Department of Justice, and asked the officials to draft a clause which would meet the requirements which seemed to be in accord with my intentions and the views of the committee. They suggested a change in clause 11 and also the insertion of two words in clause 10. I move therefore that in clause 10, on the fourth line, after the words 'which he has reason to,' the word 'suspect' be added.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 10—examination of seeds—payment of samples—penalty for preventing examination.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister changed the penalty under this Bill to a large extent, but the penalty in this clause still remains. It provides for a penalty 'not exceeding $500.' I do not know whether the attention of the minister has been directed to that point, but I would suggest that this is a very large penalty, particularly having regard to the minister's own suggestion that the penalty should be made very moderate at the beginning. I am not going to argue the matter but simply call attention to it.

Mr. FISHER. I would point out that this is not a penalty for the contravention of the Act, but for obstructing an officer in the enforcement of the Act. I think that an offence of that kind may require a much heavier penalty than would an ordinary offence against the Act.

Mr. LENNOX. I agree with that; but, at the same time, I think that while the Act is new it may happen that when parties enter premises bona fide to carry out the purposes of the Act, those in charge, not having been educated to the new condition of things, may, to some extent obstruct the officer, yet without causing very great inconvenience. As this Bill is educative, as the minister has said, I think that a penalty of less than $500 would accomplish all the purposes sought to be accomplished.

Mr. FISHER. It would be only in flagrant cases that a penalty of $500 would be imposed by the court. The range of the penalty is from $25 to $500; and I think we might leave the discretion with the magistrate.

On section 11,

Any inspector, informant or complainant who finds or has good reason to suspect seeds to be sold, or offered, exposed or had in possession for sale for the purpose of seeding in violation of the provisions of this Act, shall take a sample from the said seeds and forward it to such person as the Governor in Council appoints as an official seed analyst to examine and report upon any seed submitted for analysis under the provisions of this Act.

Mr. FISHER. I wish to amend this section. It will be remembered that the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) and others, thought the clause went further than the intention as declared by me and as desired by the committee. I submitted that question to the Department of Justice, and they suggested certain changes which, I think, meet the view of those who objected, and certainly cause the section to express more clearly what I desire. The section as I propose to amend it will read:

Any purchaser of seeds with respect to which he has reason to suspect or believe that any provision of this Act has been violated, or any person charged with the enforcement of this Act at his request may take a sample from the seeds and forward it to such person——

And so on as in the section already printed. That removes any doubt as to who may take this sample of seeds, and puts the section in the form which, I think, we practically all agree it ought to have.

Mr. LENNOX. That covers one point very well indeed. But there is another point that, probably, has been lost sight of. The minister will notice that, under section 10, where the official charged with the enforcement of the Act may take samples, there is a provision for payment; and it was urged, when we dere discussing section 11, that there should be similar provision here. That was mentioned when the matter first came up, but, probably, was not adverted to when we subsequently discussed this section. As regards the question of the purchaser taking a sample, the amendment seems to completely overcome the difficulty. But, as regards the person engaged in the enforcement of the Act, there is no provision that he should be entitled to take a sample only upon paying for it. I think that principle should be embodied here, as it has been in section 10.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It seems to me that the conditions under section 10 and under section 11 are different. The person charged with the enforcement of the Act goes into premises to see whether the seed kept there is tainted, and takes a sample. There is nothing to suggest impropriety on the part of anybody. But, in the case of section 11, the purchaser complains, practically, that he has been defrauded, that the seed sold to him is not up to the standard set by the Act, and he asks the person charged with the enforcement of the Act to take a sample. There seems to me no reason why that person should be compelled to pay for the seeds.

Mr. LENNOX. Evidently, I have not made myself understood. What I have said does not apply to the purchaser—he takes a sample from his own lot of seed. But I call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture and of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to the fact that, under section 10, any person charged with the enforcement of the Act may enter premises and take samples from any sack and so on, for

which sample the owner shall be paid at the current value of the seed. I do not see why if you pay in one case, you should not pay in the other. The conditions are exactly similar. With regard to the person who purchases the seed, of course there is no necessity ; but when you come to deal with the person going in and taking samples under section 11, he should be placed on the same basis as the person charged with the enforcement of the Act under section 10.

Mr. FISHER. From my understanding of the wording of the clause, I think it is clear that the sample would be taken from the seeds purchased, and would be done by the inspector at the request of the purchaser. I move to amend section 11 so that it should read as follows, after striking out the first four lines.

Any purchaser of seeds, with respect to which he has reason to suspect or believe that any provision of this Act has been violated, or any person charged with the enforcement of this Act, at his request, may take a sample from the said seeds and forward it to such person as the Governor in Council appoints as an official seed analyst, to examine and report upon any seed submitted for analysis under the provisions of this Act.

Amedment agreed to.

On section 12,

Mr. FISHER moved :

To add after the words ' inspector, informant or complainant ' the words ' person taking the same.'

Mr. LENNOX. I have not got anything of that kind in my Bill and some of my friends are in the same position. I suppose it has been reprinted ?

Mr. FISHER. I think the reprint has been distributed. ' Person taking the same ' is a description which would cover exactly what has been provided.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BOYCE. I desire to draw attention to section 17 where it says that the Governor in Council may make such regulations as he thinks necessary in order to secure the efficient enforcement of the provisions of this Act, and may impose penalities not exceeding $50 on any person offending against it. Is that not contradictory of section 8 and section 10? Might there not be an Order in Council inconsistent with the Act ?

Mr. FISHER. An Order in Council could not conflict with the provisions of the Act, it would have to comply with the provisions of the Act.

Mr. BOYCE. What would be the object of having an Order in Council providing for penalities where specified penalties are provided for by the Act?

Mr. FISHER. The Order in Council providing penalities would have to be for penalties not provided by the Act, but they could not be inconsistent with the others so provided.

Mr. BOYCE. Would it not be better instead of having penalities provided by Order in Council for something not specified in the statute, to have a general clause providing for cases not otherwise provided for by the Act?

Mr. FISHER. It is the usual procedure, when power is given for the making of regulations and rules—within certain limits which are here fixed—to allow the Order in Council to provide the penalties. That is the usual practice in other Acts, and I think it would be as well to comply with that practice here.

Mr. BOYCE. I would point out that this is a penalty and a quasi criminal proceeding and one is entitled to know on the face of the statute the penalty for such and such an offence. Under section 8, the limit of the penalty is defined ; then under section 10, which as the minister points out is not for an infraction of the Act, but the obstruction of an officer, the limit of the penality is defined, but then we have a limit here to be defined by something not contained in the statute, namely : a penalty to be provided by Order in Council so it would not appear upon the face of the statute with respect to the infraction of clauses penal in their nature. What the penalty is to be, except that there is a limit to the penalty for the infraction of these clauses is not defined. I would submit to the minister that it would be better to have this in a separate clause than to have the penalties dependent on an Order in Council as for instance, in the Criminal Code or the Summary Convictions Act, where penalties are provided for any other infraction of the Act not otherwise specially provided.

Mr. FISHER. These regulations are not in the Act. The rules and regulations are to be provided by Order in Council and the penalties for the infraction of them are also to be governed by Order in Council. There is a limit ; the Act says that the penalty should not exceed $50. The amount of the fine or the penalty would no doubt be increased in accordance with the gravity of the offence. The Act leaves to the Order in Council the making of the regulations and also leaves, within certain limits—the maximum fine being $50—the amount of the penalty. If we were to undertake in the Act to give the penalties we would encounter many difficulties, because the rules and regulations would differ from time to time and the penalty should differ with them. Therefore I think it is better to leave the penalties for the Order in Council as well as the rules and regulations, and I assure my hon. friend that that is quite in accordance with other Acts where the rules and regulations are fixed.

Mr. BOYCE. I may be very far astray but it looks to me as if this Act provided for every known case of infraction of the Act, and it seems a somewhat dubious proposition in connection with the enforcement of this Act for any person to have to consider that there may be offences created, that they may be offending against provisions of this Act of which they have no knowledge whatever, which may be contained in some Order in Council of comparatively recent date. The Order in Council will provide for an offence which the Act does not specially declare to be an offence. That is the danger that I would point out to the minister, that there may be an offence against the rules and regulations and a penalty attached to that offence which does not constitute a part of the Act.

Mr. FISHER. I think experience will teach that we may well leave it in the hands of Council.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Before the Bill is reported I wish to say that I have had great difficulty in hearing the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) to-day. Several amendments, very important amendments no doubt, have been moved, but I have been entirely unable to follow even the wording of the amendments much less to follow the discussion on them. It may be strictly parliamentary, but it is not very edifying that we cannot follow the debate. I have in my hands a very voluminous correspondence on this question occupying a great many pages that I would have liked to have had an opportunity of submitting to the House, so that the gentlemen whose views have been entrusted to me might have been represented, but I could not see any place in the discussion where I could bring them in properly. The amendments suggested have been very far reaching, and I think the matter should not be rushed through in that way without giving hon. gentlemen an opportunity of finding out what the amendments are.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Now that the Minister of Justice is in his place I propose reading a letter addressed to the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) from a gentleman in the riding I have the honour to represent. I may say at the outset that he is a very prominent Liberal and, I think is the best seed man in the Dominion of Canada. I shall ask the attention of the Minister of Justice to some points which he makes, in the hope that his broad sense of justice and knowledge of law shall induce him to take hold of the matter and have this Bill put in something like fair-play shape. The letter is from Mr. A. O. Hogg and is as follows :

Oakwood, Ont., Feb. 23rd, 1905.

It is not British justice that two men doing the same act one is allowed to go free and the other is punished. In reference to clause 3, we do not want to do any boasting whatever, but if you will make inquiries from people in the trade you will find that the statement we make will be verified, which is, that our firm has perhaps better equipment than any other firm in Canada for the handling, cleaning, storing and distribution of grain for seed purposes. We have made it a special feature of our business for eighteen years and we think we are situated in as good a section of country, with as high a class of intelligent farmers as can be found in Ontario. In corroboration of this, the four farms immediately surrounding our elevators at Mariposa would sell in the open market to-day for from $95 to $100 per acre, and one of these farms sold last week at $100 per acre, and many farms are of equal value, and the reason that these are so valuable is that they are specially adapted for growing high class cereals and clover seeds. One farm not two miles from our warehouse here has changed hands twice within the last two years at $105 per acre, and upon this farm we have had grown on contract grain for seed purposes, and we have no hesitation whatever in saying that it is utterly impossible to procure sufficient grain for seed that will comply with clause 3 of the Act. You will notice that this clause requires absolute purity unless you wish to plaster your bags with all kinds of weed seeds which may or may not be in the grain, but it would not be safe to sell it without putting them on, and though you had sold a man an assorted carload of seed grain by actual sample, have you any idea as a practical business man that when he received his carload and found the grain exactly like the samples, but with the bags branded with all these kinds of weed names, that he would not refuse to accept the goods, and yet it would not be safe for the dealer to ship the goods without all this disfiguring the bags with branding. Clause 5, however, may be a redeeming feature, as you will note that the government may pass regulations allowing a certain percentage of impurity and still allow it to be called pure, and yet when you come to clause 6 no matter how much branding you do, it is simply illegal to sell cereals, clover or timothy seeds with a mixture of more than five weed seeds to 1,000, and we want to say that there is not one firm in fifty in Ontario that can produce cereals that will pass this rigid section, and if the farmers cannot grow it how can the dealers supply the demand ? We have paid the farmers a bonus above the ordinary price of grain to induce them to use their best fields and give their best attention to produce cereals for seed.

Much stress has been laid on the cost of cleaning apparatus for handling seed. Might say that the cost of machines used exclusively for cleaning clover and grain for seed purposes by our firm cost over $2,000, and this does not include any machines or power for running them. The elevator we use for seed purposes cost over $10,000, in addition to machines, and it is specially built. All the planking in the bins having been planed on the four sides so as to have a perfectly smooth surface for the walls so that it is impossible for grain to get mixed. Now, what is the use of talking such nonsense as to say that $800 will put in a cleaning equipment ? What is the use of the cleaners without the power and building to handle the stuff in ? We export large quantities of clover seed and handle a good deal in Canada, and the department seems to overlook the fact that one of the essential things in handling clover seed, as you well know, is that if you sell a man say 200 bags of clover seed of a certain

grade he will throw it on your hands unless you have every bag of exactly uniform quality. To obtain this requires an additional equipment to cleaning machinery.

I would like the minister to catch these words: I will read them again.

To obtain this requires an additional equipment to cleaning machinery.

As the Bill first read, on a car of oats containing say 400 sacks the minimum fine would have been $2,000, but clause 8 now reads that the minimum fine for a transaction shall be $5. If you can induce them to allow some such margin of percentage as the difference between clause 8 and what it previously was in allowing impurities in cereals and clover seeds without the necessity of branding the bags, you will have accomplished a good deal for the seed trade and also of the farmers who produce seeds in Ontario.

We have taken the trouble to figure up our total purchases of grain at our twelve different buying points last year, and in addition to the grain grown on contract for seed purposes, each of our buyers has instructions to select any farmers' lots that are sufficiently clean and known to be true to name for seed purposes, and last season out of the total quantity of grain received by us only nine and a half per cent of the receipts were considered fit for seed purposes, without any legislation, and unless clause 5 will allow as much latitude as clause 6 provides and still be called pure we are quite satisfied that not one per cent of the grain purchased at our twelve points will grade No. 1 under the Act.

I may tell the minister that this district has no rival in the Dominion of Canada for clean farms.

Bonus growing.—Farmers last year received from our firm alone a bonus of over $2,000 above the ordinary market value of grain on the nine and a half per cent of our receipts used for seed purposes, and we feel that we have done a great deal more to bring about the demand for good quality clean seed grain than any legislation can do, and if the effect of this legislation to-day is to prohibit what has been done, it must be borne in mind that the growers of the grain who are the farmers, who do not go into the business on their own account, will be the losers as well as the firms engaged in the trade. Statements made in House of samples of cereals shown in the seed laboratory that the Bill as it stands, are not correct. Only one sample shown would be prohibited under clause 6, but we wish to call your attention to the fact that on the analysis made in the laboratory only one, or two of the twenty odd samples shown would be allowed to grade No. 1 under clause 3 till we know what provision clause 5 will allow, and we think it absolutely unfair that this argument should be used when it is not in accordance with the facts, as it is well known by all present on the deputation that the samples shown of cereals, were our samples.

If the statements contained in this letter are questioned, and it is necessary, we give you authority to use our name to corroborate the statements.

The figures given you as to cost of cleaning plant, &c., are simply for grain cleaned and sold in Canada, and has no reference to an expensive warehouse we have at Port Hope, used for cleaning and handling fancy peas, which is a very large trade, but these peas are sold mostly outside of Canada.

This letter is from Mr. A. O. Hogg, of the firm of Hogg & Lytle, seed merchants of Oakwood, Ont. Mr. Hogg is a strong Liberal and a man who is sincere in every word he utters; he has appealed to the Minister of Agriculture personally and he has placed before him the evidence which he was able to produce. I can see no reason in the world why the statements of this gentleman should not have some influence on the government in relation to this question.

Mr. BOYCE. Before the Bill is reported I desire to draw the attention of the Minister of Agriculture and also of the Minister of Justice to subsection 2 of section 8. When the Bill was last in committee, I drew the attention of these two ministers to this apparently extraordinary section which provides:

Nevertheless, if the accused proves to the magistrate before whom he is tried that the package, sack, bag or receptacle containing the seed respecting which the complaint or information is laid, was purchased by him directly from a seed merchant domiciled in Canada, and was not opened, or the state of the seed was not altered, while it was in his possession, and he had no reason to believe that the seed did not comply with the provisions of this Act, he shall, upon disclosing the name of the person from whom he purchased the seed, and the place and date of the sale thereof, to him, not be liable beyond the costs of prosecution.

I submit to the Minister of Justice that the exceptions in the subsection clearly make out a case of immunity under the law. It would be equally just to prosecute both the thief and the innocent receiver of stolen goods, as it would be to prosecute in this case both the principal and the innocent agent. What greater innocency could be established from a legal point of view than to establish the facts set out in this subsection—that he innocently purchased the seed; that the package was not opened; that its condition was not altered while it was in his possession, and that he had no reason to believe that the seed did not comply with the provisions of this Act. Why, should a retailer who has given proof of all this, be mulcted in the costs of the prosecution. I will submit to the ministers that the words: 'Beyond the costs of prosecution' should be stricken out of this clause, thus rendering it obligatory as the section provides, that proceedings be instituted against the person domiciled in Canada who is liable under the Act for offences against the Act and who would be guilty. Otherwise, penalties would be visited upon the person who actually was guilty of an offence against this Act, and would also be visited, in the shape of costs, upon the person who innocently was a handler of seed bags, the contents of which he did not know and which in his possession were not altered. A man who merely had a sealed pack-

age in his possession could not be found guilty, and yet this subsection would find him guilty to the extent of making him pay the costs of prosecution. It is a compromise and a compromise against a person who establishes by statutory essentials his innocency, and who notwithstanding has to pay the costs of the prosecution, which might be very heavy.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If we ever are to get to the end of this Bill it can only be by observing the rules of the House. This Bill came up for its third reading and it was referred back to the committee for the purpose of reconsidering clauses ten and eleven. So far as I am concerned I am not disposed to reopen the whole question by discussing every clause of the Bill.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I suggest to the minister that this Bill should be allowed to stand for to-day. The House has not been able to grasp the meaning of the amendments which the Minister of Agriculture has just read, and it is only reasonable to ask that we should be placed in possession of a copy of these proposed amendments so that we may know what they really are. In view of the very great importance of this measure, the Bill should be allowed to stand until we can study the amendments and discuss them intelligently. The Minister of Justice well said that the discussion should be confined to the clauses that are amended. But we should have a copy of these amendments before us, so that we could look over them and understand what they mean. I hope the hon. minister will let the Bill stand until we have time to look over the amendments.

Mr. BOYCE. I would draw the attention of the hon. minister to the fact that when this clause was under consideration before, as when other clauses were under consideration, the Minister of Justice was not in his place; and the hon. Minister of Agriculture admitted that several clauses, as to which there were objections of a technical character, had not been submitted to the Minister of Justice. It was for the purpose of drawing this clause, as well as the clauses under direct scrutiny, to the attention of the Minister of Justice, that I rose. I think it is sufficiently important to justify me in moving that the Bill be again referred to the committee for the consideration of that point.

Mr. SPROULE. I respectfully submit that that is quite unnecessary. We are now in Committee of the Whole, and it is quite competent to move the reconsideration of any clause of the Bill.

Mr. FISHER. I think the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) has a little misunderstood what we agreed upon the other night in the committee. There were certain doubts raised in regard to clause 11, which I quite admitted might be referred to the Department of Justice, so that it might be made clear that it expressed what I intended and what I gathered to be the sense of the committee; but I do not think it was intended to refer any of the other clauses or that one which my hon. friend brought up. That clause was discussed at some length and was eventually accepted by the committee, though, of course, my hon. friend did not agree with the decision of the committee. I moved that the Bill be referred back to the committee for the express purpose of amending these clauses 10 and 11. That has now been done, and I do not think it would be in the interest of the Bill or in the interest of the House further to discuss matters which have already been settled. As the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says, there is no need of going out of committee in order to go back into committee. We are now in committee, and any member may move for the reconsideration of any clause in the Bill.

Mr. HAGGART. Let us clearly understand that. When a Bill is recommitted for the purpose of our considering two clauses, can any other clause be considered?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I know it is of great consequence to the Minister of Justice to have to sit and listen to this thing; I know he wishes the Bill were in another climate; but I think we would like to have him apply his genius to it and make it as perfect as possible.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is so perfect that I do not see any need of that.

Mr. WHITE. If the Bill is referred back to the committee for the purpose of considering certain clauses, these clauses only can be considered; but when the amended Bill comes up for consideration, and the motion is made to read the amendments, then the whole Bill is open for discussion.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Exactly; that is in the House.

Mr. MACLAREN. As a farmer myself and also engaged in a business which obliges me to travel all over the country, I may say that no one is more anxious than I to have pure seeds sown on our lands, and no one can feel more disappointed when he sees a farm covered with mustard and all kinds of obnoxious weeds. At the same time I think we had better refer this Bill over to the Agriculture Committee, because that committee is in a better position to get the views of the farmers as to what should be done. I have a letter here from one of the seedsmen of my city objecting very seriously to this Bill passing in the shape in which he received it a few days ago, and he wants it amended in many respects. I am in favour of abolishing by every means weeds as much as possible, but I would like to have something done that would be practicable; and I

think we should pause and reflect very seriously before passing a measure such as this, which may have the effect of making it almost impossible for a man to deal in the seed business at all. I would therefore strongly urge that it would be sent to the Agriculture Committee and let that committee amend and put it in such shape that it will be practicable.

Mr. LALOR. May I be permitted to ask whether there is such an organization as the Canadian Seed Growers' Association, and who are the members of that association ?

Mr. FISHER. There is a Canadian Seed Growers' Association, but I could not undertake to give my hon. friend the names of its members. They are spread over a very considerable part of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. LALOR. Is not that association organized for the purpose of furnishing pure seed to the people of this country ? and have they not seed for sale, which will be recognized as pure seed ?

Mr. FISHER. I have not with me the by-laws of the Seed Growers' Association. I was not even present when the association was formed, having another engagement; but I understand that the Seed Growers' Association was formed for the purpose of growing improved seed by selection and other means; and I believe that one of the objects of the association is to create a register for pure seeds, somewhat similar to the register for pure live stock, under certain rules, regulations and conditions. I cannot tell what these rules, regulations and conditions are. I am not sure that they have even been formulated.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Might I ask the hon. minister if any servant of the Seed Growers' Association is in the pay of the government or of the Department of Agriculture ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, I believe the Seed Commissioner of my department is acting as the secretary of that association.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Is that not calculated to still further jeopardize the interests of the trade ? If the Seed Growers' Association is provided with servants free of charge, while men selling seeds have to pay their own hands, will not the competition tend to grow worse between the Seed Growers' Association and the seed dealers of Canada ? It is only within the last day or two that my attention has been drawn to the fact that such an organization exists, and if that association is going to raise seed under government paid servants and compete with those who have no such government paid servants, it does not appear to me to be legitimate competition.

Mr. FISHER. I am not aware that the Seed Growers' Association has anything to do with the sale of seeds. The officer of the department certainly has not. I have no doubt that members of the Seed Growers' Association will themselves sell seeds. One of the objects of the association is to encourage the growing of better seed, but I do not think that will interfere in any way with the business of the seed dealers of the country. On the contrary, I think it will enable them to get good seed from the growers. The object of the Seed Growers' Association is to improve the seed grown, and in that way to aid those who deal in seeds as well as those who grow them.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I understood that the object of the association was not only to raise seed, but to sell it direct to those who consume it. That was part of my information which may be wrong, but if it be correct it appears to me that we are creating an unfair competition.

Mr. FISHER. I do not understand that the association has anything to do with the sale of seeds. The men who belong to the association can sell them, just as men who belong to the Live Stock Association can sell their stock.

Mr. LALOR. Will the Department of Agriculture recommend the seeds grown by the Seeds Association ?

Mr. FISHER. If seeds grown by members of the association were submitted to the association and registered as pure seeds, the department might put its imprimatur on that register or certificate, just as they would in the case of pure stock, but the department would not recommend that these seeds be bought. All the department would do would be to certify that they came up to a certain standard.

Mr. LALOR. This will be the germ of competition by the association against ordinary seed growers. The latter will have to compete with an association which is officered largely by men paid out of the public exchequer and connected with the Department of Agriculture, and I am also advised that the Minister of Agriculture is himself a member of the association. It does not seem to me fair that the ordinary seed merchant should have to compete with an organization of that kind. Whether that be the case or not, to the ordinary individual it looks as if the Bill now before the House were in the interests of the Seed Growers' Association; and, of course, the farmers will naturally go to an association which is so closely identified with the Department of Agriculture. That is not fair to the farmers or seed merchants or the wholesale trade.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend has put the cart before the horse. The Bill is not introduced for the benefit of the association, but the association has, to a large extent, grown out of the agitation in favour

of pure seeds, just as other associations for the improvement of various branches of agriculture have grown out of the knowledge of what can be done by co-operation or organization. Any one who chooses can join the association. There is not even a fee required. I am not a member of it myself. An officer of my department is connected with it at present as secretary, but that is only while it is in its formative stage; and it is not intended that any officer of my department shall continue long to be an officer of it.

Mr. WALSH. This association will compete with the other seed growers and sellers.

Mr. FISHER. The association has no power to sell seed, and its individual members will certainly come under the operation of the law just the same as anybody else.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. But I understand that under this Bill the deputy minister is to be the judge and jury in determining whether or not certain seeds come up to the standard. If this officer is also an officer of the Seed Growers' Association, will not this happen? If samples be sent in by two persons, one of whom is a member of the association and the other is not, the outside dealer will be handicapped by the fact that he has to send in his samples to an officer of that association, the members of which are competing with him in his business. If an official of the department is also at the head of the association, you may have a combine. It does not seem to me wise that any officer of the department should become an officer of the association, especially when he has to sit in each case as judge and jury. All samples of seeds must be submitted to him; and if he is interested in the association, that may incline him to lean a little more one way than the other. The fact of his being an officer of the association would probably lead dealers to suspect his decisions, though they might be perfectly right. I would be sorry to see any official of the department connected with a corporation that may compete with private dealers.

Mr. FISHER. This association does not come into competition with the seed dealers in any shape or form. It is not the deputy minister who is secretary of the association, but the seed commissioner, and he is simply acting as such at the start, and will cease to hold that office within a very short time.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I ask that the committee be allowed to sit again for further consideration of the proposed amendments, as it is desirable that we should have an opportunity to look over them.

Mr. FISHER. These amendments are simply carrying out what was suggested a few days ago. I am willing to give the House an opportunity to discuss them, however, if the hon. gentleman wants us to reconsider them.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The hon. minister thinks we can understand clauses we have not seen at all, though many legal gentlemen differ in their opinions regarding the proposed amendments. It will do them no harm to let them lay over a day or two, and give us a chance to investigate them and compare them with the Bill itself.

Mr. FISHER. The Bill was referred back for the purpose of thoroughly considering the amendments proposed by the Department of Justice to meet the views expressed the other day.

Mr. SPROULE. There is considerable need for time to consider the amendments, and the question is whether the House has had time to do this. In my opinion, the hon. minister should grant the request of the hon. gentleman from Brantford. It could not interfere with the passage of the Bill afterwards.

Mr. WHITE. I would suggest to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) that he agree to the proposition made by the hon. member for Brantford. For he can see quite clearly that if he refuses that reasonable proposition and the committee now reports the Bill, when the Bill is brought up for third reading, the hon. member for Brantford may move the House back into committee. Under these circumstances it seems to me that the minister might well yield the point, especially as the hon. member for Brantford has not had an opportunity to consider the amendments proposed in the Bill.

Mr. FISHER. I was going to suggest that we should report the Bill, but not read it the third time to-day. When the third reading is proposed, if my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) wished to change it in any way, he can move that the Bill be again referred to the Committee of the Whole to consider these proposed changes. That is the appropriate and simple course.

Mr. TAYLOR. That will do.

Bill reported.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903, AMENDMENT.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 36) to amend the Railway Act, 1903. He said: This is the Bill we had up the other day with respect to provision for chairman of the Railway Commission.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I gave the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) notice that I proposed to move to amend this Bill by striking out section 4. That section reads as follows:—

If, between the date of the appointment of any such chief commissioner or of his resignation of his office as such judge and the date of his resignation of, or retirement from, the office of chief commissioner, the salary attached to the judicial office which he held at the time of

his appointment, or which he resigned for the purpose of accepting appointment as such chief commissioner, has been increased, the annuity to be granted to him under this Act may be increased in the same proportion.

By sections 2 and 3, provision is made that the chief commissioner, being a judge of the Superior Court at the time of his appointment as chief commissioner shall be entitled to the allowance that he would have been entitled to if he had continued in office. These are very considerable advantages, and the section, in this respect, probably goes as far as the circumstances of the country will justify. It has been determined by parliament, that, if a judge holds his office for fifteen years, and, at the end of that time retires from his position through permanent affliction, he shall be entitled to two-thirds of the salary he would be entitled to as judge. And the same Act which so provides contains a further proposition that when a judge attains the age of 75 years and has been for twenty years on the bench, or attains the age of seventy years and has been for twenty-five years in office; or when, regardless of age, he has been a judge for thirty years, he shall be entitled to retire upon an allowance equal to his full salary. Judge Killam, having been appointed from the bench to the chief commissionership, is entitled to all these advantages, just as if he had continued to be a judge. The Act will apply in every case where we appoint a judge of a Superior Court to the position of high commissioner. Judge Killam has been upon the bench for twenty years and is now fifty-five years of age. He is now appointed to the chief commissionership. If he continues in that position for ten years, he will, under subsection (c) of section 3 of this Bill, be entitled to full retiring allowance as a judge, and, in the meantime, he will have the advantages that accrue from his new position, as an extra, amounting, in ten years to $30,000. Then, under section 2, he is immediately entitled, if he retires from his position, to a retiring allowance of two-thirds of his salary. The proposition is that, if we change the status of retiring allowances of the judges, the gentleman now appointed, or any who may hereafter be appointed from the bench to the chief commissionership, will be entitled not only to all the benefits that accrue from the office of chief commissionership, but shall be entitled also to all the advantages accruing to those who continue to labour on the bench. I cannot see the justice of that position. It can work a very great injustice in many instances. Why, if we should increase the salaries of the judges to $15,000, the gentleman who takes the position of chief commissioner to-day can resign to-morrow, having been twenty years upon the bench,—he could do so even if he had been there but fifteen years—and can have an allowance of $10,000 a year, which is as great as the present salary of his office. Either upon resigning his position or retiring because of permanent disability, he would be entitled to all the benefits that would accrue to the judges who continue to discharge the functions of their office. I object to this as urgently as I possibly can; and I hope that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will consider the matter carefully, in order, that no man, however eminent may have the advantage attaching to two positions. As I have shown the increase of salary to Judge Killam by reason of the new appointment is $3,000 a year, or $30,000 in ten years, with all the possibility that the salary attached to the new position may be increased. He would also benefit by salaries of the judicial office hereafter. The gentleman who takes the position of chief commissioner has unlimited time, from the time of his appointment to that of his retirement of his position, which may be twenty or thirty years. He has all the chances accruing to the bench in that time.

Take the instance of Judge Killam as an illustration. He may remain in this position for twenty years, he may have been paid an additional remuneration by reason of that changed position of $60,000. In those twenty years great changes may take place in this country, and the salaries of judges may be greatly increased, involving an additional retiring allowance which may amount to $15,000—I am speaking of a Supreme Court judge. This gentleman would then be entitled by reason of the arrangements we are now making to this additional retiring allowance. I need not say more about this. I feel strongly that we are moving in the wrong direction if we pass this clause. I therefore move that Bill (No. 36) to amend the Railway Act, 1903, be referred back to the committee to amend the same by striking out paragraph 4 thereof.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As I explained when this Bill was introduced and on several occasions during the progress of the debate in committee, the intention is to provide that a judge who holds the position of chairman of the Railway Commission shall be in no way prejudiced by reason of his acceptance of that office, either with respect to his tenure of office or with respect to his retiring allowance. This clause is merely intended to give effect to that intention with respect to any increase of salary that may affect a judge during the time this commissioner shall occupy his position. Now, this section is as necessary as any of the other sections we have introduced to carry out the object we have in view; therefore, I am sorry to say I cannot accept the amendment suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox).

Mr. SPROULE. This seems to me to be class legislation of a most extreme character.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think we have heard that before.

Mr. SPROULE. You cannot hear a good thing too often. As long as the minister refrains from doing what in our judgment is right, we cannot remind him of it too often. This is made practically for the judges and for no others, and cannot be taken advantage of by any others.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am afraid that is true.

Mr. SPROULE. It is objectionable in this feature, that it gives him the advantage of a higher position as well as the advantages that may accrue in future from any increase in the salary of judges. I think it is very improper and unjust legislation.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Lennox).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lake,
Ames,	Lalor,
Archambault,	Lancaster,
Armstrong,	Lennox,
Barker,	Maclean (York, S.),
Barr,	McCarthy (Calgary),
Bennett,	McLean (Queen's, P.E.I
Bergeron,	Martin (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Blain,	Monk,
Boyce,	Paquet,
Chisholm,	Porter,
Christie,	Roche (Marquette),
Clare,	Schaffner,
Clements,	Sproule,
Cochrane,	Staples,
Cockshutt,	Stockton,
Crocket,	Taylor,
Elson,	Walsh,
Ganong,	White,
Gunn,	Wilmot,
Henderson,	Wilson
Herron,	(Lennox & Add.)
Hughes (Victoria),	Worthington,
Ingram,	Wright (Muskoka).—47.
Jackson (Elgin),	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Beauparlant,	Lavergne
Béland,	(Montmagny),
Black,	Law,
Bole,	LeBlanc,
Borden	Lemieux,
(Sir Frederick),	Loggie,
Boyer,	Lovell,
Brodeur,	Maclean (Lunenburg),
Caldwell,	Macpherson,
Calvert,	McCool,
Carney,	McIntyre,
Carvell,	McIsaac,
Cash,	McKenzie (Bruce),
Clark (Essex),	McKenzie
Costigan,	(Cape Breton, N.),
Crawford,	McLennan,
Cyr,	Marcil (Bagot),
Demers (St. John),	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Derbyshire,	Meigs,
Desjardins,	Mulock
Dubeau,	(Sir William),
Ethier,	Oliver,
Fielding,	Parmelee,
Finlay,	Paterson,
Finlayson,	Piché,
Fisher,	Pickup,
Fitzpatrick,	Préfontaine,
Fortier,	Proulx,
Galliher,	Riley,
Gauvreau,	Rivet,
Geoffrion,	Roche (Halifax),
Girard,	Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Gladu,	Savoie,
Gordon,	Schell (Glengarry),
Grant,	Schell (Oxford),
Greenway,	Scott,
Guthrie,	Sifton,
Hall,	Sinclair,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Sloan,
Jackson (Selkirk),	Smith (Nanaimo),
Johnston	Stewart,
(Cape Breton, S.),	Talbot (Bellechasse),
Johnston (Lambton),	Talbot (Strathcona),
Kennedy,	Telford,
Lamont,	Tobin,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Turgeon,
Laurier	Turriff,
(L'Assomption),	Watson,
Lavergne	Wright (Renfrew),
(Drum. & Arth.),	Zimmerman.—93.

PAIRS :

Ministerial	Opposition
Adamson,	Avery,
Belcourt,	Bland,
Macdonald (Pictou),	Borden (Carleton),
Bourassa,	Brabazon,
Bourbonnais,	Broder,
Bureau,	Léonard,
Burrows,	Lewis,
Campbell,	Clarke (Toronto),
Conmee,	Daniel,
Dyment,	Maclaren,
Emmerson,	Fowler,
Bickerdike,	Foster,
Gallery,	Tisdale,
German,	Macdonell,
Gervais,	Kemp,
Sutherland (Oxford),	Haggart,
Harty,	Reid (Grenville),
Hyman,	Pringle,
Logan,	Lefurgey,
McCarthy (Simcoe),	Northrup,
McColl,	Ward,
Martin (Wellington),	Seagram,
Mayrand,	Morin,
Miller,	Perley,
Ratz,	Osler,
Wilson (Russell).	Forget.

Amendment—Mr. Lennox—negatived.

Bill as amended, read the third time and passed.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 51), respecting Contracts for Government Works.—Mr. Fitzpatrick.

Bill (No. 53), to amend the Act respecting the Department of Railways and Canals. —Mr. Emmerson.

Bill (No. 54), to amend the Public Works Act.—Mr. Hyman.

SUPPLY—ABUSE OF FRANKING PRIVILEGES.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. H. B. AMES (Montreal, St. Antoine). Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into supply I wish to raise a question in reference to what certainly seems to me to be an abuse of the franking privilege. A number of my constituents and a number of constituents of other members of this House have, within the last few days, received, franked free through the mails, advertising material from a Montreal house engaged in the sale of dental goods called 'The Franco-American Dental Institute,' manufacturers of and dealers in dental supplies. I have received from various gentlemen letters from St. Thomas, Ottawa, Montreal, Quebec, Toronto, in fact all parts of the Dominion, from dentists and other persons engaged in similar lines of business, saying that this advertising material which is purely commercial, has been sent to practically all the dentists throughout these two older provinces. This matter was brought to my attention by a business man in Montreal, in a similar line of wholesale business, who complains that one of his competitors is taking advantage of His Majesty's mails and securing the free distribution of a large quantity of advertising material for purely commercial purposes, and I was informed by one of these gentlemen that if necessary he would produce witnesses to describe what they had themselves seen of the preparation of this advertising material in a business house in the city of Montreal.

Mr. LANCASTER. Where were they mailed from ?

Mr. AMES. The letters were apparently all prepared in the city of Montreal and were then evidently brought here and franked.

Mr. LANCASTER. How were they franked ?

Mr. AMES. They were all franked in the same way. I would like to send these over to the Postmaster General in order that he may himself see the franks to which I refer.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames), who has brought this matter to the attention of the House, that the use of the frank for such a purpose as this is certainly contrary to the meaning and the spirit of the Act which allows the franking privilege to members. It is not the first time that the franking privilege has been abused ; it is not the first time that I have had occasion on the floor of the House to call attention to abuses of various kinds. How to prevent these abuses is another thing. In regard to this particular question I have myself received complaints—only to-day, however—and I made inquiry of one of the gentlemen. I find that a number of names or initials have been used. The envelopes which the hon. gentleman has sent to me all bear the initials of one member, but other frankings have taken place with the initials of various members, as far as I am able to discover, without the authority of the owner. Nevertheless the practice has grown up in this House of having the initials stamped, and the franks put on by a stamp have been accepted in the post office. Stamps can be obtained or copied and this system affords a very easy way for persons to make this unwarranted use of the franking privilege. Last year my deputy called my attention to the matter and recommended to me that in future we should require the members to sign their names.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. And if this is the wish of the House I am quite prepared to adopt it.

Mr. LOGAN. The initials would be sufficient.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend (Mr. Logan) suggests that the signing of the full name would be to laborious. I am quite prepared to adopt whatever regulation appears to recommend itself to the good judgment of this House. The old system of using a stamp, I think, ought to be abolished. I would draw the inference from the present expression of poinion that the House desires me to prescribe a rule that the frank shall be signed either the full signature or the initials.

Some hon. MEMBERS. The initials.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am quite prepared to adopt such a regulation. If I can take the opinion of the House in an informal way I would say that the initials have it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If I am right therefore, in assuming that it is the wish of this House that in future we shall not accept franking by a stamp, then I will require the initials. I draw that conclusion and will act accordingly.

An hon. MEMBER. How about the departments ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The departments frank under the terms of an Order in Council of a good many years' standing. It may be necessary, in view of this expression of opinion from the House, for the government to reconsider that Order in Council. The Order in Council has been in force for about 15 years, having been passed I think, in 1891.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What the hon. gentleman says applies simply to our own post office.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am now speaking of our own post office, and I understand that it is assented to by this House that we shall discontinue the use of the

stamp and require the initials of the members. To that extent the change will come into effect at once.

Mr. AMES. There is just one remark that fell from the lips of the Postmaster General to which I would draw attention. He stated that in this particular instance these stamps have been used without the authority of the owners thereof. I would like to know whether the use of such a stamp without the authority of the owner is not a grave breach, if not of law, certainly of courtesy to this House, and I would like to ask if any steps are being taken to punish the people who are using stamps without authority ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And to collect the postage.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No person is more anxious to protect the revenue of the Post Office Department than myself, but the hon. gentleman will bear in mind that this only occurs, as a rule, about the commencement of each parliament.

Mr. COCHRANE. And at election times.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Not the commercial, it is the political literature that we complain of at election times. Last year we had some reference to conditions of that kind, but this particular form of abuse, as a rule, occurs only in the case of new members who are not quite familiar with the practice and spirit of the law and are a little more careless and a little more generous than they should be. When you ask a member—I have asked them over and over again—if he has permitted the use of his stamp in this way, you always get the answer, 'oh, no, no, no.' He is quite indignant, but when you press him you will find that he may perhaps have allowed it for some trifling use, not to the extent to which it has been used, and he may be quite innocently more or less to blame. So that, in one sense I was correct in saying that the abuse is without authority. In another sense I should qualify that, by assuming that members have not been sufficiently guarded in the quasi authority they may have given, and the debate I am sure will be beneficial in preventing any abuse especially if the rule I have referred to be followed.

Hon. PETER WHITE (North Renfrew). When the Postmaster General is considering this question as it effects members of parliament, I trust he will have some regard to the abuse of the franking privilege by members of the government. For a considerable time before the date of the last election, a very large quantity of literature was circulated throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion and franked by the Postmaster General ; not by one of the deputy ministers but by my hon. friend the Postmaster General himself.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Excuse me, just there. I challenge any one to produce any political literature franked by me during the recess.

Mr. WHITE. Then all I can say is that had I known the Postmaster General would deny the charge, I would have had the evidence here to prove the truth of my statement.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I can only say that there is no such evidence in existence.

Mr. WHITE. I have in my possession the political literature of one political party —not the party to which I belong but the party to which the Postmaster General belongs—and I know as a matter of fact that it bore the frank of the Postmaster General.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend is not fair ; I have denied his statement.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How do you know ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not think it is fair for my hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. White) to make that statement, because I never gave any such authority, and I am satisfied the thing never occurred.

Mr. WHITE. I am glad to hear the Postmaster General say that he never gave authority to frank this political literature with his frank. He may not have given that express authority, but it was a matter of notoriety throughout the province of Ontario at all events, that this literature was being circulated with his frank. I do not know that there would have been quite so much objection to the Postmaster General having adopted that course——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I did not adopt it.

Mr. WHITE. Well, from somebody having adopted that course——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No one ever used my frank.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Postmaster General denies that his frank was so used, and I do not think that the statement should be insisted on.

Mr. WHITE. I abide by your decision, Mr. Speaker, and of course I am bound to accept the statement of the Postmaster General that he did not authorize the use of his stamp——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Nor was it done.

Mr. COCHRANE. It was.

Mr. WHITE. If the Minister of Justice is in his place, I would like to hear his opinion as to the unauthorized use of those stamps to which reference has been made. I do not pretend to be a lawyer ; I do not know what the legal effect of the use of these stamps by an unauthorized party may

be, but I do think it ought to be punishable in some way.

An hon. MEMBER. Forgery.

Mr. WHITE. I should think it would be forgery. Whatever may be the fact as to the Postmaster General's frank, there is no doubt that this large quantity of literature was circulated through the mails on behalf of the Liberal party. The same privilege was not accorded to the Conservatives. I know that in my own case a newspaper offered to send into my constituency two or three hundred copies of the daily issue during the six weeks preceding the election, and when I accepted the offer it was found that the rules of the Post Office Department precluded the newspapers unless they were put in separate wrappers and postage paid on each. Of course the newspaper proprietor who was willing to supply the papers free could not be expected to pay the postage thereon. It is therefore that I say that this system, not only affected beneficially the Liberal party, but it affected prejudicially the Conservative party during the last election.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). I have another matter to take up with the Postmaster General. During the last campaign in my riding there were great parcels containing Liberal campaign literature circulated in my county—I do not know exactly what they were, but as nobody read them it makes no difference. The last letter of the frank used was a 'B,' but I cannot say whether it was the initial of the member for Ottawa or not. I want to ask the Postmaster General, if he knows that these things were franked through the mail outside of the session, by some member. I also want to ask the Postmaster General if he gave any order to the various postmasters throughout the country to allow this literature to be posted at the local post offices with these franks on; did he give the postmasters authority to accept a frank at the local post offices instead of having this mail matter posted at Ottawa? We might as well have the Postmaster General on record.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am quite prepared to be on record. In reply to the hon. member for North Renfrew, I here say the stamps used in the Post Office Department are in accordance with the Order in Council passed many years before we took office. My official stamp is under the control of my private secretary. I know him too well as a reliable officer to believe for one moment that he ever allowed my stamp to be used for the franking privilege during the election to which my hon. friend has referred—I am speaking of during the recess, or since the prorogation of parliament, and that is to what the hon. gentleman alludes. Knowing the fidelity of my private secretary, I am satisfied, as I am of my existence, that he never allowed my stamp to be so used, and I am sure it never was used during the recess in question for the transmission, through the mail, of political matter such as is spoken of now. Since my hon. friend (Mr. White) is so positive about it and states that if he knew the matter was coming up he could produce proof, I would ask him to do so at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. WHITE. I shall endeavour to do so.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I shall investigate the case, for I know that under no circumstances did I ever sanction such a thing being done. As I have said, I have too much confidence in the fidelity of my secretary, to think that even by accident he would allow it to be done; nothing could be further from my practice or my wishes. I did send some political literature myself when I was a candidate during the recess, and I sent it from Ottawa; but I purchased stamps in the ordinary way from the post office, and every piece of that literature bore one of His Majesty's stamps in accordance with Post Office Act.

Mr. TAYLOR. Everybody ought to do the same.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think so, and I will tell you of a very bad example. When I took office in 1896, one of the first instances of abuse of law brought to my attention was that some 240,000 pieces of political literature were sent out after the prorogation of 1896 under the frank of the then Minister of Agriculture. The postage on that would have amounted to thousands of dollars. It was an abuse then and it is an abuse now, and I will not defend it no matter what minister or cabinet permits it. My hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) asked me if I authorized or knew of the matter to which he referred. When I say I did not authorize, I also mean that I have no knowledge of any such transaction. I do not know whether it occurred or did not occur. No local postmaster would have the right to allow to go through his post office free any mail matter originating there as described, and if my hon. friend would give me the name of the postmaster who did so, I will have an investigation into the case and see where the responsibility is.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. When the literature came into the county of Victoria it had no postmark on it, but only a monogram, the last letter of which was a plain B. This literature was sent to every elector in the riding which I have the honour of representing, Liberal and Conservative alike, with the compliments of the Liberal Association. Why were the packages not stamped at Ottawa? I presume that some arrangement was made by which they were sent out in bags. I could not understand that they were franked by any minister. I thought the

initials were those of the member for Ottawa.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If the hon. member will produce to me any of this franked literature, I will endeavour to trace it up. On his vague description of the frank I cannot know anything about it. But on no occasion have I authorized any violation of the law. Exception is taken now, and very properly taken, to the franking of these advertisements of dental goods. Last year my attention was called to another equally grave abuse—the franking of literature issued by the Manufacturers' Association of Canada, and sent everywhere. I received a complaint from a citizen of the town of Brockville, informing me that there had been such a deluge of that class of mail matter sent from Ottawa to Brockville, I think under the frank of my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) that the office was blocked with it for two or three days, and in that interval he was unable to get the despatch of his mail matter. So that hon. members will see that the abuse complained of as occurring, perhaps at the instance of new members, did not begin to-day.

Mr. E. COCHRANE (East Northumberland). I think it would be pretty easy for the hon. Postmaster General to find out where all this literature came from when it was mailed in Ottawa. Not only was it sent to the electors of the riding I represent, but they had the impudence to send it to me, and when I opened it I found that it had the compliments of my opponent on it. The hon. Postmaster General holds up his hands in holy horror, but I do not see why my opponent should have some gentlemen, whose salaries are paid out of the funds of the people of Canada, stamping his literature in Ottawa and the post office robbed of its legitimate revenue for carrying it. Now, that literature was stamped by some minister. It was done in a sly kind of way. The literature that came into East Northumberland was not stamped with a stamp. There was on it an imitation of some letters that I could not make out. But the work was done in some of the departments, otherwise the post office at Ottawa would not have accepted the literature and sent it all over the country. It had in it those pointers Nos. 1, 2 and 3 which the Minister of Customs paid for out of the money of the people of Canada, and I thought it was rather cruel to rub the fact in in that way. I do not know whether this literature did hurt me any or not. I was returned, though they did their best to defeat me, not only by means of that literature, but by means of a lot of money which I suppose they got out of this railroad scheme.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). With regard to the question referred to by the Postmaster General, as to whether the House was of the opinion that the franking privilege as it was formerly understood should be continued or discontinued, I do not see that any difficulty would arise from asking members to put their initials on letters, but great difficulty will arise if we cannot use our ordinary stamps for sending out the kind of literature which we often send out, such as speeches and blue books. It is undoubtedly in the interest of the public that the proceedings of parliament should be known, and naturally the people of a riding are more interested in the speeches of their own member than in the general proceedings of the House. Therefore, I think an intermediate course might be adopted by allowing franking by stamp upon literature inclosed in Hansard envelopes and requiring letters to be initialled.

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to say just a few words with reference to the matter brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Montreal. For some time prior to the last general election, the county of Halton was flooded with literature sent out from Ottawa. I would not have objected so much to the fact that that literature was sent free, as to the fact that my opponent should have had the privilege of flooding the county with literature free of postage, whilst I was debarred from the same privilege. The franking privilege of members of parliament ceases of course at prorogation, but in my case, as in that of the hon. gentleman from Northumberland, an official of the government used his franking privilege on behalf of my opponent and of course was not willing to extend the same favour to me. But what made the thing more objectionable still, was that not only were pointers one, two and three distributed all over the country, with the picture of the Prime Minister on the front page, but these pointers were stamped with the compliments of my opponent. That I thought was carrying the thing a little too far. I would naturally have assumed that this literature was sent out by the government in their own interest as campaign sheets, but when it was also found to contain stamped inside the compliments of my opponent, the matter became a personal one. The hon. the Postmaster General is perfectly right in his contention that the department should be protected somewhat better than it is. I do not say that he is aware of the practice I have referred to, but certainly it was a grave abuse of the franking privilege. It was not an abuse of that privilege by any member of this House but by some official of the government. We should have an investigation to find out who the official was that put his frank upon what was not simply campaign literature but private matter, made private by the fact that the compliments of the candidate were stamped inside. Had that matter been paid for in the usual way, it would have cost probably $400 or $500 to send it out.

An hon. MEMBER. Whose frank was on it ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am unable to say. I searched through the civil lists to find out initials that correspond to those stamped on this campaign literature but could not find any. Of course they may have been the initials of some official who had been appointed after the last civil service lists were published. I do not know that even those packages went through the post office of the House of Commons, but I am under the impression that they were mailed direct from some department of the government, and that department should be held responsible. That is the practice which the Postmaster General is quite justified in saying we should not put up with. No doubt he will carefullly investigate it and see whether he cannot exercise some control over his colleagues.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. the Postmaster General was told a few moments ago by some one behind him that during last session commercial literature published by the Manufacturers' Association was distributed through the post office at Brockville bearing the frank of the hon. member for South Leeds. I have been a member of this House some twenty-one years—I think the Postmaster General and myself came in the same day—and during all that time I have never violated the franking privilege. During the session I have the right, as has every member, to send all mailable matter through the post office free, and as whip of the party it has devolved upon me in the sessions preceding general elections to send out literature to constituencies not represented on this side of the House. Last session certain literature was prepared by the Manufacturers' Association, but it was not commercial literature. It was literature intended to convince the people of the great value of protection to our Canadian industries.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Was it of a non partisan character ?

Mr. TAYLOR. To a certain extent it was, and it certainly was not of a commercial character. It was pointing out the value of protection and showing up the hypocrisy of this government in pretending to be anti-protectionists while at the same time they did not dare carry out their principles but felt compelled to steal the clothes of their oppponents. That was the class of literature that I franked last session, but while the opposition sent out hundreds of pounds—

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Carloads.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Reform party and its whips and the officials of the different departments were sending out tons to every hundred pounds we sent, and the campaign literature was mailed free from the public departments, franked by the officials of this country, during recess, when we had to pay out of our own pockets for every pamphlet we mailed. I have at home one of these documents that came to me just preceding the campaign, franked by a government official, which I shall be happy to produce to the House whenever required. In direct contravention of the law this literature was sent out during recess by officials of the government and every riding of the country flooded with it. I have some of it franked by the Minister of Trade and Commerce and some that came last fall bearing the initials 'J. S., M.P.'

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. John Smith.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, they are the initials of the Minister of Public Works. Some two or three years ago, during recess, Mr. Britton received a pamphlet with my frank on it, and the charge was made against me in the local press that I was franking literature during recess when I had no right to do it. I offered to make a wager that I had not.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. TAYLOR. And there it remained while the House was in session, detained by the Postmaster General or somebody else ; and it did not leave Ottawa until last fall. And, from reports I get from all over the country, I am certain that much of the literature that was mailed here during the session never reached its destination until the elections were over—impounded by the Postmaster General or some of his officials.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If I might interrupt to ask my hon. friend a question, I would like to know if he is aware that literature mailed here during the session by thousands of copies by your humble servant, for instance, has never reached its destination yet ? I am told that eight hundred bags of such literature franked from this House is in some subterranean passage of the post office of this city, and there remains to this day.

Mr. TAYLOR. It may be that the literature that my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) refers to met the same fate as that sent to a postmaster in the west, who admitted that all the literature of that kind that came to his office he put in the stove.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There are lots of honest postmasters.

Mr. TAYLOR. This literature may have been put in the stove without leaving Ottawa at all.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No ; I am told that eight hundred bags of it are stored in this city.

Mr. TAYLOR. Perhaps the Postmaster General will have that investigated. It will be interesting to know if this amount of mail matter, which should have gone forward as soon as it was put in the charge of the post office, is still stored in this city. I want to repeat that during my twenty-one years in parliament I have never used my

frank illegally. But the Postmaster General and his colleagues have franked campaign literature to be sent out during the recess, when the law giving the members of parliament the franking privilege does not apply.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman said I did.

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not say the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock), but his colleagues. I have had some of this literature in my own constituency, and so have my hon. friends about me—my hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. White), my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane), my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) and others. Our constituents received that literature—Facts for Electors, Nos. 1, 2 and 3—inclosed in envelopes provided by the government, and mailed during the recess under frank, sent out with the compliments of our opponents, and sent out illegally. Whereas, to distribute our campaign literature during the recess, we had to buy postage stamps just as the Postmaster General had to do in his own case.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. That is too bad.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was too bad for us, but my hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Derbyshire) could have his sent out free, even though it was in plain violation of the law.

Mr. J. FINLAY (East Peterborough). I am surprised that my Conservative friends should talk as they do. I received campaign literature from my opponents, and it was franked by Mr. Carscallen, and stamped 'with the compliments' of John A. Sixsmith, my opponent. That literature was received, not only by many of my friends, but even by myself.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. In view of the facts adduced, I think the hon. Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) ought to withdraw his statement that new members have abused the franking privilege. I hope he will not include the members on this side, because I think that ample testimony has been brought forward to show that this privilege was abused in former parliaments. I think that to cast an imputation upon the new members of abusing this privilege is not right.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) says that he never illegally stamped any literature—never made an illegal use of the franking privilege. I will admit that the law does not specify the kind of literature that may be franked by members of parliament during the session; each member is left to be the judge of his own conduct in the matter. The literature that my hon. friend franked by tons, the editor of which, I think, was Mr. Griffin—I had quantities sent to me—was not political literature; did not purport to be political literature; and I think the organization that caused it to be printed would resent the statement that they were a political organization. My hon. friend from St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Ames), objects to the franking of literature such as has been referred to, that is literature of a commercial character. Well, what was the literature sent out by hon. gentlemen opposite last year? It was of a commercial character.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It was not political literature.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes, it was.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was national political literature.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It was not political literature according to the definition of my hon. friend and others; it had no bearing upon elections; and, therefore, it ought not to have been sent out under frank. Yet it was sent out in such quantities as to conjest the mails in Brockville and other places, even to the extent of blockading the work. As to the observation of my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes), that eight hundred bags of literature, franked by himself, did he say?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No; but franked by the Liberal-Conservatives in this House, who have a perfect right to frank it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is always with great fear that I venture to cross swords with my hon. and ferocious friend from Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes); but if I might, with all mildness, suggest something, I would say that I am satisfied he is entirely in error. Mail matter mailed in this House, no matter by whom, is delivered to a man who is an officer of the House. He is not under the orders of the government or of the Postmaster General—he is an officer of this House, and is amenable to this House. And my hon. friend from Victoria says that eight hundred bags of literature posted last session here are still concealed somewhere in the precincts of this building.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No; in the city post office.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Why, that is simply absurd. The city post office was nearly burned down——

Mr. LOGAN. That is what burned it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I should not be surprised if Providence did smite the post office for that. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) says this literature was stored in the basement of the city post office. That building was burned from the roof down to the working floor, and we had immediately to take possession of the basement and fill it with the staff. And they have been in occupation of the basement

ever since—that is, for more than a year, or from a time beginning long before the posting of this literature last session. So the hon. gentleman will have to find some other place in which to charge that this literature is stored, for it could not be in that building. Now, the hon. gentleman has made a statement. Let him prove it. Let him give me some inkling of facts so that the matter may be looked into.

Mr. COCHRANE. Will you appoint a commission ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I will investigate the case. I say that the postmaster and the acting postmaster of Ottawa are as reliable gentlemen as are to be found in the service, and they would be the last persons in the world to do the thing the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) says has been done. Therefore, I feel certain that no such thing has occurred as the hon. gentleman has charged.

Mr. COCHRANE. The hon. gentleman (Sir William Mulock) had better investigate what has occurred. I say that during last session many communications were received from Liberal candidates throughout Canada which contained campaign literature sent from Ottawa under frank, and marked 'with the compliments' of some candidate in opposition to the Conservative party. It is true that Conservative members in this House sent out literature under frank. But this they had a perfect right to do, as the Postmaster General knows, for it was posted during the session. And he wants simply to draw a red herring across the track. But our complaint is that the Postmaster General or any other minister of the Crown has no right to send out documents during the recess from their departments other than reports and official documents. But they went further. After the session they not only sent out this literature, but they had the hardihood to put our opponents' compliments on it, and that was done with the stamp, no doubt, paid for by the people's money. That is what we complain of. I don't want the Postmaster General to delude public opinion by saying, 'Oh, you are another.' We have got sick and tired of that. The Postmaster General tried to use his authority to prevent us from using our privileges as members of parliament last session in sending out literature and having it brought into the House. We have a perfect right during the session to send out literature and stamp it, and we will accord to the Postmaster General and his ministers the same privilege we enjoy. But after the session was over, when we were right upon the heels of an election, I complain that we had literature that was written by our hon. friend's secretary, when we were paying him a salary for doing it, and that was sent out with the likeness of Sir Wilfrid Laurier upon it ; and then to add insult to injury, they put on that literature 'with the compliments' of our opponents.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend said they had a perfect right during the session to frank whatever they liked.

Mr. COCHRANE. I did not.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Perhaps he intended to say that. It is not a question of legal right, it is a question of propriety and good taste. If any gentleman franked these advertisements of dental supplies, I presume he can find nothing in the law to make it illegal ; yet public opinion in this House is against such an abuse; and I think public opinion is also against the abuse I referred to of transmitting through the mails, even during the session, of matter which is not properly parliamentary literature and connected with public life. It is equally improper and illegal after the session, in my opinion.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). While this subject is under consideration I want to say that it is generally believed, and I think with good grounds for the belief, that a large amount of literature which we sent out from this House last session never reached its destination. I know for a fact that when the campaign was on at various places in my riding, I inquired whether they had received literature from Ottawa during the session, and in many cases the answer was that they had not. I addressed that literature, I franked it and sent it out, it went into the post office here, and where did it go after it left here? It was in the possession of the Postmaster General's employees, there is no doubt whatever of that, and some person must have made away with it, because it never reached its intended destination. I believe the same thing took place in many portions of this country, literature addressed and franked here, with the compliments of our opponents on it, was sent all over our county.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Both sides did it.

Mr. SPROULE. No, I never saw or heard of it being done except by the Liberal side. I know that my opponent had his compliments put on the literature that was sent out, and some was sent to myself, while the election was going on, and it was distributed all over my riding. When I went into North Grey, I found some distributed there, presumably from Ottawa. Now that was improper and illegal. I could not ascertain whose frank had been used, because the letters were so blurred that you could not read them. In some cases there were letters but you could not fix it on any member. It was sent out in large quantities. Certainly that went through the post office, and it was supposed to have come from Ottawa, and it was franked with the compliments of my opponent on it. I think

that was very wrong. A privilege that was enjoyed by one side ought to be enjoyed by the other side as well. It was illegal and improper, yet it was done. Now I have sometimes questioned whether the explanation was that this literature never went from Ottawa, or whether it was intercepted at Toronto or some other point on its destination, or whether it was made away with by some of the Postmaster General's friends, the postmasters throughout the country. I have sometimes wondered whether it might not be the case that it was made away with by the postmasters, and that opinion was strengthened by the fact that was brought to our notice last session, namely, that away out in the Northwest Territories our literature was deliberately thrown into the fire by the postmaster and burned. That was stated in this House for a fact, and there was no contradiction. I do not know whether the postmaster was ignorant of his duties, but he was known to be a friend of the Postmaster General and his supporters; but he never even handed out the stuff from the post office, it was sent out and burned.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Would the hon. gentleman give me the name of that postmaster?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not remember the name now, it was in the Yorkton district. The statement was made in the House, and the name of the postmaster was given in the House, and attention was drawn to it; therefore I am within my rights in referring to it again. Although I cannot give the name from memory, I am sure the name can easily be found and given to the Postmaster General. That took place in one portion of the country, may it not have taken place in any other portion of the country? I am not saying that is the case, but at any rate it is a fact that can be established beyond question that many parties to whom literature was mailed here during the last session of parliament, never received it. I think it would be quite in order for the Postmaster General to inquire into many of these cases and ascertain where the abuse takes place.

Mr. A. ZIMMERMAN (West Hamilton). I am glad that this matter has come before the House. I think that many people are guilty of abuse of the franking privilege to which allusion has been made. We know that that has always been done by both parties ever since we have had a government in this country. I have a letter that I received this morning from one of my constituents, in which he complains that business literature is being franked to different business concerns in this country. I will read the letter:

There is another matter which I have been requested to bring to the notice of the Postmaster General through you. The dentists here, and no doubt throughout the country, received the inclosed sealed package containing advertisements and price lists, and franked by a member of parliament. I do not know whether that is a customary practice or not, but it struck some of my friends and myself as savouring of a breach of parliamentary privilege, and has given rise to considerable criticism in certain circles. I leave the matter in your hands to do as your judgment dictates.

Now, Sir, if it is the rule, or the law, to allow that kind of matter to be franked, I trust the government will immediately take steps to put a stop to it. It is unfair to other business men, it is unfair to the whole country, that public money should be used to convey advertisements going from this House by the thousands every day. I would like to ask the Postmaster General whether it is customary to allow private advertisements to be franked by members of parliament, and by members even who have no interest in the business, so far as we can see. So far as I can make out the member had no interest whatever in the business of this firm.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Whose frank is it?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The subject to which my hon. friend from Hamilton alludes was brought up by anothe member of this House some time ago during this session and I then gave an explanation which will appear in 'Hansard.' My hon. friend will perhaps be willing to read my explanation in 'Hansard' given to the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) because he refers to the very same abuse to which my hon. friend from Hamilton West (Mr. Zimmerman) refers.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to tell us whose frank was used?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I have not the envelopes in my possession at the present time, I have sent them to the Postmaster General.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the hon. member know whose frank it is?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. It is the Dental Supply Company's circular and price-list.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How can the member make the statement that the gentleman whose frank was used had no interest in the business if he does not know who he is?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I made some inquiries, and my impression was that the member was not in the business.

Hon. JOHN COSTIGAN (Victoria, N.B.). While this matter is up, I would like to say a few words on it because my attention has been drawn to it before and I have discussed it with a number of members. There is another feature about the franking privilege which has not been touched on. In former years it was a greater convenience

to members than it is to-day for we used to be able to frank our letters with our initials or our stamp and we could mail them from our hotels or private residences at the nearest post office box in the city, which was a great privilege. An abuse grew up and the attention of the House was called to the fact that the initials were easily imitated, and this led to such an abuse that the Postmaster General of the day very properly put a stop to that system and ordered that our frank should be good only in the post office in the House of Commons. It is a great inconvenience not to be able to post letters at post boxes through the city and to have to bring them here to the House of Commons. Those who discussed the question know that there is good reason for restricting the privilege to the House of Commons post office, but we suggest to the Postmaster General that he might extend that privilege so that any member who chose to frank a letter by writing his full name on it could post it in any part of the city. There would be little danger of the full name being imitated, while there was evidence that initials were being frequently copied. Members have received several letters from the post office with apparently their initials, although they had never seen the letters. The Postmaster General has said that he would accept a suggestion in favour of doing away with the stamp and requiring the use of initials. That is all right, but I ask him to take into consideration the suggestion that such members as choose to frank their letters with their full names should be allowed to post them at any post box in the city.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I simply desire to ask the hon. gentleman who made the statement a few moments ago (Mr. Finlay) with reference to literature that went into his riding, whether the literature was franked during the last session of parliament or after the House prorogued. We on this side got the idea that he was referring to literature sent out after the conclusion of the last session, whereas, I rather think the literature the hon. member refers to was sent out during the last session, quite correctly under the regulations. I would like the hon. gentleman just to state the case.

Mr. FINLAY. It was before the election.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. During the session ?

Mr. FINLAY. No, after the session.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Archives, $20,000.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). The increase in this vote over that of last year is due to the very large expansion of the work in connection with this branch of the department. About a year ago an archivist was appointed and new duties were allotted to him. A report was made to Council which authorized the transfer of various documents in other departments to the archivist's branch and the archivist was given the custody of these records. A building is needed to house these documents ; that building is now under contract and the contract requires it to be finished on the 1st of next October. We will then transfer the documents from all the departments, classify them, catalogue them and place them in such form that they will be available to the public for reference. This will involve more work in that branch. In addition, I had the new archivist inquire into the condition of affairs in the archives branch and make a careful examination. There was no catalogue of the papers which are called the Archives of Canada and this made it very inconvenient for students of our history. The work of cataloguing is advanced to a considerable extent and will be pressed to completion. In connection with the copying in Paris of documents which bear on the early history of our country, I may say that for years we had two gentlemen there, Mr. Marmette and Mr. Richard, who had chosen out documents which referred particularly to the French regime in Canada and these gentlemen reported that these documents ought to be copied and placed in our archives. A large number of such documents have been chosen, but a comparatively small proportion of them has been copied and sent out here. A certain expenditure has been made each year in this work.

Mr. MONK. Who is in charge of that ?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Tantet an officer of the French government in the Bibliotheque Française has been in charge of the actual copying work. It is considered that there is no necessity to spend further money on the selection of these documents until we have made more progress in copying those which have already been selected. Under Mr. Tantet, expert coypists of the libraries in Paris are engaged in this work, which we wish to press forward more rapidly than in the past. In addition to the archives in Canada and to the records of the other departments under the control of the government, there are a very large number of important historical documents and papers scattered throughout private libraries, in some cases in the possession of private individuals, and in other cases in possession of various local historical societies. It would be impossible to get copies of these documents within any reasonable period of time, but the greater number of them are available to the public under certain restrictions, and it is proposed to publish a guide to these documents, indicating their existence, where they are to be

found and what their character is. The student of history will be able to refer to this guide which can be prepared at a comparatively small cost. One thousand dollars will be devoted to that purpose. Also, there are a large number of historical documents bearing on Canada, not only in Paris but in Great Britain as well as in Spain, Italy and other continental European countries. We wish to find out where these are, and what their nature is so as to be able from time to time to obtain copies. I think the House and the country will agree with me that this subject of the collection and preservation of our archives is one of great interest and importance, and that it is time we should take the necessary steps to secure a systematic and efficient administration of this branch of the department.

Mr. STOCKTON. I fully agree with what has been said by the minister as to the desirability of acquiring all historic documents and data that we can possibly get to be placed in our archives for the benefit of Canada. If, however, the minister would endeavour to get the original documents which are scattered throughout the country, instead of copies of them, it would be very much better, because it is always an object on the part of the original investigator or the historical writer to consult the original documents. I am glad to know that such progress has been made and is being made with respect to the documents in Paris. I would like to know what progress is being made with respect to the documents in the record office or in the foreign office in London. At the time of confederation all the public documents of the province of New Brunswick were taken to London, and consequently those who take an interest in historical studies have been at a great disadvantage as far as New Brunswick is concerned. I think the additional amount will be well expended if it is used in collecting historical data with respect to the Dominion of Canada. Every year that passes will make it more difficult to collect that data, and the more vigorous we are in attempting to collect it now, the better it will be for the archives department and for the future writers of the history of our country.

Mr. FISHER. I am very glad to hear what my hon. friend has said, and I quite agree with the expressions he has used. I would like very much to get the original documents, and whenever we can we do so to the extent of our finances, but in very many instances the owners do not wish to part with original documents, and then we have to take copies. This is the case almost entirely in Europe. For a number of years past we have been spending about $5,000 a year on the other side of the Atlantic, of which about $1,000 has been spent in Paris and about $4,000 in London. The great bulk of the copies we have received in our archives library here have come from London, and not from Paris. Out of three thousand volumes which we have in our archives, only 229 have come from Paris. Each of these volumes contains a number of documents, so that the three thousand volumes would represent about half a million documents. I have been myself almost startled at the figures that have been given me of the number of documents we have in our archives. There are about half a million documents there besides the bound books. A little while ago we received from the Secretary of State's Department alone over a million documents to take charge of and look after; but we had not sufficient accommodation or facilities for dealing with them. That is one reason why it is so necessary that we should have a new fireproof building where these documents could be safely stored, classified, catalogued and made available. At the present time, in the various departments, the great majority of the documents are stored away in boxes in out of the way corners and rooms and are quite inaccessible, and in many instances there does not seem to be anybody who knows what these boxes contain. We shall have to take these documents and put them in a building where they will be safe, and then classify and catalogue them. This is a part of the work to be done as soon as the new building is ready.

Mr. STOCKTON. I had occasion three or four times to consult the archives in Ottawa and the arrangements seemed to me to be very good indeed. I was anxious, a few months ago, to get some documents respecting the early history of New Brunswick, and I went to the archives department and in a very short time got copies of just what I wanted. They had not the originals, but they had copies which had been obtained from the offices in London. Therefore, I think we ought to feel somewhat proud that we are getting along as well as we are respecting the archives of Canada.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the minister enlarged the distribution of the report of the archives?

Mr. FISHER. The report is printed as a parliamentary blue book. It is parliament that decides the number to be printed.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood the minister to state two or three years ago that he was going to supply the high schools with copies of these reports ?

Mr. FISHER. The printing of that report is under the control of the House of Commons, not of the department, and the number of copies to be printed is decided by parliament through the printing committee. We have no control over it. We simply have a certain number of copies supplied to us as a department.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood that the minister was going to recommend a larger distribution of these reports.

Mr. FISHER. If I made that agreement, it has escaped my memory. We have had a mailing list of the copies supplied to us, just as we have had a mailing list for our departmental reports, and we have always been able to meet any demands that have come to us.

Mr. MONK. Does the report show what number of documents have been copied in England or in France during the year or the expense incurred ?

Mr. FISHER. We spend just a little under $5,000 each year in Europe. I have not any figures to show the number of documents copied. The people in London are engaged by the High Commissioner's officers and those in Paris are engaged by Mr. Tantet, an officer of the Bibliothèque Française, and are paid at a fixed rate per folio. One of the objects in asking for this greater expenditure is to increase the number of those working in Paris and have the documents copied more rapidly.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. minister explain the item of $1,000 on page D—31 of the Auditor General's Report, paid Wm. M. Kearns for some books ?

Mr. FISHER. That was the price of some books sold by Mr. Kearns, auctioneer, for the estate of the late Hon. Louis Masson, of Montreal. We think we have made a very good bargain. There were United States purchasers bidding against us, but we were able to secure the works, and immediately afterwards were offered a very considerable sum over what we paid for them if we would allow them to go to the United States. They are works of the greatest historical interest and our experts, Messrs. Sylvain, Suite and Descelles, librarians, very strongly recommended us to get them even at a figure very much higher than we bought them for.

General statistics, $18,200.

Mr. INGRAM. There is an item concerning which I would like to ask a question. I was not here when it passed. Each member is supplied with a monthly report of the Patent Record unbound. At the end of the year we have 12 copies. Why should members not be supplied with a bound volume containing the 12 monthly reports ? I appreciate these reports very highly because I receive a number of inquiries concerning them every year. There is another point I would submit to the hon. gentleman. If you want to get a type written copy of the explanation of any patent, you have to pay a very high figure for it. In Washington one has only to pay a few cents. The department would do well to make a change in this respect and follow the example set by Washington. At this moment I have inquiries from the United States for copies of patents, but the figure asked—although not too high for the amount of writing to be done—is still so much higher than that charged in the United States that it deters people from getting it.

Mr. FISHER. With regard to members getting bound copies, we only bind three or four for the use of the department. We keep the unbound copies, and when any one makes application for a description of a patent, we use those extra copies, and the patent examiners must have them all the time on hand for their own reference. In the United States the conditions are very different from what they are here. There is such a large demand there for descriptions of patents that the American Patent Office find it economical to print a description of every patent issued, drawings and everything. Once these are printed, copies can be supplied at a nominal figure. But here there might not be a demand for a single copy of more that one-quarter of all the patents issued in a year, and if we went to the expense of printing them, we would have to ask for a much more considerable sum than we are doing. Even then, I fear the great bulk would never be asked for.

Mr. INGRAM. Our present method discourages the sale of any of these copies. You have to pay $3 or $4 now to get a copy of a patent, whereas if the price were nominal there would be a great demand for these copies which does not exist now. And if you sold a few copies, that would meet the cost of the printing generally.

Mr. FISHER. Of course if any one wants a patent merely out of curiosity, intending to throw it away immediately after looking at it, he will not care to pay $3 or $4. But if he wanted it for any serious purpose, he would consider that a very trifling expense. The officers of the department have carefully looked into the matter on several different occasions and they consider that the expense would be too great.

Mr. INGRAM. I think the hon. the minister would find that if the price were considerably reduced, there would be demand for copies which would pay for the expense of printing. My hon. friend promised to tell us about the amount he was going to ask for for the collection of statistics, criminal statistics, census statistics and the others to be gathered by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. FISHER. I have not been able to go into further details, and this item of $18,200 is simply a repetition of last year's vote. The Census Bill has only just passed through the House, and I have not yet been able to make careful, detailed calculations of the expenses under it. But I will try to make these calculations and be ready to give the information my hon. friend asks when I propose, as I mean to do, the supple-

mentary vote. That vote will probably be larger than this. This a mere repetition of the vote which we had last year, and I am not now prepared to give the details the hon. gentleman asked for.

Aid to agricultural societies, $7,000.

Mr. FISHER. This is required in order to give the usual aid to agricultural societies in the Northwest. I have frequeatly explained that, in the different provinces the provincial governments aid agricultural societies, but, there being no provincial government in the Territories, parliament has voted this sum year after year. In view of the fact that Bills for the creation of new provinces are before the House, I do not know whether this vote will be needed. But those Bills have not yet been passed, and we cannot know what the arrangement will be. I think it better to vote it this year and have it available for next fall, the time when the payments are made, as, I suppose that the provincial organization will not by that time be ready to take up this work; and certainly it will be a pity to have a cessation of the assistance to the agricultural societies.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the minister divide it between the two provinces that are being formed?

Mr. FISHER. It is paid through the secretary of agriculture for the Northwest.

Mr. SPROULE. How many agricultural societies are there in the Northwest ?

Mr. FISHER. In 1904-5, there were thirty-one societies.

Mr. INGRAM. With what membership ?

Mr. FISHER. I may explain that the secretary of agriculture for the Northwest supplies us each year with a list which indicates what amount should be sent to each society. Formerly it was paid on a per capita basis of membership, but lately the Department of Agriculture in the Northwest has taken account of the money raised by the agricultural societies themselves, as well as the membership. We have not, for a number of years back, undertaken to decide what each society should have. That has been left to the Department of Agriculture of the Territories. They know that there is $7,000 coming, and they send us a statement and vouchers that the several societies have fulfilled the conditions, and we send a cheque to each society. I have here a list showing the membership of the societies in 1903, but not for 1904. The Regina society had a membership of 334, that being the largest society, and the smallest society had a membership of 75. They average about 150 to 200.

Mr. SPROULE. They would receive an average of about $225 per society?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, I believe the territorial government give them some allowance also.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the grant from the Dominion paid according to the amount the society raises? Formerly the rule in Ontario was that the province paid $2 for every $1 that each agricultural society raised.

Mr. FISHER. It is upon that that the territorial grant is based, and the secretary of agriculture of the Territories, when he divides the $7,000 here voted and gives us the items, takes that into consideration, I believe. In Quebec, I think it is the same as in Ontario, the assistance from the provinces varies according to the amount the society raises. That cannot be carried out in this case because the amount is fixed.

Mr. SPROULE. Would this vote be available if new provinces are established in the Northwest? Would the Auditor General be satisfied to pay out on such a vote as this?

Mr. FISHER. I could not say positively as to that. This is simply an appropriation to aid agricultural societies.

Mr. SPROULE. In the Northwest Territories?

Mr. FISHER. It does not say so. As a matter of fact it has been used only for the Northwest Territories. I think it is not likely that by the time this grant is needed, next fall, the provincial governments will be in a position to do this work, and I think it would be unfortunate if any lapse should occur and the societies should not get the usual aid.

Towards compiling historical data in regard to the Acadian families in Canada, $1,400.

Mr. STOCKTON. I would like the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to state to the committee who is compiling this historical data, how long the work has been going on, and what progress has thus far been made ?

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman who is doing this work is Mr. Gaudet, who was recommended to me many years ago by the gentlemen in the House of Commons and Senate, on both sides of politics, who represented constituencies in which there were a large number of Acadian residents. He was accustomed to this work ; and at that time representations were made that probably the work would be accomplished in a few years. The period was not definitely indicated, but it was expected that the work would go on with fair rapidity. I must say frankly that I have been disappointed in the progress of the work. Mr. Gaudet has collected a great mass of information, partly by travelling about in the maritime provinces, partly by a careful examination of local, municipal and other records, which

mass of information he has been working at to try and complete the first volume of his record. But almost invariably when he has reached a certain point in this work he has found other information which has delayed the final compilation, if I may call it such, or the making up of the final record; and the result is that to-day not a single volume has been published or is finished. I have asked the archivist, Mr. Doughty, who is an expert in this kind of work, to take up this matter and go into the records which Mr. Gaudet has collected, and see if he can find means by which this work can be more rapidly and more successfully conducted. I may say that Mr. Doughty has done this to a very considerable extent; he has not examined the whole of the records yet, but he has examined them to some extent, and he finds that there is a mass of information there which will be of great value. But that information has to be carefully gone over and systematized before it can be published. Mr. Gaudet is doing that now, and I believe that within a reasonable time, with the supervision and assistance of Mr. Doughty, he will be able to complete the first volume. I may say that the information he has found is far greater than could be published in one volume, but it is so mixed up, if I may use that term, that it is impossible for him to select and pick out a portion and bring it to the condition necessary for publication. I believe, however, that with the supervision and assistance Mr. Doughty can give him, within a reasonable time he will be able to eliminate from this mass of information such portions as can be published in one volume, and then go ahead with another portion and prepare it for another volume. The mass of information he has obtained is enormous, and quite sufficient for several volumes, but it needs careful going over to bring it to a condition where it will be ready for publication.

Fumigating stations, $4,000.

Mr. FISHER. These stations are at St. John, N.B., for the maritime provinces; St. Johns, Que., for the province of Quebec; Niagara Falls and Windsor, for the province of Ontario; Winnipeg, for the province of Manitoba; and Vancouver, for the province of British Columbia. Of course, there may be some slight importations at other ports, but these are the most important and convenient.

Exhibitions, $75,000.

Mr. FISHER. This vote is for the next fiscal year, and is to cover the completion of the exhibition at Liege, Belgium, which commences about the 1st of May next, and which we have accepted an invitation to take part in; also it is intended to continue, to a certain extent, to take part in what is called trade exhibitions in England, the first of which we took part in during last fall, and which seems to have been a very successful investment of money. Roughly speaking, I think that $50,000 or $60,000 of this vote will be needed to complete the Liege exhibition, and the balance will be used for the trade exhibitions in Great Britain.

Mr. J. D. REID. How much was spent on the St. Louis exhibition altogether?

Mr. FISHER. Up to the present time $298,000 has been spent, and I think $10,000 or $12,000 more will be required to close up all the accounts, making a total of just about $310,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. I suppose all the goods that were sent there will be sold and deducted from that amount?

Mr. FISHER. No. A few goods were sold there, but very few. In the first place, the customs regulations are such that it is actually cheaper to bring the goods back here than to sell them there. In the next place, a very large proportion of the goods that were sent there were not of a perishable nature, and are to be utilized for the Liege exhibition and others; they are what I may call permanent exhibition stock. I was asked this morning, and I find that in the neighbourhood of $35,000 has been spent on what we may call permanent exhibition stock. This was bought for the St. Louis exhibition, and is still available for use in other exhibitions, and I would not think of selling it. It is a stock that is far too valuable to sell. I do not want to boast, but I will say that we had at St. Louis a mineral exhibit which has not been equalled by any exhibit ever shown at any exhibition in the world. That is talking pretty big, as we say, but at the same time I have the statement of disinterested parties, Americans, well able to judge, and that is their opinion. That exhibit contained a lot of minerals that were very valuable, but which were so exceptionally good as exhibits that I felt it was in our interest to purchase them rather than to have them owned by anybody else. We had one exhibit there for which we spent about $8,000, but which we could sell to-day for much more than that. I would not think of selling it, so long as we are going to exhibit at international exhibitions. There were other exhibits of timber, fur, &c., that cost considerable sums of money, but which attracted great attention, and which it would be very hard to replace. The money value of these is not so great as the expense of collection. We have had to send men all over the country to collect them, and the cost of collection was more than the cost of the exhibits. We own these now, and in the future will not have to go to the expense of collecting; this will enable us to put up an excellent exhibit at Liege at less cost.

Mr. J. D. REID. I had not the pleasure of being at the St. Louis exhibition, but I inquired from gentlemen who were there and

they congratulated us on our fine exhibit. With reference to this exhibit in Belgium, is it the intention of the government to have an exhibit somewhat similar to the Glasgow exhibit or is it to be larger or smaller ?

Mr. FISHER. The cost will be more ; it is a larger exhibition than the Glasgow exhibition. We are going to have a Canadian building with all our exhibits in the one building, and this costs more than to have space in each of the buildings, but we have found by experience that it is far more effective. It saves a little in cost of administration but in effectiveness there is no comparison. At Liège we have to pay a rent for the land on which our building will be placed, half a dollar a foot, amounting in all to about $7,000. The contract price for the building is about $33,000. It is a large item and when I first got the estimate I shrank from it, but when I came to examine the alternative of obtaining space in the different buildings and the difference in the cost of administration and management, I came to the conclusion that even at that expense, if we were going to exhibit at all, it was best to undertake that expenditure. The estimate to-day is that the Liège exhibition will cost from $120,000 to $125,000. Judging from my experience we will be able to keep within that. I estimated that our expenditure at St. Louis would be about $300,000 ; it is going to cost about $310,000, so I think I was fairly accurate in that estimate. The Glasgow exhibit cost about $70,000 or $75,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. I agree that if you are having an exhibit of any kind which is for the purpose of advertising our country you should have a good one, because otherwise the money would be entirely thrown away. I understood that the expense of this was to be about $75,000.

Mr. FISHER. The $50,000 is to be expended after the 1st of July. All the expense of preparing the exhibits, sending them over, erecting the building and all other expenses up to the 1st of July is paid out of this year's vote, the $200,000 we had this year.

Mr. MONK. What amount has been spent on the Liège exhibition?

Mr. FISHER. I am told that up to the present time, although I have not the exact figures, we have spent about $25,000 or $30,000. We have not yet sent a cheque for the buildings, but we will have to do so in a few weeks.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is not half a dollar a foot rather a heavy rental ?

Mr. FISHER. That is not an unreasonable charge for space in exhibitions of this kind. Sometimes they charge as much as a dollar a foot.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who is the commissioner ?

Mr. FISHER. We have a permanent exhibition commissioner, now in the department, who has been in the department for about four years, Mr. William Hutchison. We will have to appoint another commissioner for the Liège exhibition, because Mr. Hutchison does not understand French,

Mr. J. D. REID. Will Mr. Hutchison be there too ?

Mr. FISHER. Oh, yes, he is the business commissioner, who will attend to the administration and will certainly have to be there. If he understood French it probably would not be necessary for me to appoint anybody else, but under the circumstances I would not like to put the business work of the exhibition under the management of an inexperienced person. I believe that the success of our exhibitions lately has been very largely due to the fact that we have at the head of that department, Mr. Hutchison, who for three or four years has had great experience in exhibition work.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is he a permanent employee, and if so, at what salary ?

Mr. FISHER. He is permanent at $3,000 a year.

Mr. J. D. REID. And expenses ?

Mr. FISHER Yes, when they are incurred.

Mr. U. WILSON. Will the minister give us a further explanation as to these exhibitions in England ; do I understand that he expects to make them permanent.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend misunderstood me if he thought I said they would be permanent. In England there are held annually what are known as trade exhibitions; at the Islington Agricultural Hall in London there are held five or six of these each year. Last fall there were three which came within a week of each other, each lasting ten days. One was the exhibition of the grocers and allied trades ; another, the bakers, and another a dairying exhibition. We had been for several years invited to take part in these exhibitions but for one reason or another we had been unable to do so. My officers and I were impressed with the value to Canadian trade of our taking part in these exhibitions which are attended by the retail and wholesale merchants from all over the country, who pick up new ideas in any of the trades in which they are specially interested. We took part in these three exhibitions last fall.

Mr. U. WILSON. What was the cost ?

Mr. FISHER. The cost amounted to about $5,000 each. There was another exhibition of a somewhat similar character called the Colonial Products exhibition held in St. Georges Hall, Liverpool, and we also took part in that at an expense of $5,000

or $6,000. The trade journals of the old country have universally congratulated us on having shown Canadian products at these exhibitions, and our experience is that our exhibits have caused a good deal of stir among the trades interested. I believe this work is of the utmost value to us in pushing our agriculture and food products in the English markets. So far as my opinion is concerned, I believe we should take part another year in some of these exhibitions, though not necessarily in the same ones as last year. An expenditure of $15,000 or $20,000 in such work is of the greatest value to Canadian trade in the English market.

Mr. U. WILSON. Did the $15,000 for the three exhibitions cover the cost of collecting the exhibits and forwarding them to England?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. U. WILSON. Did you have to get new exhibits for each exhibition?

Mr. FISHER. No. Part of the exhibits could be shown at the three exhibitions. At the grocers' exhibition we had canned goods, bacon, pork, and some butter and cheese ; at the dairy exhibition we had butter and cheese, eggs, and dressed poultry; at the baker's exhibit, we had butter and lard, some canned goods, flour, breakfast foods and articles of that kind. At these exhibitions, of late years we have set out the exhibits in an attractive and striking way which might perhaps be called a trick of the trade; something like what shop keepers do in what is called window dressing. At these three exhibitions in London we used these same decorations, although the exhibits themselves were changed. I am glad to say that I have some officers in my department who are experts at displaying our goods ; and when presented in this manner the exhibits attracted a good deal of attention.

Mr. U. WILSON. You will only have to renew the expense once a year ?

Mr. FISHER. If the three exhibitions were held in the same hall, yes. But in the change from London to Liverpool, we had to renew the decorations. A good deal of this decoration is of grasses and grains which are very effective and very beautiful, and these we have to renew from time to time.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who had charge of the London exhibit?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Hay and Mr. Brodie; the latter gentleman speaks French very well and he has gone to Liége. Mr. Race showed great aptitude at St. Louis, and I got him to go to Liverpool; he is not a permanent officer.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are these the only exhibitions we are to take part in during the coming year?

Mr. FISHER. The Liége exhibition and these trade exhibitions in London are the only ones provided for in this vote, and the only ones we have so far considered.

For renewing and improving Canadian exhibits at Imperial Institute, London, and assisting in the maintenance thereof, $8,000.

Mr. INGRAM. What changes have taken place in this office ?

Mr. FISHER. We pay £450 a year as a contribution towards the general maintenance of the institute. In addition, we pay a rental at the rate of £250 a year for a city office ; but this only commenced on September 29 last. We pay Mr. Harrison Watson's salary at the rate of £300 sterling per annum ; he has been the curator of the Imperial Institute for many years. We shall have to spend about £100 a year for office expenses and typewriting assistance, making a total of about £1,100 sterling. I have always expected that something would have to be spent in repairing and renovating the exhibits in the institute. Last fall, when the gentleman whom I sent in connection with other exhibitions were in London, I asked Mr. Brodie and Mr. Hay to report what ought to be done to make the exhibit in the Imperial Institute a thoroughly effective one. I have that report, and it is evident that a great deal will have to be done. As soon as the exhibits for Liège are sent away, I hope to start on that work. Of the vote of $8,000 for the current year, I have just accounted for about $5,000, and I propose to apply the other $3,000 in preparing and sending forward exhibits to the Imperial Institute, where I hope to have them installed before the 1st of July. Some of the officers who are going to install our exhibits at Liège are expected to be free in time to return to London and start the work at the Imperial Institute. That is one of the advantages of having a permanent staff of officers for exhibition work.

Mr. KEMP. What is this city office for ?

Mr. FISHER. It is for two purposes. In the first place there has been a constant objection that the Imperial Institute was too far in the west end to be convenient for business men. In connection with the city office there is a show room, where I hope to have brief temporary exhibits. For instance, one week we may have an exhibit of canned goods, another week bacon and pork, another week something else ; and each exhibit will be advertised beforehand to the trade specially interested in the particular line of products exhibited. The exhibits in the city will be exhibits of goods of a perishable nature, lasting only a few days or a week, whereas the exhibition at the Imperial Institute at South Kensington is one of a more permanent and general character. At the city office we might have in the course of the year fifteen or twenty different exhibits.

Mr. KEMP. The office will be run the whole year round ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. KEMP. Then you will require a permanent officer ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. KEMP. The amount is scarcely sufficient to carry such an enterprise in the city and do it effectively.

Mr. FISHER. We expect that Mr. Watson, with an ordinary clerk, will be able to alternate between the exhibit at South Kensington and the office in the city. When the exhibit is going on he will spend most of his time there and have his clerk at the South Kensington Institute.

Mr. KEMP. Does he give all his time to this work for the sum of $1,500 a year ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, he does nothing else. He only got $1,200 for a long time.

Mr. KEMP. Can you get a good officer for that price ?

Mr. FISHER. I am surprised that Mr. Watson is contented, but he is an efficient officer. He has been there a long time, and is well up in Canadian products and affairs, and a most suitable man for the purpose.

Mr. KEMP. He is a very fine man.

Mr. FISHER. I cannot see why he is willing to go on at the low price, but he is.

Mr. KEMP. He is a very efficient gentleman, and I am surprised at the smallness of his salary. He must have some private income.

Mr. FISHER. I know nothing about that.

Mr. LALOR. What inducements are held out to manufacturers to exhibit ? Have they to pay their own freight, or what means should they take to have their goods exhibited ?

Mr. FISHER. I have not made out any special rules regarding this exhibition. In preparing exhibits, if the manufacturers will supply the goods, we have always been in the habit of sending them forward at our expense and looking after them. I suppose we will have to do that in connection with the Imperial Institute exhibit.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman is referring to exhibitions, not to the Imperial Institute.

Mr. FISHER. We will do the same in that case.

Mr. INGRAM. I think the hon. gentleman has been a negligent sinner once more. He has not carried out what he promised last session and the session before that, and has not much of an excuse to offer.

Mr. FISHER. I have not got on as fast as I would like.

Mr. BLAIN. In what condition is the Canadian exhibit in the Imperial Institute at the present time, and how is it constituted ?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know if I could tell the hon. gentleman.

Mr. KEMP. The hon. gentleman is ashamed of it.

Mr. FISHER. I do not want to say much about it.

Mr. BARR. Is it increasing or decreasing ?

Mr. FISHER. It is very much in statu quo at present, but before next July, I hope to be able to increase it very considerably.

Mr. KEMP. It is not a credit to the country, that exhibition in the Imperial Institute.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the use of spending $8,000 if we make no efforts to improve it ?

Mr. FISHER. We did not spend it last year at all, but I hope that by the end of this year we will be able to make the exhibit fairly creditable. I may not succeed in doing all I would like before the 1st July, but will make a decided effort.

Mr. SPROULE. What do you propose doing ?

Mr. FISHER. I propose to collect exhibits this year as much as I can with the money at my disposal, and send them over and set them up. Once the installation at Liège is completed, I hope to turn some of the staff back into London to do the installation there. The Liège exhibition must be installed by the 1st May, and I will have May and June to work in the Imperial Institute at London.

Steamer service at Grosse Isle, $55,000.

Mr. FISHER. The amount of the contract is $83,000 for the vessel, and it will take the vote of last year of $30,000 and this year's $55,000 to pay for it. When I asked for $30,000 last year, I did not know what the contract would come to. We invited tenders from a considerable number of builders, and eventually awarded the contract to the lowest Canadian tenderer. There were tenders from abroad at a lower price, but we thought it only fair to give a chance to Canadian builders. Bertram & Company, of Toronto, are the contractors.

Mr. BARR. When will the contract be finished ?

Mr. FISHER. The vessel is to be delivered in September. There were other tenders that ran up to $110,000, and the tender we accepted was the lowest Canadian tender. It will be an iron steamer 120 feet long and otherwise in proportion.

Mr. SPROULE. I presume you expect to spend this $30,000 voted last year before the 30th June next, and the balance is to pay for the rest of the contract ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. $80,000 seems a high figure for a vessel 120 feet long.

Mr. FISHER. We asked for tenders from some four or five builders in Canada and two in Scotland. The offers from Scotland were lower, but we thought it would be fair to add 25 per cent to them to account for the duty which the Canadian builders said they had to pay on the material. When we did that, the Scotch tenders came higher than $83,000. The 25 per cent is an arbitrary figure, but it is about what the average duty would be, and I thought it best to give the contract to a Canadian builder on reasonable terms.

Mr. J. D. REID. I understand that, of late, they have been building large steel steamers in Toronto for prices quite as low as are demanded in the old country. Had the minister made inquiries he would have learned that a large number of lake vessels have been built in Toronto. Therefore, if he has added 25 per cent, he has simply given a profit of 25 per cent or $20,000 to the builders over and above what the vessel could have been built for if the contract had been by tender.

Mr. FISHER. It was by tender, and none of the tenders were opened until all were in. There was one Scotch tender for $67,000, another for $73,000 ? The Bertram tender was for $83,000 and the Collingwood Ship-building Company and the Polsons each $110,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. On the same specifications?

Mr. FISHER. The same in every way.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is it understood that there are to be no extras?

Mr FISHER. There would have to be a change in the specifications to have extras. The specifications were prepared by the Department of Marine and Fisheries just as they prepare them for themselves when they have to order a boat. Of course, the officers of my department explained the work to be done by the boat and what she would need.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister has taken a novel way of introducing the protection principle when he says that he added 25 per cent to the Scotch tender. It seems a strange way to overcome a protective duty in the interest of Canadians. I am not objecting to it but I think it is a very bad principle to introduce.

Mr. FISHER. I think it is the principle that has been acted upon by the government in a great many instances.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not remember having heard it explained or defended in the House before.

Mr. FISHER. When the matter was discussed, I was informed that the Public Works Department act on this principle.

Mr. SPROULE. In connection with what work?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot say; I was simply told they acted on the principle of adding a percentage to the tender of the trans-Atlantic contractor, so as to make it as fair as possible for our own contractor.

Mr. SPROULE. I have heard it explained that it cost something to bring a vessel across the water, and that must be taken into the calculation in comparing tenders. But I cannot remember having ever heard of the addition of a percentage to the tender from outside of Canada in order to be fair to our contractors.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Minister of Agriculture does not appear to be as economical as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine). I think that when that hon. gentleman wants a steamer he purchases it on the other side of the water. Is it not true that the government purchased a steamer last year, ordering it from the other side of the Atlantic on the ground that it could be built there at a less price than here?

Mr. FISHER. I think the reason was that they could not get it delivered here in time. I might say that these tenders from the other side of the water were for a vessel delivered at Quebec.

Mr. SPROULE. That is why I made the inquiry—because I understood that the cost of delivering the vessel on this side was the only item in the calculation in considering Canadian tenders. Now, it is put on the ground of protection. This is an illustration that devised many means to introduce the element of protection, though they would not admit the principle openly. They have accomplished it in a round-about way in many instances, of which this is one.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has the minister named the vessel? I think we should decide on a name. I think we ought to call her the 'Minnie M.'

Mr. FISHER. I do not know that name?

Mr. SPROULE. What speed will the vessel have ?

Mr. FISHER. The specifications require 12 knots.

Mr. SPROULE. The vessel is for quarantine purposes. Will she carry passengers?

Mr. FISHER. We have constantly to send numbers of people from the quarantine station at Grosse Isle to Quebec—people

whose time of quarantine has expired—when there is no vessel to carry them. The vessel has to carry also a disinfecting apparatus, so that if a ship comes that requires disinfecting that can be done.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the department any different method for disinfecting ships from that which was in use some years ago ?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know of any change within the last seven years. This vessel will have what they call the sulphur blast furnace.

Steamer for service at William Head, $20,000.

Mr. FISHER. I have not been able to make a contract for that ship yet. Specifications are now being drawn up by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I hope to get the ship built on the Pacific coast.

Mr. BARR. What is the object of this vessel ?

Mr. FISHER. This vessel belongs to the quarantine station at Victoria. We have to have a small steamer there to run out to the ships as they come in, and take off passengers if necessary.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you any reason to hope that you will be able to get this built in British Columbia ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Specifications were prepared last year, what is the cause of the delay ?

Mr. FISHER. Specifications were prepared, but they were on too extensive a scale, too large a ship altogether, and I insisted upon having specifications for a smaller vessel.

Mr. SPROULE. What are you doing the service with now ?

Mr. FISHER. An old boat which has been under constant repair, costing us very heavily every year, and which is not fit for the service. Sometimes I almost wish that she might be lost, she is absolutely unfit for service.

Salaries and contingencies of organized districts, and public health in other districts, $150,000.

Mr. HERRON. I would like to ask the minister for some information regarding some unsettled claims in the town of Pincher Creek where I live. Three or four years ago there was a small-pox epidemic in the Northwest Territories, and it broke out in that town. The Northwest government took steps to prevent the spread of the disease, they appointed health officers and a committee to look after the matter. They quarantined several houses in the town, and held people occupying them under quarantine. When the time came to settle, the Northwest government had not sufficient funds to meet all the claims, because there were other cases in other towns. I understand that an agreement was arrived at between the Dominion government and the government of the Northwest Territories, and the cases were handed over to the Department of Agriculture. In some of the towns in my district the claims were settled in their entirety, but for some reason of which I am not aware, in other places they were not satisfied. There are two towns in the district which I represent, where not over twenty-five or thirty per cent of all the claims have been settled, though they were certified to by the health officer, or the health committee appointed by the Northwest government, and sworn statements were submitted. I would like to ask the minister if he can tell me why these claims have not been paid ? I think they should be paid, it is in the interest of the country that they should be paid.

Mr. FISHER. I may say to my hon. friend that I do not quite understand the situation as he has described it. I was not aware that the Northwest government had any health officers there apart from those we appoint and pay. But the hon. gentleman seems to indicate some local or other health officers. As a matter of fact, we had to deal with the small-pox epidemic in the Northwest, and we did so through Dr. Patterson, who was appointed by us to superintend this work in the Territories. Everything the hon. gentleman describes came before Dr. Patterson, and he made reports upon it to the department, passed the various claims and so forth, and wherever he passed claims we paid them. I do not remember at the moment any cases which were not settled, though in some cases we did not pay the full amount claimed, but in those cases the matter was amicably adjusted. I am not aware that there were any outstanding claims. If my hon. friend would give the names of the places and the individuals whose claims remain unsettled, I will be glad to look into them, if they are certified and approved by the officer in charge.

Mr. HERRON. The Dr. Patterson to whom the minister refers did make a visit to this town in order to settle these claims. He came there and spoke to one or two men of the town, I do not think there were three men who knew of his business in the town, although there were over twenty interested in these claims. When he came at noon he said he would be there the whole afternoon, and he went away in an hour or two, and never made any investigation of the claims, good, bad or indifferent. I was there, and am able to make this statement. He put his own interpretation upon our claims, and they have not been settled to this day. I hope the minister will look into this matter and set it right. I can give all the details, the names of the applicants, and everything necessary to justify my statement. I am now speaking of Pincher Creek, but I

believe there were similar claims unpaid at Fort Macleod. This occurred four years ago last February. The disease broke out in Pincher Creek about the same time. I know of one instance where the officers took possession of a vacant house, placed patients in same, also furniture and bedding, and it all remains in that house up to this time. The board of health recommended that the building should be burned down, but no action has yet been taken.

Mr. FISHER. I will look into the matter and see what has been done.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The hon. gentleman has a number of officers to guard the frontier in Manitoba from contagious diseases. Has the minister appointed any new officers during the past year? He had Dr. Riddell at Crystal City, Dr. Thorburn at Deloraine, and Dr. White from some other place down there.

Mr. FISHER. No, we have taken them all off. Small-pox seems to have practically disappeared from the United States and we have felt justified in withdrawing these officers.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Small-pox is the only disease that you guard against?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. How many officers have you appointed for the unorganized districts and what are their salaries?

Mr. FISHER. Those along the frontier are appointed from month to month and are paid $100 a month except a few in the west where the expenses are higher and where they are paid $125 a month, as they are not resident at the places at which they are stationed.

Mr. SPROULE. If you have dispensed with the services of so many medical men and do not intend to employ them again, except an emergency arises, why do you want this large vote?

Mr. FISHER. I do not now expect to need all that, but at the time these estimates were made up, two or three months ago, we could not be very sure. We may be able to get on with $20,000 or $25,000 less and I would be willing to reduce the vote by $20,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How much did you spend last year?

Mr. FISHER. The Auditor General's Report will show what we spent last year; I am speaking now of the current year. I do not think we will spend $150,000 this present year, because the necessity for watching the frontier has ceased during this current fiscal year, and if nothing occurs to require the reappointment of these men during the next four or five years we will not spend the $150,000.

Mr. HERRON.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Auditor General's Report shows that last year $106,216 was spent, $73,056.60 for the organized districts and $33,159.40 for the unorganized districts, for public health generally. The minister states that he will not require $20,000 of last year's expenditure this year, so that about $83,000 should cover the expenditure for this year.

Mr. FISHER. Of course the organized districts are all we can surely count on. The other work is intermittent in its character, but we never know exactly what we will be called upon to spend.

Mr. J. D. REID. Last year $73,000 was for the organized districts and $33,000 for the unorganized districts. The hon. minister does not mean to say that that will be increased at all.

Mr. FISHER. There must be some mistake there, because last year I think we spent nearly $150,000; otherwise I would not have asked for the $150,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. There must be some other portion of the Auditor General's Report which my hon. friend has not seen.

Mr. FISHER. Some years ago, I asked for $80,000 for the organized districts alone, but I was forced to take a supplementary estimate and I think it came to $100,000 altogether. That has been the expenditure generally.

Mr. J. D. REID. You should not take a larger vote than is required for this purpose, because there is great temptation to use the money for some other purpose. The Auditor General has complained in respect to matters of this kind.

Mr. FISHER. I do not want the temptation of getting more money than I actually need.

Mr. SPROULE. Then why do you not act on that principle?

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister says that this year he does not want within $20,000 of what he expended last year. He spent $106,000 last year and $20,000 less would be $86,000. If he gets $100,000 it ought to cover all requirements.

Mr. FISHER. In the year 1902-3, we expended on the organized districts alone $99,000, so that there appears to be something omitted in the Auditor General's Report. I am perfectly willing to let the item stand until I get further information, but if the hon. gentlemen wish to pass the vote I think it might be reduced to $130,000.

Mr. SPROULE. You must have had some memorandum to present to Council on which to base your request for this vote.

Mr. FISHER. I have not that memorandum with me at present.

Mr. INGRAM. The expenditure last year according to the Auditor General's Report was $217,000, and if you deduct the $99,000 for cattle quarantine it leaves a balance of $118,000 expended in this way.

Mr. FISHER. The estimate for 1905-6 shows $105,000 for organized quarantine work; $15,000 for frontier work, and $10,000 for Northwest Territories, or $130,000 in all.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister had better let the item stand until we get the information.

Mr. FISHER. Very well.

Item allowed to stand.

Tracadie Lazaretto, $6,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Why is this vote increased $500?

Mr. FISHER. The physician there is experimenting on a new treatment and he wishes to continue his experiments more extensively. That accounts for the larger part of the increase, and then there are some little travelling expenses which the doctor has to incur in examining into reported cases of leprosy.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are the lepers increasing?

Mr. FISHER. It varies a little. There are seventeen now and two years ago there were twenty-one.

Public Works Health Act, $6,000.

Mr. FISHER. The statute passed some years ago requires that certain facilities in the matter of hospital accommodation and so on, shall be provided by contractors on public works. We have a gentleman who visits these works and sees that this law is properly carried out.

Mr. J. D. REID. I see that last year the expenditure under this head was only $3,500.

Mr. FISHER. I asked for the vote of $6,000 last year in anticipation of the construction of the Transcontinental Railway. So far we have only expended about $3,000, but before the end of the current fiscal year we may have to expend more. So far, I am very pleased to say, there has been no unusual occurrence. The ordinary routine inspection has been sufficient. We have had very little in the way of complaint, and our inspector has been able, by ordinary travelling, to overlook the work and make satisfactory reports. As an instance of what might occur at any time, a report came to the department that there was an epidemic of a peculiar disease on a certain work. The inspector immediately went off to inquire into it, and returned within a week with the statement that there was no foundation for the report. When a report of that kind comes to the department, however, we look into it at once.

Winnipeg and St. Boniface hospitals, $4,000.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. How are the grants to these hospitals made?

Mr. FISHER. The vote is divided between them according to the number of patients, at the rate of so much per day.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. It was stated in this House a year or two ago that the reason we had to give so much to hospitals in that part of the country was that a large number of immigrants were taken to them, and it would be unfair to throw the whole burden upon the people there. Will the minister state how many are in the hospitals, and what proportion are immigrants?

Mr. FISHER. I have no report of the number there at present, and I do not think that would influence the grant. It is the number of admissions of newly arrived people during the year that regulates the amount we send to each hospital.

Some resolutions reported.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I ask what work will be taken up to-morrow?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The Minister of Agriculture will proceed with the third reading of the Seeds Bill.

Mr. BARR. Will that take the whole day?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is possible, judging by the past. If that be passed, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, if he is ready, will proceed with his Seamen's Bill, and Mr. Fitzpatrick may proceed with his Bill to amend the Franchise Act. If we go into supply, the Minister of Railways and Canals will proceed with his estimates, and the Minister of Agriculture may take up the items he has left unfinished to-day.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 1, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery certificate of the election and return of Emmanuel Bernard Devlin, Esq., for the electoral district of Wright, in the province of Quebec.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Emmanuel Bernard Devlin, Esq., member for the electoral district of Wright, was introduced by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Hon. N. A. Belcourt.

QUESTIONS.

IMMIGRANTS DEPORTED.

Mr. URIAH WILSON asked :

1. How many immigrants were deported from this country during the fiscal year 1904, and up to the 1st of February, 1905 ?
2. What were their nationalities, and what was the cause of their being deported ?
3. How many were deported for diseases, and for what diseases ? How many because they were liable to become paupers ?

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

1. During the fiscal year 1903-4 359 immigrants were deported. From 1st July, 1904, to the 1st of February, of the fiscal year 1905, 387 were deported, making a total of 746.

2. Deported immigrants were of the following nationalities :—

Russians	202
Syrians	173
British	140
Japanese	25
Poles	24
Armenians	23
Hebrews	22
Galicians	22
Italians	17
Germans	16
Norwegians	15
Finns	12
Austrians	11
Roumanians	11
Swedes	8
Danes	5
Lithuanians	4
Hungarians	4
Chinese	3
Turks	2
Belgians	2
Americans	2
Buckowinians	2
Icelanders	1
Total	746

3. Deportations were for the following causes :—

Trachoma	502
Physical infirmity	25
Consumption	23
Insanity	19
Mental infirmity	14
Favus	13
Rheumatism	8
Tuberculosis	6
Crippled	5
Epilepsy	5
Poor physique	4
Heart disease	3
Bronchitis	3
Melancholia	2
Syphilis	2
Chronic dysentery	2
Varicose ulcer	2
Blindness	2
Rheumatism and heart disease	2
Mixed conjunctivitis	1
Conjunctivitis	1
Gout and debility	1
Idiocy	1
Tabes	1
Pregnancy	1
Deformity	1
Gonorrhœa	1
Deaf mute	1
Small-pox	1
Inflammatory rheumatism	1
Physical and mental infirmity	1
Cancer	1
Adenitis lymphatics	1
Hæmoptysis	1
Imbecile	1
Broken back	1
Hernia	1
	660
Likely to become public charges	60
Accompanying deported persons	16
Criminals	6
Refused by United States officers	3
Bad character	1
	26
Total	746

CARRIAGE OF MAILS BETWEEN COLDWATER AND LOVERING.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Who is the present contractor for carrying the mails between Coldwater and Lovering ?
2. When does the contract expire ?
3. What is the remuneration per year for such service ?
4. What is the date of execution of such contract, and when does it expire ?
5. Were tenders invited for such service ?
6. If so, who tendered, and what was the amount respectively of such tenders, if any ?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General) :

1. W. H. Lovering.
2. 31st March, 1905.
3. $130 per annum.
4. 13th day of March, 1901—31st March, 1905.
5. & 6. Tenders were not invited in 1901, but were invited in 1897 when the contract was awarded to W. H. Lovering the lowest tenderer, at $130 a year, and on its expiry in 1901, was renewed as authorized by the Post Office Act with the same contractor at the same price.

LIVE STOCK RECORDS OF CANADA.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. What steps have been taken to secure the nationalization of the live stock records of Canada ?
2. Are national records likely to be established in the near future, and under what conditions ? If not, why not ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). Will the hon. gentleman let that stand ? I will have the information, I hope, to-morrow.

COPYRIGHT PHOTOGRAPHS.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. Were representations made to the Department of Agriculture in the month of April, 1903, in reference to the inconvenience of the long inscription required on copyright photographs ?
2. Did the government take the request of Messrs. Wm. Notman & Son, of Montreal, Stephen J. Thompson, of Vancouver, B.C., and W. J. Topley, of Ottawa, into consideration ?
3. Is it the intention of the government to introduce legislation in the near future to amend the Copyright Act on photographs, in conformity with the suggestions contained in the aforesaid communications ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. Yes.
2. The government did not think it was wise to introduce a special Bill for the purpose of making that amendment to the Copyright Act.
3. The matter is under consideration.

CONVICTIONS BY JUDGE PRENDERGAST.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. Were two men named Hamelin and Goselin sentenced to imprisonment in the penitentiary for horse-stealing by Judge Prendergast in 1902 ?
2. What was the length of sentence in each case ?
3. Were they released before sentence expired ?
4. If so, at what date, and for what cause ?

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). In answer to my hon. friend, it is contrary to the well established usage of parliament to answer questions of this sort; and if the hon. gentleman will permit me I will send him over the reference in Todd where he will find the rule stated.

FITTINGS OF THE STEAMER 'ACADIA.'

Mr. AMES asked :

1. What disposition was made of the furniture and fittings of the steamer 'Acadia,' formerly in the service of the Department of Marine and Fisheries ?
2. At what time, in what manner, to whom, and for what consideration were these articles disposed of ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minof Marine and Fisheries):

1. They have been stored.
2. Answered by No. 1.

STEAM LAUNCH 'MAISONNEUVE.'

Mr. AMES asked :

1. What has the steam launch 'Maisonneuve' cost the government since her purchase for the following :—(a) repairs, (b) fittings, (c) provisions, (d) fuel, (e) other supplies, (f) salaries and wages ?
2. How many persons compose her regular staff and crew ?
3. How many months was she in active service in 1903, and during 1904 ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minof Marine and Fisheries):

1. (a) $1,640.85, (b) $1,243.98, (c) $450.22, (d) $274.61, (e) $1,482.09, (f) $3,388.13.
2. Five, with three additional when employed in surveys.
3. Three months in 1903 and seven and a half in 1904.

ANTICOSTI LIGHTSHIPS.

Mr. LEWIS asked :

1. What was, in each case. the stipulated contract price of the 'Lurcher' and of the 'East Point,' Anticosti, lightships ?
2. What additional amounts did the contractors receive in respect of these ships ?
3. What further expenditure for alterations, repairs and renewals, have been incurred up to January 1st, 1905 ?
4. According to the contract, upon what date or dates were said boats to be completed and delivered by the contractors ?
5. Was there any forfeit stipulated in the contract for delay of delivery ?
6. Were the contractors in any way penalized for failure to complete the contract within the time limit ?
7. Is the 'Lurcher' lightship in position at the present time ? If not, why not ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I would ask the hon. gentleman to move for an order for papers. The answer will be too voluminous

STEAMERS OF LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE.

Mr. LEWIS asked :

1. At what port or ports did each vessel under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries call between the 31st of October and the 4th of November, 1904, inclusive ?
2. Where was each vessel on the 3rd day of November last ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I would ask the hon. gentleman to proceed in the same manner. There is no disposition to withhold the information, but it cannot be obtained without a good deal of trouble.

WHARF AT BIC.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. Some days before the month of November last did the government enter into a contract with one P. Ross for the purchase of land for the building of a road leading to a wharf that was to be constructed at Pointe à Côté at Bic ?
2. If so, how much did Mr. Ross receive for his land ?

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. No land was purchased from Mr. Ross ; but Mr. Ross gave, in writing a promise of sale of a right of way, to our resident engineer, on the 8th of December, 1904.
2. No action taken.

RESIGNATION OF THE HON. CLIFFORD SIFTON.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I have to inform the House that my colleague, Hon. Mr. Sifton, has resigned his position in the government, and as Minister of the Interior. Mr. Sifton finds himself unable to agree with the terms of the Bill which has lately been introduced for the admission into the Dominion of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, his disagreement being confined altogether to the educational clause. After a conference with him, the following correspondence has been exchanged between him and myself :

Ottawa, February 27, 1905.

Dear Sir Wilfrid,—After giving my best consideration to the matters which we discussed last evening, I have arrived at the conclusion that it is impossible for me to continue in office under present circumstances, and that it is better for all concerned that I should act at once. I therefore beg to tender my resignation as a member of the government. I trust that the unhappy necessity which has arisen will not in the least impair the friendship with which you have been kind enough to honour me.

Believe me,

Yours most faithfully,

CLIFFORD SIFTON.

Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G.,
Ottawa.

To this I answered yesterday in the following terms :

Ottawa, February 28, 1905.

My dear Sifton,—I received yesterday your letter of same date, whereby you tender me your resignation as a member of the government.

There is no alternative to me, but to accept it, and with much regret, it will be my duty to place it in the hands of His Excellency.

After our conversation of the other day, I had left you with the impression that the differences between us were more of words than of substance, and until I received your letter, I had cherished the hope that it would be possible ere this to find a comparatively easy solution.

Whilst I feel more regret than I can express at this termination of our official relations, let me assure you that should our old friendship be ever impaired, the fault will not be mine.

Yours very sincerely,

WILFRID LAURIER.

The Hon. Clifford Sifton, Ottawa.

The resignation has been placed in the hands of His Excellency, who has been pleased to accept it.

Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON. The statement made by the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) necessitates a very short explanation to the House on my part. When it was determined that during this session of parliament legislation should be introduced creating new provinces out of a portion of the Northwest Territories, I felt called upon, in view of the history of the educational question in Canada, to give very serious consideration to the position which I should take with regard to the legislative power to be conferred upon the provinces in regard to the subject of education. It was necessary that conferences should take place with members of parliament representing the Northwest Territories and with the representatives of the Territorial government, upon the subject of education and other subjects involved in the Bill. These conferences were unavoidably postponed until after the beginning of the new year, by reason of the absence of the Prime Minister, who, after the general election, was compelled to take a short rest, and was therefore absent from the country. Shortly before the time fixed for holding these conferences I was compelled by my own state of health to leave Ottawa, and was therefore unable to be present at the discussions which took place. Before leaving I discussed with the Prime Minister most of the subjects that necessarily required to be dealt with in the Bill which was to be introduced, and so far as I was able to do so at that time, I communicated my views to him upon the various subjects. I may say that when I went away I did not anticipate that it would be considered necessary to introduce the Bill for creating the new provinces, before I returned. As members of the House are aware, I returned to the capital on Thursday afternoon. I immediately took occasion to read carefully the speech which the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had delivered in introducing the Bill. I regretted that in the right hon. gentleman's address I found some principles enunciated with which I am unable to agree. On Friday, the next day after I returned, at the earliest possible moment, I procured a copy of the educational clause of the Bill which my leader had introduced. That clause is as follows :

16. The provisions of section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, shall apply to the said provinces as if, at the date upon which this Act comes into force, the territory comprised therein were already a province, the expression 'the union' in the said section being taken to mean the said date.

2. Subject to the provisions of the said section 93, and in continuance of the principles heretofore sanctioned under the Northwest Territories Act, it is enacted that the legislature of the said province shall pass all necessary laws in respect of education, and that it shall therein always be provided (a) that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the said province or of any less portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name it is known may establish such schools therein as they think fit, and make the necessary assessments and collection of rates therefor, and (b) that the minority of the ratepayers therein whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor, and (c) that in such case the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assess-

ment of such rates as they impose upon themselves with respect thereto.

3. In the appropriation of public moneys by the legislature in aid of education, and in the distribution of any moneys paid to the government of the said province arising from the school fund established by the Dominion Lands Act, there shall be no discrimination between the public schools and the separate schools, and such moneys shall be applied to the support of public and separate schools in equitable shares or proportion.

That is the clause which is contained in the Bill which was introduced by the leader of the government. Between Friday, when I procured a copy of the clause, and Monday morning I gave the subject my best consideration, and I had the privilege in the meantime of having an interview with the Prime Minister on the subject. As the result of such consideration I determined that I could not endorse or support the principle of the educational clauses. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, my duty became perfectly clear, and on Monday morning I wrote to the Prime Minister tendering my resignation as a member of the cabinet. Subsequently, I expressed the desire that my resignation should be acted upon at once and to that wish the Prime Minister has now assented.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, not intending and not considering it proper at this time to enter into a discussion of the merits of the matter which has caused the difference between myself and my leader, I have only to add my regret that circumstances have compelled the severance of my official relations with my leader and with my colleagues with whom my relations have always been of the most harmonious and pleasant character, and with whom upon other questions I am in entire accord. The circumstances, however, in my judgment, make my duty perfectly clear, and it does not seem possible for me to properly consider anything except the principles which are involved.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, the retiring minister (Hon. Mr. Sifton) that this is not the time to undertake the discussion of the principles involved in the Bill. But, with the two statements which have been read and with the reading of the statements and the causes which make the reading of the statements necessary this afternoon, we alone have to deal and with these I shall deal for a moment with your kindly permission. It did not come as a matter of surprise to this side of the House that the Minister of the Interior should at some early period read his letter of resignation, or give his reasons for resigning to this House, nor do I think it came as a matter of surprise to hon. gentlemen who are within the secrets of the party on the other side of the House. We all remember the peculiar circumstances under which this Bill appears to have been framed and to have been rushed before the House. It did seem an odd and almost unexplainable thing that a Bill of such importance should be framed in the absence of two of the most responsible ministers in the House as regards the country and the scope of territory in which that Bill was to be operative, and having respect to the declaration of policy which I think a year or two ago was made in this House when, with some new idea of a division of ministerial responsibility, it was announced that certain ministers were to be held more or less accountable for the particular provinces or sections from which they came. This was exemplied in the case of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) in his intermeddling with the militia matters of this country. During the last few weeks this important Bill has been framed and has been laid before the House in the absence of the hon. Minister of the Interior, who was especially charged with the supervision of and the responsibility for the Northwest Territories and the west generally. We were led to think that possibly the second chapter of what took place on an almost similar line a year or two ago was being prepared for the House and the country. It is well known that at that time a most important railway Bill was conceived and formed and was almost, if not quite, presented to this House behind the back of the responsible Minister of Railways and Canals, whose office it should have been to have aided in the consideration and preparation of that Bill. We were of late led still more to suppose this from a remark which fell casually, but rather acridly, from the lips of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself, who, when, not long ago, asked about the time when we might expect the introduction of the Bill, gave as his answer that it would probably be introduced at a certain time, and when some inquiring minds on this side of the House put the question to the right hon. Prime Minister as to whether the hon. the Minister of the Interior would be back by that time, the right hon. Prime Minister, as I say, rather sharply retorted that he did not know whether he would or not, but that he, the Prime Minister, would be here. Taking all this with the history of this Bill into consideration it did not come as a surprise to this part of the House, and I doubt very much if it fell as much of a surprise upon hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. But, it is a still stranger thing that the hon. Minister of the Interior, a most important member of the cabinet at any time and a specially important member of the cabinet as regards the conception and arrangement of this Bill, did not actually know, although it is supposed that telegraph wires stretch from here to almost all parts of the United States of America in some particular portion of which the hon.

Minister of the Interior has been for the past number of weeks, of the educational clauses of this Bill until after he had returned to this city and to this House when he obtained a copy of the clause. One would have thought that on the general theory of responsible government, of a cabinet acting unitedly, of a cabinet acting wisely, consulting with every unit of the cabinet, as, I think it is in duty bound to do, in order to secure the united wisdom of the whole of the cabinet, that the hon. Minister of the Interior would have been consulted with, not even by telegraph or letter does it seem that the hon. Minster of the Interior was apprised of the one prominent clause in the Bill in which it would be supposed naturally that he would be very much interested.

The excuse, the reason, is given to-day—and we are bound to take the reason in a parliamentary sense—that the hon. gentleman is retiring because he could not find it consistent with his principles to accede to that particular clause in the Autonomy Bill, but from what I have stated and from what we have seen, it would be easily inferred, I think, by any member of this House that there is a reasonable doubt as to whether or not that was the cause of the resignation, as to whether the deliberate actions of the Prime Minister and the rest of the Cabinet heretofore have not made it quite abundantly apparent that it was the intention to get rid of the hon. gentleman whether he got out on this particular clause of the Bill or on some other. The Prime Minister has not quite satisfied the curiosity of the House. Outside of the information which was conveyed to us by the bulletin boards there are other rumours which are abroad in the corridors of this House, abroad on the streets of the city and, I dare say, are tingling the wires, which stretch from Ottawa to different parts of this country even now while we are speaking. And why? It is stated that another important minister, another important member of the cabinet of the right hon. gentleman, is deliberating as to whether he shall not follow in the tracks—no, I would not put it that way—but follow, at least, the example of the hon. the Minister of the Interior who has retired, in also expressing his formal and unqualified dissent from this Bill. There might be some reasons which would impose on us the idea that there is truth in that. I could hardly reconcile to my own mind the idea of a Prime Minister and a cabinet undertaking to frame and to put before the country so important a Bill as this, involving no trivial and unimportant financial burdens, but involving very onerous and continuous and growing financial burdens upon this country, I cannot, I say, understand how a Bill of that kind could be conceived, put into form and introduced into this House in the absence of the Minister of Finance, who is responsible, if any man in the cabinet is responsible, for the financial interests of this country. Was he also altogether and entirely in the dark with reference to this Bill? Did he know the clauses, financial or otherwise, before he came back to Ottawa and ascertained what they were by asking for a copy of the Bill? Was there such an urgent necessity for the introduction of the Bill that a delay of at least two or three days could not have been given until both the Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Finance should have had opportunity to meet their colleagues in Council and by word of mouth and interchange of ideas, see if an amicable and united conclusion could not be had? Now, we would be very loath to lose the Minister of Finance.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. His pleasant countenance is always an inspiration to us—when it is not the opposite, and it is not often it is the opposite. But we would like to have this set at rest and to hear the Prime Minister state whether there is any truth in the rumour which is persistent that the Minister of Finance, not having been consulted, is not altogether at one with the rest of the cabinet in relation to this Bill. We must bid adieu to the Minister of the Interior with varying feelings. We do it some with sympathy; some will say he has fought the fight and finished the course—I am not going to say how good a course it was—and he has entered into his reward. Probably he has had his reward before; possibly, like the late Minister of Railways and Canals, there is some glorious future awaiting him in some of the large official charges of this country. Anyway, if he leaves us as Minister of the Interior, he has not stated that he is going to leave us as member and we will still have him with us to remonstrate with and to counsel and as far as we can abiding in good will and friendship.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, partly as a question of privilege I desire to refer now to the question before the House, and I would ask the right hon. gentleman, who lives in the ramshackle house now, and who is the Samson who has pushed down the pillars and has the roof upon him and his co-ministers in the government? The other day the right hon. gentleman said I was quixotic. Well, there is this at least to be said about Don Quixote, that he was a country gentleman, a man of high honour and that he died with good Christian burial. If I must search for a historical reference to the hon. gentleman after what has happened here to-day, I could think of no one else than one of these autocratic Russian grand dukes of whom we hear at the present time. He has confessed here and the late Minister of the Interior has confessed here that in this House on Monday of this week when I asked where was the Minister of the Interior and the right hon. gentleman said it was for me to have him here, that he

knew then, as the House knows now, that he was not in his cabinet and was not in his administration. What is the reason of all this ? This autocratic Prime Minister that we have in this country eight years ago using the words of Bismarck said: We shall not go to Canossa. The right hon. gentleman has been to Three Rivers; he has made the treaty of Three Rivers, and in pursuance of that treaty he has chosen in his autocratic way to bring down a Bill dealing with the great questions now at issue without consulting his colleagues. It is said that in the preparation of this Bill he consulted only three of his ministers, of whom two came from his own province of Quebec. I do not propose to discuss the Bill, but I know now why the Minister of the Interior has left the government; it is now known that it is on the school question and it is on the land question as I said on Monday—but it is more. The right hon. gentleman in introducing a certain measure in this House argued on three grounds, the constitutional ground, the ground of policy, and he argued for separate schools per se and it is because the proposition is for separate schools per se that the late Minister of the Interior has had to leave the administration.

Mr. SPEAKER. I presume the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) intends to conclude with a motion)

Mr W. F. MACLEAN. Yes, I have certainly the right to speak somewhat from the standpoint of privilege, but I intend to conclude with a motion. There is another thing in regard to this question. There is a good old verse in the Bible which says that all they who take to the sword shall perish by the sword; and I say that all those who take to provincial rights and school questions will die by provincial rights and school questions. The handwriting is on the wall.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes, and the right hon. gentleman has lost not only his Minister of the Interior, the Napoleon of the West, but that panegyrist of his, who set the right hon. gentleman up as the greatest statesman we have ever had in this country, and who glorified the late Minister of the Interior as the Napoleon of the West. The two of them are now joined together against the right hon. gentleman. He has lost his chief organ, the Toronto 'Globe,' or this question ; he has lost the Montreal 'Witness,' another of his organs ; and I am afraid that he is now about to repudiate the last organ he appears to have left, 'Le Soleil,' that organ which, in its pontifical way, said the other day : 'We are the organ of Sir Wilfrid, and every one must take note of it and govern themselves accordingly.'

I now come to the question of the school lands and the way little Manitoba is treated ; and again I call the attention of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway), who is now in his place, to this declaration of the leading organ of the right hon. gentleman, that it was the intention to punish Manitoba because she had vindicated provincial rights in connection with educational matters. The province of Manitoba has an area of only 74,000 square miles, while the proposed provinces are to have an area of nearly 300,000 square miles each. But the province of Manitoba happens to be in favour of public education, and she is to be punished ; and now the House and the country will be able to see how all this came about. If you extended the limits of the province of Manitoba to the west, the result would be that the portion of territory to the east would have the right to regulate its own educational affairs, while the other portion of the same territory would be shackled. That is the reason why Manitoba is being punished. And so it turns out, after all the taunts that I was met with here on Monday, that I was right when I said that Manitoba was being punished, and that the Dominion Lands Act would have to be changed in order to carry out the proposal made in the Bill. I was given what was called a categorical denial ; but to-day I have received a categorical affirmation from the late Minister of the Interior, I warn the right hon. gentleman that he is engaged in a quixotic career if he fancies that he and his party, which claims to be the party of provincial rights, can shackle the two new provinces of the west and impose a separate school system upon them without consulting the people. He does not consult his own ministers—the confession is made to-day. And what is to be the fate of that minister who to-day declares that he has not been consulted? He is to be Tartified and Blairified, like the other ministers who have resigned ; and the same fate awaits any one else who chooses not to come under this new czardom which we have in this country, under which not even a cabinet minister is to be consulted in regard to public policy ; under which that great free west, which feels more keenly on these great public questions than we do in the east, is not to be consulted through its recognized minister, but this hasty and ill-advised proposal is to be introduced into this House in his absence.

I congratulate the late Minister of the Interior upon having the courage to come out. I can say this at least of him, that he has justified to-day that mission which he made several years ago into my own province, into the county of Haldimand, to say that he came to the province of Ontario to ask for our sympathy because it was proposed to put shackles upon his province ; because, he said, if the province of Manitoba is shackled to-day, the time will come when the greater provinces to

the west will be treated in the same way. It turns out now that this treatment is being meted out by the czar of the Liberal party without consulting his colleagues. And this man of autocratic tendencies gets up in this House and reads us a lecture and calls us all kinds of names; and yet, within less than forty-eight hours of his lecture to me, everything I said has been justified and proved true. The right hon. gentleman to-day stands discredited in this House. He stands discredited of his own colleagues; he stands discredited in the different provinces, especially in the province of Ontario, and by his own newspaper, the 'Globe.' The right hon. gentleman quoted George Brown. The right hon. gentleman actually read into the constitution the utterances of George Brown's newspaper and George Brown's speeches, in justification of this proposal of his to shackle these great new provinces of the west. The right hon. gentleman has failed. He has no justification for his proposal except as a matter of policy. But he has not made it a question of policy. He made a bogus constitutional argument, and then he made a moral argument, and that moral argument was what? Many a time in this House the right hon. gentleman has read us a lesson about respect for our neighbours; but there never was a more insulting statement made to the people of the United States than that statement of his that they were immoral, that divorces, lynchings and murders prevailed in their country, and that the reason of Canada's superiority in this respect was that dogma was taught in our public schools.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What the people of Canada believe in is the separation of state and church. With regard to what is embodied in the constitution, so far as Ontario and Quebec are concerned, we say all right, we accept the situation.

An hon. MEMBER. Thank you.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Nay, more; I go further and say, I for one would not lift my hand to prevent the people of these western provinces having separate schools if they desire them. But my plea is that the question must be left to them—that we must not impose these schools upon them. I am ready to declare here or anywhere else—shall I say as a radical or a democrat?—for the principle of the entire separation of church and state, so far as our constitution will permit it. The right hon. gentleman is in this House to-day as the champion of a new alliance between church and state. Again I warn him that he is on dangerous ground. Again I tell him that he who takes to the sword shall perish by the sword. He who apparently, a few weeks ago, entered on a long career of office, is to-day face to face with the handwriting on the wall. I would like to see the right hon. gentleman introduce great measures into this House, and not bring up questions of this kind. I do not want to say anything against my hon. friend who has retired from office to-day; but if there is one thing he can recall, it is this: He came in on that wave; he goes out on that wave; whither it will carry him I leave him to find out in his own experience.

Mr. LEIGHTON G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe). Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is still no question before the House.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LEIGHTON G. McCARTHY. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has referred to matters which, perhaps should not have been referred to in discussing the question before the House. But, lest my silence should be misconstrued, I desire to make a short statement. I occupy, on this question, a much different position from that occupied, probably, by any other member in this House. My hon. friend from South York refers to the campaign of some ten years ago in the county of Haldimand. The fact was referred to that, on that occasion, the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) and myself stood on the same platform when we were fighting the men who are now calling in question the actions which have taken place and have caused that hon. gentleman's (Mr. Sifton's) retirement. Therefore, for the last ten years, my position on the school question has been defined. I also fought on the school question in 1895 in Cardwell, and again in June 1896 was the school question fought out in my riding. From that day to this, I have remained firm and free, so far as my constituency was concerned, upon this question, and I have been thrice endorsed upon it. Therefore, I simply rise to announce to this House as I announced the first time I spoke in the House and as I have previously announced to individual members, that I am, like the ex-Minister of the Interior, absolutely opposed to the education clauses as submitted in the Autonomy Bills; that I will oppose them and oppose them unalterably.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I do not rise to anticipate the discussion on the Bill that will shortly be before us or to explain to the House where I stand on the question—I think my position is pretty well known. But I rise merely to say that, so far as the Prime Minister has given this House his confidence, and so far as he has explained the position, all is well. But some of us thought he might well have gone a little further. Perhaps to expect that would be to ask him to anticipate events. He did not indicate in any way who is to be the incumbent of the office

which has just been made vacant. However, that is something that concerns him more than it does us on this side of the House. But, in view of the loss from the cabinet of the representative of Manitoba and the Northwest,—and a man regarded by many as one of the ablest members of the cabinet to which he belonged, I wish to ask the Prime Minister if he does not think that it would be well to tell this House that he is prepared to drop that clause of the Bill? I wish also to congratulate the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) who has just resigned, and to congratulate ourselves who are opposed to this feature of the Bill upon the acquisition by our ranks of that hon. gentleman and also of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. L. G. McCarthy).

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Don't call the hon. member for North Simcoe an acquisition.

Mr. SPROULE. I hope that many others on that side will find that open confession is good for the soul, and will rise and do as these hon. gentlemen have done. While I am on my feet I would like to say a word with regard to the number of copies of the Bill distributed so far. Eight days ago the Bill was introduced. Up to to-day each of us could only get one copy of the Bill. Yesterday, the Prime Minister said that there was no objection to having a large number struck off. It would only take two or three hours to strike off a couple of thousand copies of the Bill. It seems strange to us, therefore, that up to the present, we have been able to get only four or five copies each. I made inquiry of the Printing Bureau and they told me: We were instructed to give no information as to the number of copies of the Bill to be printed. It seems strange that there should be such secrecy. I would ask the Prime Minister if he knows any good reason why we should not get more copies of the Bill, and whether he will give instructions that a much larger number be printed, because there is an urgent demand for them from many parts of the country. I myself have applications for at least a hundred copies of the Bill. Yet, though it is eight days since the Bill was introduced, I am able to supply only five.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). It is not my intention to speak on this matter, further than to congratulate the late Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) on the action he has taken in withdrawing from the present government. I take this opportunity of stating that, as soon as the Bill was introduced, knowing the action that the late Minister of the Interior had taken in 1895 and 1896, when the Manitoba school question was under discussion, though I had no consultation with the hon. gentleman, I had absolute faith that he would take the course he has taken to-day. In justice to that hon. gentleman I may say that I am in a position to state positively, knowing whereof I speak, that it was his desire that the Manitoba school question should be kept out of the arena of Dominion politics and be settled in a satisfactory manner by the province. That was the wish also of many hon. gentlemen on the Liberal-Conservative side of this House. But the wishes of those gentlemen and of the late Minister of the Interior were not gratified. I felt that there was no other honourable course open to the late Minister of the Interior, than that which he has taken, and I had the most perfect confidence in his strength of purpose and knew that he would not tolerate the infliction upon the Northwest of the clause in this Bill relating to education. I ask the Prime Minister; I appeal to his patriotism—and he pretends to be patriotic—in view of the fact that the Minister of the Interior has retired and that other ministers hang their heads when this Bill is mentioned; in view of the fact that many hon. members behind him will not and dare not support him; in the interest of the west and of the financial and commercial institutions that depend upon the development and progress of that great country, I appeal to him to pause in pressing this Bill. He cannot but know that the great tide of immigration now flowing toward that country, once checked will not easily resume its course. I predict, if he goes on with this Bill—and I am not the only one who predicts—dire disaster to this country.

An hon. MEMBER. War.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. War? Sir, if because a few half-breeds on the banks of the Saskatchewan refused to accept the new and reasonable method of survey instead of the old one to which they were accustomed, the First Minister would have been justified in shouldering his musket in their support, as he declared in 1885 he would have done, then far more would the boys in the Northwest—it will not need the boys from Ontario—be justified in shouldering their muskets in resistance to the tyranny the Prime Minister proposes in this Bill. His action, if he persists in it, will check the tide of immigration into that country and will produce a crisis in the financial and business affairs of the Dominion. I ask the First Minister to give his most careful attention to this idea. He can turn a corner as quickly as anybody can. It is not too late for him yet. Let him withdraw these clauses of his Bill, and leave it to the Northwest to settle this matter.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (Leeds). I do not rise to discuss the Bill which has led to the resignation of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) but only to congratulate my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) on having already de-

clared his attitude. He is not a member of the cabinet; but I presume that he was a prospective minister. I have been waiting to hear from another gentleman who sits close to that hon. member. I refer to the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Grant). At a by-election in that constituency, I had the honour to go there to say a word on behalf of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who was then a candidate in North Ontario. And one of the principal things brought against the hon. member for North Toronto in that campaign, was that he had supported the Remedial Bill, and if elected would advocate the granting of separate schools in the Northwest. That was the principal argument used in that by-election to further the election of the hon. member for North Ontario, and I now expect to hear from him that he will follow the hon. member for North Simcoe and declare the position he purposes taking when the Bill comes up.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington) On the motion to adjourn, moved by the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) and on which several members have spoken, some of whom have said that they are unalterably opposed to clause 16 of the Bills creating two new provinces in the Northwest Territories, I would say on my own behalf, speaking for myself only, that I am unalterably in favour of that clause 16 in the two Bills shortly to come up for a second reading. So far as I have been able to gather, the only point urged to-day is that made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who says that the Bills are hurried ones. Surely he does not mean that these are new Bills. I remember last session hearing this matter discussed, if not in the House at all events around the House, and likewise the session before that. They are, I submit, two of the best considered Bills that have ever been brought forward; and although they may not have been as fully discussed with some members of the government as they might have been, still I venture to say that during the past five or ten years no question has received greater consideration. If I read parliamentary practise aright, if I understand Todd's parliamentary procedure and May's usages of parliament, I believe I am correct in saying that it is the Prime Minister who should introduce measures of the kind we are now discussing; and if any of the members of his cabinet are not in accord with him, they have one duty to perform and that is to resign. If the ex-Minster of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) found he could not support the government in this matter, he has taken the proper course; but as I understand the question, so far as it has now gone, there is a distinct desire on the part of hon. members opposite, evinced both in their speeches and their newspapers, to create some inflammatory condition in this country which there is nothing in the Bills introduced to warrant.

Some hon. MEMBERS. What about the Globe?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I have read the editorials in the 'Globe,' in which that newspaper takes issue with the government regarding the educational policy laid down in the Bills presented to this House. I am sorry that the 'Globe' cannot see as the government do on this question, but the 'Globe' is only one newspaper, and we are legislating for the whole Dominion. If the 'Globe' cannot see eye to eye with us, that is no reason whatever why we should turn back from what we believe to be our duty. The majority of this House and the country, I am convinced, are of the opinion that the measure submitted to us is right and just; and in that belief I think we should go forward notwithstanding the Toronto 'Globe' and the organ of the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) and those other organs which are criticising these Bills very adversely at present.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want the right hon. the First Minister to forget the second question that I ventured to put to him so that he may settle, if it is in his power to do so, these disquieting rumours which have been given currency with reference to the attitude of some others of his ministers on this Bill. We have had a most important piece of information from the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. He has just told us that this Bill has been discussed for two sessions, and he has informed the House with all becoming gravity that it is still being discussed. Where? Is there an inner circle somewhere?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I said around the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there a circle within a circle in the party headed by my right hon. friend, and at the head of which is probably the right hon. gentleman who leads the government? Is there an inner circle which takes up these things in advance and discusses and settles them and brings them to a point where they are in the position of not being new matters but things well discussed and settled during these two years? Last year my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) was, I believe, present in this House and in his wonted health. He was also present the year before last in equally good condition. During all that time, as we have just been informed, the principles of this Bill were being discussed, and surely if any one of them was discussed it must have been that one dealing with the school question. But evidently the Minister of the Interior was not in that warm current.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the hon. gentleman bringing up some new matters? I would

remind him that he has already spoken once.

Mr. FOSTER. I spoke not on the adjournment but on the ministerial explanation, and I am now calling the attention of the First Minister to the question I have just put. I also want to call his attention to something else. It is in the interests of the country that we should know whether two or three days ago, after conferring with the Minister of the Interior, my right hon. friend still had hopes that the Minister of the Interior would accede to what was evidently a proposition put to him, possibly in modification of this clause of the Bill, and that his resignation at the last moment came as a disappointment. It would be interesting to the House to know whether the right hon. gentleman made any advance towards a compromise in the Bill as presented, in order to retain his colleague in the cabinet. I want to call to the attention of my right hon. friend two other matters, which I may as well bring before him now, as otherwise I should have to call his attention to them later. I find that in the printed Bill there are material alterations as compared with the Bill laid on the table, when introduced by the right hon. gentleman. What is the cause for these modifications? Have some modifications been made between the time this Bill was introduced and the time when it was sent to the printer, with a view of retaining in the government the Minister of the Interior or any other aggrieved minister? When my hon. friend here to my right asked for the printing of a larger number of copies of the Bill, it struck me that perhaps there was method in not printing too many copies, because, before the next printing takes place, it may possibly be that some other clauses will be modified in order to retain members who are at present recalcitrant, or to gain the favour of those who are opposed to the Bill as it stands. But I call my right hon. friend's attention to this peculiarity, that some of the clauses of the Bill which he put in Mr. Speaker's hands do not appear in these Bills, the swamp lands clause for instance.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. FOSTER. I think not. I had a copy of the Bill and read it, and I am sure that was not in the Bill. I merely mention the matter so that the right hon. gentleman may notice it. There is one other thing I would like to speak of. We have had placed in our hands what purports to be a history from official sources of the legislation of the united provinces of the Dominion since confederation. I do not know to whose courtesy we are indebted for this. It is useful in its way, so far as it goes. But it has been stated in the public press that it was arranged and collated by the Secretary of State, and publicity has been given to that statement, and it is believed by a great many people. I do not know whether that is the case or not. I have no objection to the government giving us all and the fullest information with reference to the subject, but I do object to the government putting anything in circulation as official information if it has been done under the auspices I have mentioned, and as has been reported in the press, because the information is more than a statement of facts, and is shaped into an argument from the beginning to support the contention of the government. I hope my right hon. friend will be able to say that this has not been prepared by the government or any member of the government, or officials connected with the government. It seems to bear the impress of being printed in the Government Printing Bureau, though that may not be the case. However, as that has been current, I bring it to the attention of my right hon. friend so that he may mention it, if he will be kind enough to do so, in connection with the other points I have raised.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). In order to emphasize some of the remarks of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) I wish to draw the attention of the premier to a statement he made in the ministerial correspondence which he read as having taken place between him and his late colleague. It is to my mind a very curious statement. He said that in consultation with his colleague he hoped he would be able to yield somewhat to his views so as to retain him in the cabinet. Now what the House wants is a clear cut statement from the premier whether he is wedded to that particular clause of the Bill regarding separate schools, or whether he is prepared to do what his colleague wishes him to do in order to retain him in the cabinet, and in order to meet the wishes of a great number of his supporters in the House in that direction. The difficulties may be all removed, there may be such an alteration in that clause as that it may receive the support of the whole House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no observation of any kind to offer to the House on this occasion, because the occasion does not call for any observation from me beyond the statement which has been made by myself and by my late colleague, the present member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). The hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) knows better than anybody that on such an occasion ministerial explanations are to be given when a gentleman withdraws from the administration, and it is left to the prime minister and to the minister withdrawing to make such explanations as they deem fit. I rise simply to answer one question, though it is not at all pertinent to the issue, because everything that has been said here on this occasion beyond that which

refers to the withdrawal from the cabinet, is aside altogether from the issue. But the hon. gentleman has questioned me with regard to a pamphlet which has been issued purporting to be certain collations from the debates of this House on a former occasion on the question of separate schools. I was not aware until this moment that this pamphlet had been distributed, and I shall make inquiry and ascertain who is responsible for it. I do not mean any discourtesy to the House, on the contrary; the House is entitled to the amplest information, and that it shall have at all times, and I hope before this matter is settled. But many of the matters which have been introduced today are absolutely foreign to the question which I was forced to bring before the House, that is to say the resignation of my hon. friend from Brandon. The other questions will come up at a later date. Some remarks have been made, for instance, by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) when he said that this Bill had been before the House for two sessions. That was evidently a slip of the tongue, and was easily answered. My hon. friend meant only to say that the question of autonomy had been discussed for two sessions. Everybody knows, especially the members who were in the old parliament, that for the last two sessions the question of autonomy for the Territories has been under discussion; I presume that is what my hon. friend had in his mind when he spoke on this Bill. But the only object I had in rising was to refer to a statement—not a statement but an insinuation, made, I think, by the hon. member for South York. The hon. gentleman insinuated that in bringing forward this measure there was an intention on my part in some way to get rid of the Minister of the Interior. I simply notice the statement to give it the most emphatic denial that I can. Whatever may be the differences of opinion between myself and my late colleague, I am sure he will acquit me of having had any idea of acting deceitfully towards him. I am sure that no one knows better than himself that it is with extreme regret that I have to lose his valuable services, and if I could have retained them I would have done so with great pleasure. When the hon. member for South York insinuates that I was conspiring in some way to get rid of my hon. friend from Brandon he makes an insinuation which is absolutely without the shadow of foundation.

Mr. SPROULE. We are entitled to some information showing why we cannot get more copies of the Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is very persistent in his question. I may say at once that this matter of printing is not in my department, it is in the hands of the Secretary of State. The hon. gentleman will not be surprised perhaps to learn that I have many things to attend to these days, but I will not forget the subject and will communicate directly with the Secretary of State.

Motion (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjourn, negatived.

INSPECTION AND SALE OF SEEDS.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 7) respecting the inspection and sale of seeds.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford) moved:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that the same be referred to a special committee to be named by the Prime Minister and that the said committee shall have power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses on oath and such other powers as may be necessary.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in making this motion I desire to offer but a few remarks. We have taken exception to various clauses of the Bill from time to time as they have been before the House, and though some few minor amendments have been made, I think that the Bill has not received that attention it should have received. We have called the attention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to various points in the Bill——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman's motion is out of order. The rule appears to be that no amendment, not merely verbal, shall be made to any Bill on the third reading.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I am not making an amendment to the Bill. This is a motion asking that it shall be sent to a special committee, and that it shall not go to the third reading at all. I have consulted an authority on the point. I am quite willing to abide by the ruling of Mr. Speaker. This is an amendment moved that the Bill shall not go to the third reading now, but that it shall be referred to a special committee, not a committee of the House, but a special committee to be named by the right hon. First Minister. I shall wait until Mr. Speaker decides the point.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the first motion should be to discharge the order, and then to refer this to the committee.

Mr. WHITE. My hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) may move that the order be discharged for the third reading and that the Bill be referred to the special committee.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I will move:

That the order for the third reading of Bill (No. 7) be discharged, and that the same be referred to a special committee to be named by the Prime Minister and that said committee shall have power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses on oath and such other powers as may be necessary.

I was desirous of pointing out that various amendments have been made to this Bill since it came before the House. Some of these we have been able to comprehend, others we have not. I must say that it remains in a very unsatisfactory state now, in so far as I have been able to gather the opinion of the House on the matter. The hon. Minister of Agriculture yesterday, for some reason or other, was in very poor voice for him. We could not very well hear what he said, and therefore we were unable to take that part in the debate which we should like to have taken. Therefore, I feel called upon to move this amendment which I have just offered to the House. In the first place, I desire to point out that the time mentioned in clause 1 is too limited. That I have previously drawn attention to, and it is not necessary to give further reasons than simply to say that this is a serious objection to the Bill. Then clause 3, providing for the placarding of the sacks, is also a most objectionable one. The hon. gentleman has had pointed out to him time and again that it was impossible to carry out this provision of the Bill, but he refuses to take any notice of that objection, which, all the trade will tell him, is absolutely well-founded. It is impossible to placard these bags even if we were willing, because if the seed should contain any of these weeds which are enumerated, it is necessary to placard the bag with the names of these weeds. It is impossible to do that. Further, seed for the foreign market would not be accepted in bags placarded in this way, and for that reason I desire again to point out to the hon. minister that it is impossible that this provision can be carried out. Then as to the exemption of the grower while the dealer is prohibited from selling this article, I desire again to point out that there are serious objections to this provision. The hon. minister announced that his object in bringing in this Bill was to ensure the purity of seed, but it turns out, in view of this provision of the Bill, that it is not for pure seed at all. If that were the object of the Bill, that clause should not stand for a moment. That particular clause cannot stand the test of good judgment at the hands of this House; therefore, I think the hon. gentleman should recall that clause. Then in regard to the standard for seed that he sets up. I have submitted, and I am sure it has not been controverted by the hon. gentlemen opposite, nor can it well be, that it is impossible to comply with the provisions of clause 4, I think it is. It is impossible for us to get a large amount of seed of No. 1 quality. No. 1 quality will be a very scarce article according to the Bill. The Bill makes it difficult to procure No. 1 quality, but when you have procured that quality you have not a first-class seed by any means. That, I think, is a very serious objection to the Bill. The hon. minister sets up a standard for No. 1 quality, and after he has obtained that quality, according to the test of purity which he makes, he has a very inferior quality of seed, as he takes no stock in the colour of the seed nor in the size of its development. These are two very important factors in seed which the hon. gentleman discards entirely. The evidence taken by the Royal Commission that inquired into the matter in England discloses the fact that two of the prime necessities of No. 1 seed are that it shall be of large well developed size and have a good bold colour. Both of these items are absent in the hon. minister's estimate of No. 1 seed. There is another very good reason why the clause setting up a standard for No. 1 seed should meet with the opposition of the House. The requirements of the clause are such that only a limited quantity will pass the tests, and will not be the best of seed by any means. But it must be placarded nevertheless as inferior if it contains five out of a thousand weed seeds. That is surely a great injustice to a large amount of the product of this country, because having to be placarded it makes it comparatively unsaleable. It is placed at a discount on the market, because you have branded upon it all the various impurities which it contains, though they may be very limited in quantity.

It is quite possible under this Bill that these weed seeds may prevail to the extent of 10, 15 or 20 to the thousand, and still you will have a very much better article than you would have with a sample that is poor in germination, but true to name and which at the same time may have only five weed seeds to the thousand. Therefore, I think the hon. gentleman has missed the object of the measure entirely in setting up his standard. He has not got a good standard for No. 1 seed after having graded it according to this Bill. For this and for various other reasons that have already been adduced in the House, and that are convincing to the judgment of all men who desire to have a good practicable and workable measure, I believe that this Bill should be submitted to a special committee where the evidence of those well qualified to judge can be obtained and the matter can be fully threshed out before a committee of farmers, growers, dealers and all concerned. Let every clause stand on its merits and if it is found that the Bill will pass before this committee and is believed to be a workable and practical measure which will serve the best interests of agriculture in this country by all means let us pass the Bill. But if it is not found to be such a Bill as will pass the ordeal of a committee, either the Committee of Agriculture or a special committee to be named by the Prime Minister, then I think the hon. gentleman should introduce into it such amendments as will make it a satisfactory measure. I am sure that he has misgauged the feeling of the country to a

large extent. The farmers in the district from which I have the honour to come are, I believe, strongly opposed to this measure. S. Herrold & Son, of Brantford, who are well known to the Minister of Customs and who are not political friends of mine write me a very strong letter in which they inform me that the farmers in that district are dead against the Bill; that they are unalterably opposed to this Bill. I have letters from Mr. Bruce, who formerly sat in this House, from Mr. Ewing, of Montreal, from Mr. Hogg, of Oakwood, from Mr. Steele, of Toronto, from Mr. Keith, of Toronto, and others who stand high in the trade, every one testifying that they do not think the Bill practicable and workable. These men have spent their lives in the business and are thoroughly familiar with the requirements of the trade and of agriculture, and I maintain that if the minister persists in forcing this Bill through the House it will either drive out from the trade the men legitimately entitled to stay there or it will become a dead letter on our statute-book. Both of these results are undesirable and the minister cannot wish for either of them to come to pass. I ask then that in fairness to all concerned, this Bill should be submitted to a committee where persons, documents, and evidence may be adduced to show the various features of the Bill that are impracticable and unworkable or wherein it fails to meet the wishes of the hon. gentleman who has introduced it. If this is done, I think we will secure a practicable and workable measure, and I again suggest to him that he should read carefully the evidence taken by that British committee of which I have spoken which was appointed to deal with this very subject. The members of that committee travelled from end to end of the British Isles, took the evidence of all parties concerned and of every one interested in seeds and after having deliberated and taken evidence under oath they submitted that in their opinion it was not desirable that government control should be introduced. If this is the case in Great Britain and they are the best judges of seed in the world to-day,—we have no men in this country who can equal them—I submit that the hon. gentleman should take a leaf out of the book of the British government and appoint a committee to deal with this matter, a committee who will thresh out every clause of the Bill. I wish to point out one of the amendments which the hon. gentleman put in with regard to the labelling of screenings which he allows to be held for export, whereas a large number of better seeds between screenings and No. 1 are not allowed to be held for export. Therefore a man must either not hold these seeds or label good seeds as screenings. Surely he does not want to insist on trying to carry out so unreasonable a provision as that. The hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) pointed out when this amendment was introduced that it bordered very close on nonsense and so it does. The minister allows the lowest grade to be held as screenings if for export, but the many intervening grades between screenings and No. 1 he refuses to allow to be held. Surely in view of this the minister will not insist on passing the measure through the House. It is very ill-considered, there is no hurry about the Bill, and I submit that it is far better to have a delay of two or three weeks and have a practicable working measure that can be carried out than to come to this House and insist without due consideration on the passing of this measure. I am sure that 50 per cent of the members could not hear the hon. gentleman yesterday when the amendments were introduced. We were asked to vote these amendments blindly and to take the whole dose down at once. It is surely not in the interests of enlightened legislation, not in accordance with the wishes of the members of the House of Commons of Canada, that we should endorse a Bill that contains so many imperfections; there are as many imperfections in it as there are in the seeds which the hon. gentleman describes. Twenty-five varieties of weeds may be in the seeds and I am sure there are more than 25 imperfections in this Bill that might be easily remedied by reference to a committee. I have pleasure in moving that this Bill be not now read a third time but be referred to a committee.

Mr. FISHER. Before you put the question, I would like to say in reference to the remarks of the hon. gentleman, that this whole question has been threshed out. I think that everything the hon. member has said has been said in the House by himself perhaps more than once. The hon. gentleman asks that the Bill be referred to a special committee, but the Bill has been through a general committee, through the Committee of the Whole House, and I do not think any better committee could possibly be struck to consider it any further. The Bill has been before the House not in every detail as it is now, but in principle, for the last three sessions. There is no question of precipitancy, there is no question of hastiness, there is no question of lack of consideration. The hon. gentleman himself and other gentlemen on both sides of the House have discussed every detail of this Bill over and over again. Every detail has been discussed in committee and now the Bill is up for its third reading. I cannot see any utility in delaying the passage of the Bill or referring it back to any special committee for any particular object. I can therefore only ask the House to reject the amendment of the hon. member and ask that the Bill be read a third time and be sent up to the Senate.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not wish to say more than a few words, although I regard this as

a very important measure. The amendment leaves to the leader of the government the selection of the committee or the composition of the special committee to which this Bill might be sent. This is not a new question, but there are new features in connection with this Bill. It is casting no reflection upon the ability or the energy or the care of the hon. minister who introduced the Bill to say that if we submit this to a committee having special knowledge of the matter and having special facilities for investigation, good as the Bill may be, it will be greatly improved.

Throughout this whole discussion I have desired that this Bill should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture. What have we a Committee on Agriculture for if not to consider such questions as this ? The fact that it has been before the Committee of the Whole House is no answer to the present motion for a reference. It is provided by our rules, and sanctioned by our practice, that a motion of this kind may be made at any stage of a Bill. I do not wish to be considered as opposing the principle of the Bill. I recognize that the minister has devoted much time and care to it, and it is shorn of many of the objectionable features which it had when it was introduced. Although I believe, as the hon. member for Brantford has suggested, that it is still full of the seeds of imperfection, yet these might be very well eliminated if it were referred to a special committee ; and we have excellent examples for that course. We have the example of Great Britain, a country many centuries older than our country, where, after a full and exhaustive investigation, it was decided that such a measure was not adapted to the conditions of the country ; and there may be ground for pausing to see whether this Bill is adapted to the conditions of Canada. At all events, we would have experts on these matters, not only on the committee but coming before the committee to give evidence. We would also have, what the members of the administration, from the Prime Minister down, have been pressing in Railway Bills that those most interested can come before the committee as they cannot come before the House, and express their views. I am entirely in accord with the practice that has prevailed, of threshing out these matters before the House ; but this is a matter requiring special investigation, and the knowledge of experts and practical farmers. I believe it is highly in the interest of agriculture that the Bill should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture, with power to send for persons, papers and documents, and that there should be a thorough investigation in order that the faults still in the Bill may be eliminated, or, if not, that the Bill be discontinued.

Mr. BOYCE. I am sure that the House cannot fail to recognize the labour which the hon. Minister of Agriculture has bestowed upon this Bill, in the honest and faithful endeavour to obtain by legislation pure seed for the farmers of this country. But if, as appears to be the case, the Bill, which has been through several stages in this House, has, in some of its details fallen short of the object in view, if it does not go the length of providing the remedies desired, the hon. Minister of Agriculture should hesitate before he obstructs such further investigation as would throw light upon the Bill, and enable it to become more workable. The hon. gentleman suggested, I think, in committee, that I was here to oppose the Bill. I am not opposing it. I recognize that the principle involved in the Bill is one very much to be encouraged, and I would not detract one iota from the credit due to the hon. minister for the labour which he has bestowed upon it. There are three classes affected by this legislation—the seed merchant, the farmer who purchases seed, and the farmer who grows his own seed. The farmer who grows his own seed has a different line of argument to advance with respect to the provisions of this Bill, from those of the farmer who purchases his seed. The latter is entitled to the fullest protection. In my opinion, which entirely coincides with that of the hon. minister, it is of the utmost importance that pure seed should be guaranteed to the trade at large. As the hon. minister has said, this Bill has been before this House practically for two years. That may be so : but when it came to be considered in committee during the first few days of the present session, it was found to be so weak and to fall short in so many important respects that the hon. gentleman was forced to withdraw it and have it reprinted ; and when it came down yesterday in its reprinted form, we found it to be still imperfect. In one clause especially, it had to be amended. So the hon. minister is learning day by day that even when this Bill goes through its final stages, there will be much in it to be altered ; and if it can be altered in one respect, it can be in others. I have not heard the hon. minister say that he has received expert testimony upon the clauses referred to by the hon. member for Brantford. It is of the utmost importance that expert testimony should be had before the various clauses of the Bill can be intelligently dealt with. I therefore submit to the hon. Minister of Agriculture that it would be in the interest of the purpose of this Bill, as a practical working measure, to have it put into such form that it would serve the interest of all the classes of people sought to be benefited or protected by it. There is one clause to which I have repeatedly, I fear with tiresomeness, drawn the attention of the House and the hon. minister, that is, subsection 2 of section 8. It is from my point of view an unheard-of thing to legislate that the honest agent for

the sale of seeds, who is entitled to the immunity provided by this subsection, should, notwithstanding that the section declares him to be immune and not liable to conviction, be mulcted in the case of conviction, while the principal, when his name is disclosed by the agent as a condition precedent to his statutory innocence being established, is also prosecuted. Now, I say in all seriousness and candour that it is an unheard-of proposition, that the innocent receiver of stolen goods, not knowing them to have been stolen, should be liable to prosecution as well as the thief. If it were only to save the innocent dealer, who does not open the package, who does not know the state of the seed, and who had no reason to believe that the seed did not comply with the provisions of the Act, and discloses the name of the person from whom he purchased the seed, and the date and the place of the sale, I say the Bill should be altered. If only for the purpose of protecting from prosecution a man of that character, a man who is innocent according to the spirit of the Act, it would be well for the minister to hesitate before pressing this Bill through the House. I sincerely trust the hon. minister will give his best consideration to the motion of my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), if not upon all the grounds suggested by him, upon general grounds, and in order that we may have a useful and workable piece of legislation which would really protect the class of people it is intended to.

Mr. ELSON. Representing a purely agricultural constituency and being a practical farmer myself, I have taken a very deep interest indeed in the Bill introduced by my hon. friend regarding the inspection and sale of clover and other seeds, and I desire to compliment the hon. gentleman for what I believe is an honest effort on his part to bring about such legislation as will enable our farmers to obtain clean and pure seeds. I fear, however, that the provisions of this Bill will not have the desired effect, either as regards the farmers or the merchants, and certainly not that which the hon. minister himself desires. I am convinced that if it should become law, it will decrease the price of clover seeds which the farmers have to sell and increase the price to those farmers who have to buy it, and who are the only members of our community who would after all require to purchase. Let me illustrate my argument. Let us take say four farmers who have each ten bushels of clover seed to sell. The Bill provides that a farmer may sell his seed to another farmer without coming under the provisions of this measure ; but if a farmer should have to go around among his neighbours and peddle his seed, that would not be only a humiliating position for him to occupy, but he would soon find that he would not get much sale for it. I fail to see how we can very well dispense with the services of the middle man or the merchant in the sale of our seeds. Then when farmer No. 1 brings his ten bushels of seed to the merchant, the merchant, with his keen eye or glass, finds that it contains noxious seeds, and he says : There is an inspection law at present and this seed will not stand inspection and grade as No. 1, consequently I can only give you a low price for it. The farmer, who has no other recourse, must take the price offered. When farmer No. 2 comes with his ten bushels, the merchant says to him : Your seed is not quite so good as that which I have just got, because it contains a quantity of oxeye daisy, mustard and other bad seeds, and consequently I can only give you a low price. The farmer, of course, must take the price offered, and his seed is dumped into the same bin with that of farmer No. 1. Then comes along farmer No. 3, and the merchant says to him : Your seed contains a certain proportion of noxious seed, and I can only give you a low price. The farmer again cannot help himself, and sells at the price offered, and the merchant dumps No. 3 seed into the same bin with the others. Then farmer No. 4 appears on the scene, and his ten bushels are fairly good seed. The merchant says : I cannot detect very much noxious seed in your ten bushels and I will give you a fairly good price, and he buys it and dumps that also into the same bin. So that there are forty bushels in the same bin. Then the inspector comes along, dips out a little of the seed from the bin, examines it and grades it as No. 1. When a purchaser comes to buy some clover seed, the merchant says to him : I have here a bin graded No. 1 by the government inspector, but I must charge a big price for it ; but the purchaser, of course, can do nothing else but buy, and he gets his portion from the top. Another purchaser comes, and another, and so on. But at each sale the merchant has to dip deeper into the bin ; and according as the quantity in the bin decreases, the quality of the seed becomes worse. But it has all been graded as No. 1, and the last purchaser pays the same price as the first. So that the farmer who sells has to take a low price, whereas those who buy have to pay a big price, and the profit is to the merchant, who, of course, in view of the uncertainties and difficulties with which the law surrounds him, is entitled to a fairly good price in order to enable him to handle the goods at all. Any legislation which turns against the interests of the farmer should be most carefully considered. If the Minister of Agriculture could devise some means for winnowing out the noxious seeds from the good, thereby giving to the farmer the clean seed on the one hand and the noxious weed seed on the other. There could be no objection to this measure, but so far, we have no machine which will accomplish that. But if the hon. minister could succeed in obtaining such a machine and have it put upon the market, he would certainly be rendering greater service to the

farmers of the Dominion than has ever been rendered by any previous Minister of Agriculture. We have heard, it is true, within the last three or four months, that certain gentlemen on the other side of the line, who are gifted with wonderful inventive genius, have invented a separating box which has been introduced into Canada, and which they guarantee will separate the sheep from the goats when an election is on, provided, however, that the person to whose lot it may fall to operate the machine does so as intended by the inventor. But although that machine was introduced into the province of Ontario at the last general elections, it evidently was one of those machines which did not meet with the approval of the farmers, judging from the tremendous vote they gave against the late provincial government.

I feel that legislation is against the agricultural interest of this country, is legislation in the wrong direction. Why, our agricultural interest is the greatest interest we have, it is the foundation of our prosperity; and legislation that bears against that interest is an injury to our country. We are proud of the millions of acres of fertile land belonging to the Dominion of Canada where millions of settlers may make their homes. As each settler tills his farm, the soil yields its return to his labour. His children grow up about him, and as they grow their little hands do what they can to help their parents. And as they grow to manhood and womanhood they branch out and more settlers' homes are established. And the wealth that is produced, being greater than the people can consume, it is exported, and brings back to the Dominion gold for our exchequer. And, better than gold, better than diamonds and rubies, it brings to our shores the man of intellect and energy and ambition to settle upon our lands and till them, to build up our country until it becomes the strong right arm of the British empire. Now, Mr. Speaker, through you I desire to appeal to every honourable gentleman in this House, who, like myself, is a practical farmer and desires that the produce of his lands shall not be lowered in value on the one hand or overcharged for on the other—through you, I appeal to these hon. gentlemen not to support the third reading of this Bill, through you I appeal also to the professional gentlemen in this House—and there are a fine lot of them here. No men are more anxious than they that our farmers shall prosper, knowing, as they do, that, if the farmers prosper, they have a better opportunity to obtain all that is right and honest from that portion of the agricultural community to whom they may be called upon to give their professional services. Once more, through you, I appeal to the business men in this House. We know that none are more anxious than the business men of the country that our farmers should prosper. They know that when the farmers prosper the whole country prospers, that bills are more easily collected, that, in fact, the prosperity of the farmer seems to oil the machinery of business so that it moves on smoothly and effectively, as we all desire that it should. This Bill has been discussed at considerable length, yet, what I would like to see is the Minister of Agriculture, of his own accord, lay the Bill over until next session. We are told that in the multitude of counsellors there is wisdom. And I am sure the wisdom would be pouring in from hundreds of thousands of farmers all over the Dominion, between now and next session; and, undoubtedly a better Bill would result.

Here is what I would suggest to the hon. minister: Instead of going on with this Bill let the government offer a prize of $1,000 or $2,000 to any person who will invent a fanning mill that will entirely eliminate the noxious weed-seeds from the good seeds and that can be sold at from $30 to $50. Such a machine would be within the reach of every farmer, and its use would overcome the difficulty that is sought to be met by this Bill. Every farmer would clean his own seed at home, and no noxious weed-seed would be taken to the market at all. There would be no difficulty for the farmers, no difficulty for the merchant, no difficulty for the Minister of Agriculture;—everything would be right and prosperous without the need of such legislation as is here proposed. In closing my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I thank you and the attention they have given me during this my first speech in the House of Commons.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to congratulate the farmers of Middlesex and of the country upon the able representative whom they have sent here to speak on their behalf. After the appeal he has made to the Minister of Agriculture, it is hardly to be supposed that that hon. gentleman will persist in forcing this Bill to a third reading at the present time. But I rose more particularly to refer to another question in connection with the Bill. While I support the motion of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) that this Bill shall be sent to a special committee, where evidence from all sources may be taken in regard to the important questions involved, the committee to which above all others, this Bill should be sent is clearly, in my opinion, the Agricultural Committee. Years ago we had an inquiry in this House which lasted for several weeks. Its object was to help in deciding whether it would be beneficial and in the interest of that important class, the farmers of the country, that we should have an Agricultural Committee, and that all questions affecting the interests of the farmers coming before this House, and all measures and proposals for the benefit of

the farmer, might be considered by that committee. And for what purpose? So that the committee could call before them persons who could give evidence or information, and also consider papers that would assist them in reporting to the House suggestions to be carried out in the interest of the great farming class. That committee was established. It is a large committee. I believe that every farmer in this House is a member of that committee. What could be clearer than that it is to such a committee that this Bill should be referred? Agriculturists are more interested in the subject of this Bill than are any other class; and the farmers on the Agricultural Committee would be more likely to pay direct attention to it than would any class in this House. For that reason, it has been the rule to send questions of this nature to that committee. But the Minister of Agriculture, for reasons best known to himself, sees fit to avoid sending this Bill to the Committee on Agriculture. When a Bill comes up that is of interest to the railways, what is done with it? For instance, a Bill comes up relating to cattle-guards. The farmers are interested in that Bill on the one hand and the railways on the other. That Bill is sent to the Railway Committee, where railway interests always seem to be dominant. The government insist on sending it to that committee. And with what result? Such Bills are nearly always killed in the Railway Committee. Or, when a Bill is introduced in regard to ditches and water-courses, giving property owners the right to drain across the railways, though the farmers are interested, the Bill goes to the Railway Committee on railways, where the railway interests are dominant. So, when a Bill is introduced in this House which affects the interests of only one class, the agriculturists of this country, why is it not sent to the Committee on Agriculture?

The Minister of Agriculture refuses to allow that Bill to go there, and I say he discredits the committee that he is responsible for appointing every session of parliament. He discredits the agriculturists on that committee and says by his conduct that he is not prepared to trust them, intimating that either they are not intelligent enough to do what would be in the interests of the farmers, as otherwise he would entrust them with the consideration of this Bill. It was for that purpose this committee was appointed. Years ago we had Bill after Bill in which the farmers were interested, every one of which were sent to that committee, but when the present Minister of Agriculture took charge of the department, he who professes to be so great a friend of the farmer, he will not allow these Bills to go to the Agricultural Committee where we could take evidence and present the findings of the Committee to the House. The other day the minister said, speaking of this committee, that the Committee of the Whole House was much better. But no one knows better than himself the disadvantage of discussing questions of that nature before a Committee of the Whole House. What are the disadvantages? One is that you cannot bring the farmers here and get their opinion on it, but you can bring them before the Agricultural Committee. You cannot bring the seedsmen here and ask them questions before a Committee of the Whole House, but you can do so before the Agricultural Committee. You cannot take their evidence here, but there you can take the evidence of all parties concerned. While you might name a private committee that would be perhaps equally valuable with the Agricultural Committee, still I hold that the Agricultural Committee is the proper one to deal with this Bill, where it can be considered from a farmers' standpoint, and where the farmers themselves can be asked their views upon it. If, after doing this, we could manage to prepare a Bill that would accomplish the object the minister has in view, it would be desirable to do so. I am not opposing the Bill, because I believe it to be one of great importance, but I desire to see the Bill, when it is passed, made workable so that it will be a real advantage to the farmers and to the seedsmen in carrying on their operations.

Mr. HENDERSON. I simply desire to say that I am anxious that the Bill before the House should, if passed at all, be passed in the very best possible form. I am desirous that the farmers of this country should be put in a position to secure the best and the cleanest seeds that can be obtained. While I propose to vote in favour of this amendment, I distinctly desire it to be understood that I am in no way opposed to the Bill. The effect of this amendment may be to delay its passage for a short time, but I hope it will also have the effect of further perfecting the measure and making it what I trust the Minister of Agriculture desires it should be, a good Bill, a Bill in the interests of the agriculturists of this country. While I support the amendment, I do not wish to be understood as being in any way opposed to the Bill.

Mr. INGRAM. I desire to duplicate the words just spoken by my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson).

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. When this Bill was in committee I expressed the conviction that it would be found unworkable if it became law. I think the penalty clause of the Bill is objectionable. It provides a penalty for selling seed as No. 1 which does not come up to the requirements of this measure. I want to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he knows that seed is sold by the wholesale seedsmen of this Dominion as No. 1. I know from personal experience that some of the largest wholesale seedsmen in the country do not sell seeds

by number. You might buy any quantity of seeds of any kind without their being numbered at all, although of course some are of a better quality than others. I may mention that some wholesale seedsmen classify their seeds—I refer now to clover and timothy seed—by the names of certain animals. A superfine seed they would call by the name of some fur bearing animal, for instance, the ermine, and they would classify other grades by the names of other fur bearing animals. Grasses are named in the same way. So these dealers might sell any quantity of seeds of any kind without being liable, under this Bill, for selling seed as No. 1. I cannot find anything in the measure by which you would be able to touch them if they sold seed under some particular name. Then there is another penalty provided if the dealers do not put a certain brand on the bag or receptacle containing seed, giving the name of the noxious weed seeds it may contain. Suppose that the wholesale seedsmen of this country agree to put a particular label or ticket on every bag of seed they sell, showing that the seed may contain the different weed seeds mentioned in the Bill; they might put these labels on all the seeds sold and there would be no means of determining what they were selling as No. 1, they would be within the requirements of the Act and could not be punished. So there would be no remedy for a farmer if he bought impure seed. I object to the legislation passing through this House that will not be effective. I am heartily in accord with the Minister of Agriculture in his desire to get clean seeds for the farming community, and if the Bill was likely to be effective even in a small measure in bringing this about, I would give it my hearty support. But there are many ways in which the penalties might be evaded, and a great deal of seed could still be sold without the purchaser being able to get at the wholesaler if he sold impure seed. I think it would be well to have this phase of the Bill thoroughly looked into, and I think it would be well to send the Bill before the Agricultural Committee where we could hear, not only the farmers and the wholesale seedsmen, but also the retail dealers throughout the country. These latter are an important class, and the Bill ought to be carefully considered from their standpoint, as well as from the standpoint of other persons interested, in order that we may crystallize all the information into legislation which will be a benefit to the farmers of this great Dominion.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Elson) in speaking on this Bill. He spoke as a farmer, and I speak as a farmer myself. We are all interested in any measure that is calculated to benefit them. Like the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), I am going to vote for the amendment, not because I am opposed to the principle of the Bill, but because I think that in its present form it is not in the interests of the farmers. I think the Bill can be greatly improved by sending it to the Committee on Agriculture where the farmers can be heard on it, as I think they should be heard on it. I am opposed to it for several reasons. In the first place, I think in its present form it would be detrimental to the farmers in selling their clover and other small seeds, because it will amount just to this, that a few dealers who will go into the business after this Bill becomes law will be mulcted one or two dollars per bushel on every bushel of clover seed they sell. I am also opposed to it because it will have the effect of driving a certain class of people out of the trade, who are to-day doing a great deal to supply farmers with good seed, I refer to the millers. I know what they are doing in this direction, I have been in the milling business myself for the last ten years, and I know to what trouble they have put themselves in order to get pure seed for the farmers at actual cost. I just wanted to offer my objection to the Bill as it is at present and I trust that the hon. Minister of Agriculture will not be so arbitrary but that he will be a little more lenient in his views and allow this amendment to carry and possibly next session, or at some time in the future, allow the Bill to be presented in a more practical form.

Amendment (Mr. Cockshutt) negatived on division.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe) moved:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that the order for such be discharged and that it be referred back to the committee of the whole with instructions to amend the 10th paragraph thereof by striking out the word 'five' where it occurs between the words 'exceeding' and 'hundred' in the fifteenth line of said paragraph and substituting the word 'one' therefor, and by striking out the word 'twenty' from the said fifteenth line.

He said: I wish to direct the attention of the House to the wording of section 10 for a moment. The 10th section provides that any person charged with the enforcement of the Act may enter upon the premises of the owner or other premises, including the premises of a railway or steamboat company and may take samples and so on. Then it goes on to provide that any person who obstructs or refuses to permit the making of any such examination or the taking of such samples of seed shall upon summary conviction be liable to a penalty not exceeding $500 and not less than $25. The other section providing for penalties is section 8. I pointed out at an earlier stage of the discussion that the penalties under section 8 might amount to as high as $25,000, and the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), upon further considering the Bill saw his

way to amending the section and reduced the penalty so that the maximum in each case will not exceed $25. This is a large penalty and it is for a new offence, an offence which might arise without any intentional wrong on the part of the person who is to be fined. The Bill provides that this fine may be imposed not only upon the owner but upon any person who is in possession for the time being of the seed. It may be a railway company, a common carrier, it may be any person on whose premises the goods are temporarily deposited or housed and it may be even a person who is driving a load of grain to market. If an officer comes up and insists upon making an examination and if this person refuses or obstructs in any degree he is liable to a fine of $500 if the magistrate sees fit to inflict a fine to that extent. This is, as the hon. minister said the other day, to some extent, an experimental matter. This is a matter of educating the people up to a certain standard and it is not advisable that we should have drastic legislation at the beginning. Would it not be manifestly unfair if a railway company which was carrying this grain from place to place, refused in such case to stop its train in order to permit of the examination here spoken of being made? Yet the result would be that if a railway company refused to delay its trains in order to permit of this examination being made it could be fined $500. We must be reasonable in these matters. A gentleman who has a number of people in his employment may be about closing his premises. An officer of the government steps up at about the time they are closing and says: I demand that I shall be permitted to go through and make a thorough examination of the goods in this warehouse. If you obstruct me you are liable to a fine of $500. The merchant says: I am going to close my premises and you may come back at some more convenient season. Then, he is liable to a penalty and to a penalty of $500 if he is taken before a partisan magistrate who sees fit to go to the full statutory limit. Other cases may arise. A merchant has married a wife and as scripture hath it, 'therefore cannot come' to wait upon the government official forthwith, and he too therefore will be fined $500 if the instrument of the government for the time being should summon him befor a partisan magistrate—and we have had glaring examples of partisan magistrates time and again. I feel that there is a bond of sympathy between the hon. Minister of Agriculture and myself as farmers engaged in the common undertaking of expediting the business of this House, as we are both trying to do to-day, and also in bring good results to the farmers, and I would say to my hon. friend that taking it all in all, as this is to some extent an experimental matter, it is unwise that we should put this drastic measure in force in its present form. I therefore propose to change the maximum fine from $500 to $100 and make the lowest penalty $5 instead of $25. It will be carrying out the principle involved in the law, it will afford reasonable means of enforcing the law, it will be a protection to the man who until the law becomes known, bona fide objects to inspection, and at the same time it will give ample power to the government officials. And, if a further argument is required I will point to the fact that this penalty of $500 stands side by side with the penalty under section 8 which has been reduced to $25. Surely this penalty under section 10 might be reduced to $100.

Mr. FISHER. I would say in reply to the arguments of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) in the first place, that this question was discussed in the committee and the committee decided to retain the penalty as it is. I would say again that this penalty is not a penalty under ordinary circumstances for the contravention of the law, but it is the penalty for a person who obstructs an officer in the discharge of his duty, a serious offence, an offence which must be deliberate as the officer will have to declare what his duties are and what he is there for. The penalty of $500 is the limit. I can imagine circumstances under which a person would obstruct an officer in the execution of his duty in carrying out the law where $500 would not be at all too much as a penalty for the offence. But, the penalty of $500 is not necessary. The penalty is to be $25, and it may be increased up to as high as $500. Under these circumstances I do not think the penalties as herein described are too great, and I must ask the House to reject the amendment.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that this Bill, if adopted, will not interfere with the sale of seed from one farmer to another. I wish to draw the minister's attention to a new form of selling seeds in Ontario by one farmer to another and perhaps I can do so by reading the following advertisement:

Seed Fair, Town Hall, Brampton, Saturday, February 25th.

Under the direction of the Peel Farmers' Institute, Professor Zavitz, Guelph Agricultural College, will be present and deliver an address on 'Selection of Seed' in the afternoon.

All persons having seed grain, clover, grass, corn or potatoes to dispose of are invited to bring samples (two bushels). Open to everybody, but exhibitor must become a member of Farmers' Institute.

Exhibits of new varieties are specially desired, even though not for sale.

The Institute will not assume responsibility for quality of seed.

Send in your entries as early as possible, stating variety, quantity for sale and price per bushel.

This is a splendid opportunity to sell seed. The demand will be good, as seed is scarce.

G. Downey, President. T. J. Cumberland, Secretary.

The point I want to ask is whether this Bill if adopted will interfere with the farmers' institutes having seed for sale in the manner set forth in this advertisement.

Mr. FISHER. I am not prepared to give a legal opinion but I would say that the Bill would tend to the sale of pure seed and to the sale of seed under the circumstances mentioned.

Mr. BLAIN. Clause 2 of section 3 of the Bill says :

The provisions contained in this section shall not apply to the sale of seed that is grown, sold and delivered by any farmer on his own premises, for seeding by the purchaser himself, unless the purchaser of the said seed obtains from the seller at the time of the sale thereof a certificate that the said seed is supplied to him subject to the provisions of this Act.

Here is a clause which states that a farmer can sell to his neghbour farmer on his own premises without being subject to the penalties under the Bill. Here are farmers who bring the seed together in large quantities at what is called a seed fair, and I do not think it would be in the interest of the farmers or of the country that a Bill should be passed that would prohibit the farmers from bringing their seed in and selling it at such a seed fair as that to which I have just referred.

Mr. LANCASTER. In reference to the amendment of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) the minister has not disputed that this is a new offence which has been created and if he does not realize it I can assure him that so far as I am concerned, I am satisfied that the penalty is very large for a new offence. What is the offence ? The offence is one that might very innocently be technically perpetrated by a man who would then be fined $500. It is not necessary under the section that the person proceeded against should be offering this seed for sale at all. Anybody who happens to have seed in his possession that some informer thinks might possibly be sold—and of course anything we have might possibly be sold without our being in the selling business—anybody, a professional man or a manufacturer or a clergyman without having anything to do with the growing of seed, who may be the custodian of seed which he holds in trust for somebody else, may be fined, for the informer does not have to prove that he is advertising it for sale or recommending people to buy it or in any way advancing the idea that he has it for sale. Under these circumstances there should be a very small amount of fine if it is only a trivial offence as is likely. The offence is not as serious as striking a man over the head yet a magistrate for such an offence as that could fine a man $1 only.

Mr. LENNOX. But he is not a great government official.

Mr. LANCASTER. No, as my hon. friend very properly interjects he is not a government official but at the same time I think these things should be looked at seriously by the Minister of Agriculture. Here is a matter that many people would not consider an offence at all and there could be no unanimity as to whether it is proper to fine an offender under it, yet there is no chance for a magistrate to levy a fine of less than $25. If the rules of the House would permit it, I would move an amendment to the amendment making the minimum fine $1 instead of $5. I think we should vote for the amendment to make the minimum fine at most $5 and the maximum fine $100.

Amendment (Mr. Lennox) negatived on division.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY—INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY ANNUAL STATEMENT.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply. He said : It has been usual in years gone by, to such an extent that it has become a custom of parliament, for the Minister of Railways, before the House takes into consideration the estimates relating to his department, to make a statement to the House with regard to the conditions prevailing in connection with the Intercolonial Railway during the preceding fiscal year, and also with respect to the conditions prevailing on the railway during the current fiscal year, particularly with regard to the financial aspects of these conditions.

Last year it was my duty to present a statement covering more than half a year, during which I was not connected with the administration of the Intercolonial Railway. The figures for the year ending the 30th of June last were given to the House before prorogation; so that I am in the position of having presented a statement covering a part of a year for which I was in a measure responsible, and I am now called upon to deal with Intercolonial affairs for another year which is but a little more than half spent.

That hon. members may have the facts clearly in mind, however, let me briefly state the results for the year 1903-4. The earnings amounted to $6,339,231, being $14,-908 more than those of the preceding year. The expenditure was $7,239,982, being $1,-043,329 more than those of 1902-3. This left a deficit of $900,751, which was considerably the largest in the history of the government railway.

I am quite aware that nothing I can say in explanation of that shortage will prevent hon. gentlemen opposite from criticising the administration of the Intercolonial from the

standpoint of financial results. They will, in accordance with what are deemed to be legitimate parliamentary tactics, make the most out of the bare fact that there has been this large deficit. I would say very freely, let them do so. I propose to state the facts with the utmost frankness, and leave the matter to the honest judgment of those who are disposed to fairly take into account the conditions which brought about that deficit. How was the increase of $1,043,329 in the expenditure made up? Let us look at the items in detail. The increases in the operating expenses were as follows:—

	Increases.
Wages, enginemen and firemen	$118,551
Fuel	123,202
Repairs to locomotives	184,779
Oil, waste and tallow	4,167
Water	3,909
Repairs to passenger cars	28,629
" postal, express and baggage	21,352
" freight cars and vans	188,418
Wages, conductors, baggagemen and brakemen	153,384
Wages, trackmen	52,708
Ties	1,125
Timber and lumber	21,572
Repairs to wharfs	9,208
Clearing ice and snow	41,172
Wages, station masters, &c	94,025
Salaries, general offices	16,117
	$1,062,218

The difference between this sum and the smaller figure quoted arises from the fact that there were small decreases under other heads.

Mr. BARKER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him, when he is giving some of these increases, such as those of station masters, to say whether there was an increase in the number of men employed or only an increase in wages?

Mr. EMMERSON. I quite appreciate the question of my hon. friend, and before I am through, I will fully explain that. I think I can the more briefly do it if I bring it in its order; because I do not wish to weary the House, and I want to get through with these figures, which are necessarily dry and prosy, in as concise and brief a way as I possibly can. It will be seen that the main item of increase is to be found in the bill for wages. The increases in wages last year as compared with 1903 were as follows:

Enginemen and firemen	$118,551
Conductors and trainmen	153,384
Trackmen	52,708
Station masters and operators	94,025
Mechanics	78,304
Total	$506,972

This shows a total increase in the matter of wages alone up to June 30, 1904, of $506,972. I am not disposed to apologize for that fact. It is an item to which exception can only be taken on two grounds, namely, that the government is paying more for skilled and ordinary labour than is being paid by railway corporations and private employers, or, that the Intercolonial Railway is employing more clerks and more men than are necessary to operate the railway. Neither assertion can be made in fairness. We are not paying any more than is being paid by other railways or by industrial corporations throughout Canada, and, indeed, for some classes of labour we are paying less. It is of course true, that we have been giving employment to more men than was the case formerly, but let me point out that the number of men required on a railway is directly connected with the volume of traffic, and it must be remembered that within six years the business of the Intercolonial Railway has more than doubled, and that during the past year even, there was an appreciable increase in the traffic of the Intercolonial Railway.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

OTTAWA ELECTRIC COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 12) respecting the Ottawa Electric Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). This Bill was approved by the Private Bills Committee, to which it was referred, and reported with some amendments. I understand that the city of Ottawa took exception to the Bill, and takes exception to it even in its amended form. It has been suggested to me that, perhaps, the interests of all parties, the promoting company and the city of Ottawa itself would be best served by referring the Bill to a special committee, so that the parties might have an opportunity of discussing it. I do not know much about the Bill, except from what I have read about it casually and from a cursory reading of the Bill itself. I understand that the Bill has merit, but also that the provisions go much further than the city of Ottawa would like. The reference to a special committee will not commit the House to anything. It is true that it is usual for the House to approve the report made by a committee. Yet, in view of the strong opposition made by the city of Ottawa, which is very much interested in the Bill, it has been suggested to me, and I make that suggestion to the House, that, instead of proceeding with the Bill, the order be discharged and the Bill be referred to a special committee to be composed of Messrs. Fitzpatrick, Haggart, McIsaac, Monk, Galliher, Bergeron and Dugas. Or,

if there are some hon. members whom it is particularly desired to add to the committee, I would have no objection. But, I think this is a fair, representative committee that would do the subject full justice and give a satisfactory report.

Mr. FOSTER. Would that committee have any special power more than any other? Would it simply hear the parties?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The committee would have no power except those ordinarily possessed by a committee. The object I had in view was to have the representatives of the parties, the Ottawa Electric Company and the city of Ottawa, come together and present their views, so that the House might have a report upon which it could reach a satisfactory conclusion.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I have no great objection to the committee as named, but I would like to see on it some one who represents the views of the cities in regard to these questions. I do not quite say they are entitled to representation. We have heard a great deal about vested rights. Now, the city of Ottawa has vested rights, as other cities have. The cities of this country have a vital interest in the maintenance of their rights as against the aggressions of corporations that receive franchises. I cannot object to the proposition of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), for it is evidently the beginning of a new day that will be welcomed by those who are trying to defend municipal rights as against the inroads being made not only in this legislature but in every other legislature. I say it is an indication that things are changing. And I congratulate the right hon. gentleman upon the fact that at last he thinks it worth while to call a halt in a Bill of this kind and send it to a special committee for consideration. If that is his wish, I cannot object. But I tell him now that the principle involved in this Bill is important, and the raid on the rights of municipalities so direct, that, no matter what the committee may say, unless they deal with the vital point and strike out the clause which enables the company to violate a solemn agreement with the municipality, the Bill will not be satisfactory to the organization of cities of this country. Still, as this is an indication of change of heart on the part of the Prime Minister, and of a determination to try to do better, I cannot but accept it. I would advise the city of Ottawa to be heard before this committee. And I trust that the cities all over the country will be heard, as the question is one of supreme importance.

Mr. FOSTER. I believe it has been stated by some in the city of Toronto who favour the municipality's contention, that they had no opportunity of appearing and making their statement with reference to the Bill. While the city members are here and represent the city in that respect as in others, yet, if a special committee is appointed, as my right hon. friend suggests, due notice can be given and the representatives of the municipalities can be heard. I quite see that the vital point in the Bill is as to the powers of muncipalities, that they shall not be overridden by corporations. I would sugest to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that he might well add two members to that committee.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I may say to my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) that I feel very much gratified that for once, at all events, I have been able to satisfy him. I accept his compliment; when he is reasonable he will always find me reasonable. When he makes a proposition of this kind that has merit, I have no objection to it. Both he and my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) suggest the addition of names to the committee. I do not think I could do better than add to the committee a gentleman who has taken a deep interest in municipal matters, my hon. friend from St. Antoine Montreal (Mr. Ames), and also Mr. Zimmerman.

Mr. SPROULE. Why not put on one of the members from Ottawa?

Mr. BELCOURT. Both of the members for Ottawa will consider it their duty to appear before the committee.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Could not the Prime Minister add to the committee Mr. Macdonnell, of South Toronto?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have nine members, and I think that is about as many as we ought to have for such a committee. I think it is a fair and representative committee. I know that the city of Toronto wants to be heard, and, no doubt, they will be represented by counsel and, probably, also by the mayor. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That the order be discharged, and that the Bill be referred to a committee composed of Messrs. Fitzpatrick, Haggart, McIsaac, Monk, Galliher, Bergeron, Dugas, Ames and Zimmerman.

Motion agreed to.

NORTHWEST TELEPHONE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the Northwest Telephone Company.

Mr. TURRIFF. As this Bill has been sent to be reprinted, I move that the com-

mittee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. FOSTER. For what reason ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The understanding was that the Bill was to be reprinted so that we would all be able to have an opportunity of seeing what the amendments were, and the intention was to draft it rather carefully so that it might meet the case.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Dominion Annuity Company.—Mr. Bole.

Bill (No. 83) respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 85) respecting the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—Mr. Harty.

SUPPLY—INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY, ANNUAL STATEMENT.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON. When the House separated for dinner recess, I was pointing out the fact that in this country to-day there were conditions prevailing which necessitated the payment of larger sums to wage earners. Every one familiar with the progress of events in Canada knows that during the past seven or eight years we have been passing through a period of unparalleled prosperity. The demand for labour has been such that the scale of wages has steadily risen year by year. Every employer has had to grant large increases, and the Intercolonial has not been able, even though an effort had been made in that direction, to escape from these conditions. I lay it down as a principle that the government of Canada, under similar conditions, cannot be expected to pay a lower scale of wages than is established by the rates current on the corporation railways and in private workshops. It will be said however, that ordinary railway corporations and private employers have been able to meet these new conditions in the labour market without loss. That may be so. Such an argument does not meet the case of the Intercolonial. Ordinary railways and ordinary employers are able to make adjustments which the Intercolonial cannot at present make ; they can raise their rates or charge more for the products of their factories and workshops. The Intercolonial has fixed rates. There may come a time when it may be necessary to depart from this policy, but that is not likely to come until parliament has equipped the Intercolonial as it should be equipped, and it is then still found impossible by a large sum to make ends meet. Nor can it be said that the Intercolonial gives employment to more men than are necessary for its proper operation.

Now let us look as this matter of deficits fairly and candidly. As has been often said, and as I endeavoured to make clear last year, the Intercolonial was never built to pay. Its location and its purpose make this impossible, even though it were desirable. What are the facts ? If the administration of the Intercolonial be criticised along the line of relative party responsibility, during the eighteen years of the Conservative regime, the deficits aggregated $3,730,733, or an average of $203,901 per annum. From 1897 to 1904 the total net shortage has been $1,658,856, or an everage of $156,381 per year, nearly $50,000 per annum less than the average during the eighteen year period I have referred to. In face of facts such as these it appears to me that we ought to be in a position calmly to look at this matter without recrimination or the introduction of a partisan spirit. All said and done, the management of the Intercolonial should be judged on its merits, apart from partisan considerations. It is a national railway, constructed for a special purpose, and operated under conditions which make it unreasonable to judge of the results by a comparison with those achieved by railway corporations.

Leaving that view aside for the moment, let me point out that an important consideration in the management of a large railway is the expenditure on maintenance of way. The Intercolonial Railway has probably the best roadbed in Canada, and it is good policy and true economy to maintain it in such condition. Last year the cost of maintenance, as compared with the previous year, was : For 1904, $1,491,673 ; for 1903, $1,386,350, an increase for 1904 over 1903 of $105,323 in the matter of maintenance of way charges alone. The clearing of ice and snow cost $130,652, or an increase of $41,172 as compared with the previous year. This was entirely an unavoidable result. The cost of ties put in, of which 5,000 more were laid down than in 1903, was $194,458. There was an increased cost of $1,125. Take another item of the fixed expense, the cost in connection with our stations. A comparison shows a decrease for the year of $5,298 for fuel, oil, light and so forth, indicating economical management, while there is an increase of $94,025 in the salaries and wages paid. This was unavoidable in fairness to our staff. As showing the expansion of the Intercolonial Railway, I may say that in 1896 it cost $303,796 for salaries and wages in connection with our stations as compared with $738,964.

It is, however, in the mechanical operation of a railway that serious leakages may occur, and experts are disposed to analyse the expenditure under this head with some care. The cost of the mechanical de-

partment last year was $2,796,909, showing a net increase of $672,100 over the preceding year. This increase was made up as follows :—

Enginemen's wages	$118,551 00
Mechanic's wages	78,304 67
Fuel	123,201 93
Rolling stock replaced	312,872 59
Material	39,170 77
Total	$672,100 96

The number of men employed—and here I trust to have an opportunity of answering a question put to me by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker)—in the mechanical department, which includes enginemen and trainmen as well as mechanics, was increased during the year from 858 to 957, thus accounting for a part of the added cost. The betterment of wages represents a greater proportion of the increase, however, and I shall be prepared at any time to give details in respect of the wages paid to the mechanics and to the other employees on the Intercolonial Railway. In this connection, I might call the attention of the House to a comparison of the number of men employed. The statements which I have before me refer particularly to the conductors, baggagemen, brakemen and trackmen. As to the conductors, the statement is as follows :—

Year.	No. of Conductors.	Maximum Wage per day.	Minimum Wage per day.
		$ cts.	$ cts.
1896, 30th June	134	2 50	1 90
1903, 30th June	212	2 75	2 00
1904, 30th June	221	3 25	2 50

As between 1903 and 1904 there was a difference as between the minimum wage paid of fifty cents ; that is to say, that in 1904 the minimum wage paid was fifty cents higher to conductors than it was to 30th June, 1903. Now, as to baggagemen, the results are as follows :—

Year.	No. of Baggagemen	Maximum Wage per day.	Minimum Wage per day.
		$ cts.	$ cts.
1896, 30th June	22	1 60	1 30
1903, 30th June	41	1 85	1 30
1904, 30th June	82	2 35	1 60

Showing increases ranging from twenty-five to fifty cents in the rate of wages paid this class of employees on the Intercolonial Railway. As to brakemen, the figures are as follows :—

Year.	No. of Brakemen	Maximum Wage per day.	Minimum Wage per day.
		$ cts.	$ cts.
1896, 30th June	301	1 60	1 25
1903, 30th June	507	1 75	1 30
1904, 30th June	517	2 15	1 50

Showing, as respects the brakemen on the Intercolonial Railway, a very material and very substantial increase in the rate of wages paid to them. I would mention this fact, and I think it but fair to say, that in the statement as to the baggagemen employed in the year 1896, five of the twenty-two we then had were paid $50 per month. The result is summed up in this table :

Total wages of conductors, trainmen, baggagemen and brakemen taken from statement in car expenses for the year :

1895-6	$255,412 68
1902-3	497,753 65
1903-4	651,137 08

While it does not properly come in at this moment yet it may be opportune to now refer to the trackmen's wages. The trackmen regularly employed in the month of June 1896 and 1904 numbered :

1896	641
1904	851

The average monthly number of regular trackmen employed during the years was :

1896	643
1903	868
1904	882

The wages paid to the foremen and trackmen were :

	Foremen.	Trackmen.
1896	$1 60	$1 15
1903	1 75 to 2 00	1 30
1904	1 85 to 2 25	1 30 to 1 40 & 1 50

The difference between the maximum wage paid to foremen and trackmen both in 1903 and in 1904 is accounted for by the location of the men. The men employed at terminals and large divisional points, and in the large yards in the centres of population, are paid a higher schedule of wage than are those who are employed in rural sections and along the line generally, that being under an arrangement entered into with the organization of trackmen based upon the idea that the cost of living at these larger communities is greater than in the rural communities. The wages of other important classes of employees have been increased in even a larger proportion, as I shall show in the committee stage.

The increase of $123,201 in the fuel bill is accounted for by the consumption of 33,213 more tons of coal, owing to the increased

equipment and also to the severity of the weather last year and also, in part, to the higher price, by about 25 cents per ton, paid for coal during the fiscal year 1903-4 as compared with the fiscal year 1902-3.

The charges against repairs to engines, which were increased by $184,000, were incurred in an effort to improve the efficiency of the motive power. Eight new locomotives were purchased at a cost of $149,350 to replace an equal number which were worn out or which had become obsolete, as against three thus treated in 1903. Four new locomotive tenders and three new boilers were also built and charged against this account. The increased charges against car expenses amounted to $231,000 and are to a certain extent explained by the payment of higher rates of wages and the higher cost of material. The particular reason, however, lies in the desire of the management to maintain the efficiency of the rolling stock. During the year, 462 new freight cars and one new second-class passenger car were purchased at a cost of $357,000, charged against maintenance account. This shows an increase of 160 new freight cars purchased out of revenue as compared with the number purchased in 1903, the difference in cost being $160,314. Three express and baggage cars were also purchased to replace similar cars, which accounts for the increase of $21,351 under that head.

Mr. HAGGART. You are talking of revenue account altogether ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Altogether of revenue account; I am not referring to the capital features at all, and while I have been definite in the statements I could not venture to impose upon the House any more wearying details but I could go into further figures showing accurately the increase in the operating expenses of the Intercolonial Railway for the year 1904 as compared with the preceding year. I shall speak of it now in a general way and perhaps hon. members can elaborate for themselves, and can well understand why it is that with certain objects in view the management, in carrying out these objects or attempting to carry them out, necessarily incurred very much larger expenditures during 1903-4 as compared with the preceding fiscal year. These efforts and these expenditures were put forth and incurred in an effort to give a modern service to the public.

The causes for larger expenditures may generally be summed up under the following heads : 1st, increased traffic ; 2nd, better service for the travelling public, involving more trains, faster schedules, and more comfortable travelling ; 3rd, more luxurious and more expensive passenger cars ; 4th, increased number of cars and improved service for freight traffic. I might mention in this connection that for the year 1903-4 we had on the Intercolonial what was known as the fast freight, a train specially designed to serve the business interests of Ontario and Quebec—an expense which in the preceding years was not incurred. This train was put on for the purpose of furthering the interests of Canadian imports and exports through Canadian shipping ports, and in order to meet the wishes of the business men of Toronto, Montreal and other manufacturing centres. That train ran on practically express time from Halifax to Montreal, and connected at Truro with Sydney, and at Moncton with St. John. So that I can very well emphasize the statement that one of the features of the increase in the working expenses of the Intercolonial for 1903-4 was the improved service for freight traffic. The fifth head would very naturally be heavier and consequently more expensive engines. The sixth is increased cost of materials. That is recognized not only in the east but in the west. Lumber and all other materials necessary in connection with repairs and construction work have all increased. Here I want to make one statement which may be contrary to the ideas that prevail throughout Canada to a large extent, but of which I defy successful contradiction, that every kind and description of material required in the operation of the Intercolonial, and in the repair of its rolling stock, its station buildings, its roadbed and its right of way, is purchased at a less price, certainly at no higher price, than is paid for similar materials by other great railway corporations in Canada. I know that to be a fact by comparison. The last and by no means the least cause of increased expense is the higher rates of wages to enable us to command efficient service. Constantly increasing expenditures under these heads are absolutely necessary if we are to keep pace with the advances of other railways in Canada. We have either to bear the cost of improvements or refuse to meet the requirements of the public. When I say the requirements of the public, I mean the requirements of the people of all Canada ; because all the people of Canada are interested in the Intercolonial Railway. Despite anything you may say, there is not a province that is not deeply interested in the success of the Intercolonial—in its efficient and proper management. Another item to which I have not referred, for which I have not the exact figures, and certainly a not unimportant item, is the cost to which the railway is put by unusually expensive repairs. Accidents occur on that road as they do on all other railways, and unfortunately, during the last year as well as during the current year, there have been some accidents that have involved very heavy expenditures in the way of repairs and in the payment of damages resulting from the destruction of freight.

Mr. HAGGART. Were they paid before the 1st of July last ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes. Those to which I refer were paid before the 1st of July 1904; but unfortunately, we have also had during the current year some expenditures in that direction which have gone to swell our total increased expenditure. Now, I have endeavoured as briefly as I possibly could to deal with the financial conditions of the railway during the fiscal year 1903-4.

I shall deal now with the six months periods between the 1st of July, 1904, and the 1st of January, 1905; and it would naturally be expected that I should give a statement of the results of the operations for the current year, and at the same time forecast the net result on the 30th of June next. If that forecast is not a rosy one, if it is not bright hued, it is through no fault, as I contend, of the management of the Intercolonial or of the head of the department.

Mr. KEMP. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question before he leaves the 1903-4 statement? He has told us the amount of the extra expenditure owing to the increased price of materials and the advance in wages. I did not hear him say what extra traffic or revenue that brought.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will deal with that in committee. As I stated to the House at the outset, I did not wish to impose upon the House too many wearying details and figures, and I have reserved for consideration in committee some of the minutiae of the expenditure and of the results of the year's operations. I will endeavour to satisfy my hon. friend as to that. There was an increase in the revenue in 1903-4 over that of the year 1902-3. The increase was not so very large, and I do not feel called upon to go into the details of it; but the increase in the working expenses of the road have been so very great that I felt it was due to the House and the country that I should explain the various causes which led to it. I think I can fairly claim that for the six months from the 1st of July to the 1st of January last, the operations of the road were carried on with care and with due regard to economy, but there were conditions during that period which naturally produced results that are not pleasant to contemplate. For the six months ending 31st December last, the earnings were $3,621,263, and the cost of operation $4,103,402, leaving a deficit for that period of $482,139. As compared with the same period last year, the revenue shows an increase of $226,629 and the operating expenses an increase of $412,572. In this period considerable increases of salary and wages took place. These increases applied chiefly to the mechanics in the shops and the clerks.

Mr. HAGGART. Did the hon. gentleman say that the operating expenses for the six months ending January last, as compared with the six months of the preceding year, show an increase of $412,000?

Mr. EMMERSON. To be exact, $412,572. For several years the clerks who, as a class, were receiving low compensation, had been pressing for general increases. I did not think that the financial conditions on the Intercolonial Railway warranted action of that character, but in December last, I went carefully over the salary list and made a re-adjustment. I informed deputations who waited upon me in February and March of last year that the matter would require considerable study and that whatever advance I was able to allow would date from the 1st July, last. This was in order to be perfectly fair with the clerks and not make them suffer from any unavoidable delays which might occur. Let me say right here that no large railway in Canada is carried on with a smaller cost for management and clerical help than the Intercolonial Railway. I have had occasion to make comparisons between the salaries on the Intercolonial Railway and those paid by railway corporations, and the figures do not in any way demonstrate that we are paying the Intercolonial Railway staff proportionately as high as those railway corporations pay theirs. Looking ahead, I am unable to predict anything else than a large deficit for the current fiscal year. The conditions which have prevailed for months past, and which practically are prevailing now, point to that unfortunate result. We have had a winter of unprecedented severity in the maritime provinces. The snow fall has been phenomenal and the weather conditions such that the Intercolonial Railway and all other railways have been practically paralysed. For days together all traffic has been stopped, storms have followed each other at short intervals, and all this has meant the burning of the candle at both ends. On the one hand we have an extra cost of operation and on the other a decrease in our revenue. The delay to trains on the Intercolonial Railway during the past two months have been startling, but it has been entirely unavoidable. Crews are started out, they get to a certain point and are there stalled up by reason of storms. They cannot make their crossings regularly, and crews that should go a run in eight hours are obliged to devote perhaps twenty-four or thirty-six hours to making it—all at the cost of the railway, not at the cost of the men. Every one in this House is so familiar with the conditions that govern, that it is not necessary for me to go into details. The severity of the winter and the extraordinary snow falls will necessitate very large expenditure in connection with the spring work. Hundreds, even thousands, of men have had to be employed all the way from Sydney to Montreal and St. John to Halifax, and on all the branch lines, in shovelling snow. On account of the depth of the

snow, the snow ploughs have been practically useless, and every train had to be accompanied by an army of men to clear the road. But unfortunately we have not been able to succeed in keeping our trains moving from one end of the line to the other. Halifax has been closed for days at a time from the outside world, so far as railway communication is concerned. The line from Truro to Sydney was blocked for a long period. The mails could not be carried, passengers were stalled at all points, so that practically traffic has been paralyzed. If we had more locomotives, we would certainly be in a position to overcome in some degree the shortage of cars, but coupled with all these other drawbacks there has been a shortage of motive power. When I say a shortage of motive power, I want to make this statement—and I make it unhesitatingly—that the Intercolonial Railway on December 1, 1904, instead of having the number of engines it ought to have, was short of the requisite quantity by fifty. At least fifty additional locomotives are required. Further, I am told by those who ought to know, that there should be seventy-five additional locomotives for the purpose of attending properly to the traffic and the freight.

I do not attach blame to any one on that account. There has been an increase of traffic; but there has not been always money at the disposal of the department to purchase additional engines. During the present winter it has occurred that, for days and days, there would be from 1,200 to 1,500 loaded freight cars on the Intercolonial Railway which could not be moved, because of the want of motive power. If we had more engines we could overcome, in a measure, the shortage of cars on the road. We only have about 12,000 freight cars altogether, and there certainly should be more, considering the length of haul as compared with other lines. Take the Intercolonial Railway between Montreal and Halifax, as compared with the Canadian Pacific Railway between those points. We have not twice the mileage, but we have a much greater mileage than the Canadian Pacific Railway in placing our cars at the point of destination. The Canadian Pacific Railway, by reason of its shorter haul, can get its freight cars to destination in comparatively quick time and return them for use, or have them in use along the line. Weather conditions this winter have intensified our difficulties in that respect, making it impossible to meet the requirements of the traffic. There has been a universal cry, from Montreal to Sydney, for additional cars to accommodate the ordinary business of the country. I was at Moncton on one occasion, I think in the latter part of December, when one great flour company in Montreal made a call for 100 freight cars—wanted them immediately. Yet the conditions of the Intercolonial Railway only enabled us to furnish at the time twenty cars, or one-fifth of the number these shippers needed for immediate use. Thus it will be seen that there have been many drawbacks in the operation of the Intercolonial Railway within the past few months, and that the road has been handicapped in these things.

Now the financial results on the Intercolonial Railway have been unsatisfactory during the past two years—certainly very unsatisfactory. But that has not been caused by mismanagement or lack of foresight. No blame can be attached to the administration. As I said, the drawbacks have been due to conditions beyond the control either of the minister or the officers of the railway. What we need is better and more complete equipment. I feel that the time has come when hon. members on both sides should realize this and, in a fair and generous spirit, provide sufficient equipment to enable the road to operate without being handicapped by the disadvantages under which it works at present. There has been an expansion of traffic on the road during the past six months, as compared with a like period during the preceding year, an expansion which only heightened our difficulties because of the want of motive power and of cars. The want of motive power increases the difficulty arising from the lack of cars. There has been a general increase of the traffic, and a steady increase, during the last few years, as shown by the additions to the revenue. We have had a better service, not merely passenger, but freight service. Quicker time has been made in the transportation both of freight and of passengers, and there has been greater regularity in delivering traffic at its point of destinataion. We are gradually improving our passenger service; and I am sure that the inauguration last year of the new train known as the 'Ocean Limited' will be recognized by all who have knowledge of that service as a distinct improvement in the accommodation for passengers on the Intercolonial Railway. From about the beginning of July until the middle of November we were operating two through passenger trains between Montreal and Halifax, and between Montreal and the maritime seaports. These trains were very handsomely patronized. The 'Ocean Limited' was an experiment. It was an additional fast service, a limited express, with only a stated number of stops. Passengers who boarded that train at Montreal, with a view to reaching Halifax or St. John, knew to a certainty almost that they would be there on time. The running time was shortened very considerably. And, when that train is again placed upon the route, as I hope it will be during the coming summer, I believe the time will be further shortened at least one hour between Halifax and Montreal.

Mr. HAGGART. What was the actual difference in time between it and the Cana-

dian Pacific Railway between the same points ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think we made about the same time.

Mr. HAGGART. What was the difference in the time of starting ?

Mr. EMMERSON. About fifteen minutes or half an hour. We served a section of country that the Canadian Pacific Railway did not serve. We got a tourist business which they could not possibly get. We catered to the watering places on the lower St. Lawrence and at the head of the Baie des Chaleurs and all along the north points. of New Brunswick, while the Canadian Pacific Railway did not reach these points. We catered also to the Cape Breton tourist traffic. Now, we have had, and we have on the Intercolonial line, especially during the last eight months, more luxurious passenger cars. I am sure this must be self evident to the travelling public. Our cars to-day cost very much more than they did, not that they cost more than they should, but the character of the cars is such that they cost more than we were paying for cars some years ago but the different classes of cars are the same. We carry more passengers on those cars ; so that there is not merely increased freight but more passengers carried to-day. There is increased safety as well, because the style of cars and the way they are constructed make them much more safe to the travelling public than the cars which in times past were furnished for the use of passengers on the Intercolonial. I have adverted to the fact that we have a better freight service, and we have added to the freight service. I have also adverted to the fact that we have an increased number of trains, meeting the requirements of the public on all sections of the road. All this goes to prove that we are advancing the interests of the whole country in thus furnishing to the people of Canada a better passenger service and a more regular and frequent service, because the people of today require that. A few years ago it was not necessary; one train a day was then sufficient, the people did not look for more. Today they are expecting more, nay, they are demanding more; and it is for the Intercolonial to furnish a service that will meet the requirements of the country through which it passes, that will meet the requirements of the people of all Canada, because all Canadians patronize that railway. Now that we have heavier engines, of course they haul heavier loads. These locomotives cost more. We have, as I have explained, replaced a number of old locomotives with new ones out of current revenue account. Those that were replaced cost a great deal less than did those which were previously in use. Now I think I have given to the House a clear, certainly a full, statement of the financial conditions of the Intercolonial, not only during the fiscal year 1903-4 but for the six months between the 1st of July and the last of December, 1904.

Mr. HAGGART. On the fiscal point, before the minister leaves it, would he be kind enough to tell me what the expenditure on capital account was for 1903-4 and for the six months that he mentions up to December ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Before coming to that I want to answer a question that was put to me by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Ingram) as to mileage. I have pointed out the increased cost of coal, giving the reasons therefor, showing that the heavier traffic involved an increased consumption of fuel and of oil and waste. I do not know that I have explained with respect to the six months, and perhaps I should do it now. The increased charges in the motive power department for the six months of 1904 from July to December, compared with the corresponding six months of the previous year, and amounting to $261,000, are principally accounted for by the larger amount of traffic handled. This increased traffic is indicated by a much greater locomotive and car mileage, amounting to from 12 to 14 per cent ; a greater amount charged against wages of engine crew, $70,400 during the six months as compared with the like six months of the preceding year. That is due, one-half to the increased engine mileage, and one-half to the higher rates of wages. The heavier traffic involved an increased consumption of fuel to the value of $125,000, and of oil, waste and so forth, to the value of $4,800, thus accounting for the increased expenditure during six months between July 1st and December 31st last as compared with the like period between July 1st, 1903, to January 1st, 1904. There is an increase in the cost of repairs of locomotives for the six months amounting to $51,500. This is partly accounted for by the increased engine mileage, it being 4,690,000 for the six months of 1904 as against 4,050,000 for a like period in 1903. The remainder of the increase was made necessary by the higher rates of wages generally prevailing all over the country which we felt constrained to accord to our men from the 1st July, 1904, and aggregating about $100,000 per year for the whole mechanical department. That accounts for $50,000 at least of this increase of upwards of $400,000.

Now these figures I have just given account for a total of about $252,000 out of the $261,000 of extra cost, that is the $261,000 in connection with the motive power department. The increased cost in the car department, amounting to $29,000 is properly accounted for by the increased rate of wages and the increased car mileage. The car mileage increased from 40,000,000 in the six months of 1903 to 45,500,000 in 1904. Summed up, the six months from July to December, 1904, we have the larger

traffic, the engine mileage increased from 4,047,000 in the six months of 1903 to 4,690,000 in the like period of 1904. About 200,000 miles of the increase of 600,000 was due to the 'Ocean Limited' express. I may say that the 'Ocean Limited' express held its own, and there was no loss particularly on that train as compared with other trains in the service. The cost of engine crews and fuel was largely increased during the period. We paid higher wages to the shopmen in order to meet the market rates but we did not pay our shopmen appreciably higher wages than those paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am making comparisons between the wages paid at Moncton by the Intercolonial and the wages paid at McAdam, the headquarters of the mechanical department of the Atlantic division of the Canadian Pacific Railway. These increased rates could not consistently be denied however much they have affected the balance sheet. It was due to the men. It was only in accordance with the conditions prevailing in the country in connection with other railways and in connection with manufacturing and industrial establishments throughout Canada. Taking it all in all I think it can be said that the cost of the Intercolonial Railway in respect to its mechanical department, its operating and track departments and in maintenance of way and operation of its trains, is not extravagant as compared with the cost of like services on other roads.

Mr. INGRAM. What number of engines were not in proper state of repair on the 30th June last, and on the 30th of January of this year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not that statement here. I will furnish the information at a later stage when the estimates are under discussion. I was asked by some hon. members for the increase in the capital expenditure.

Mr. HAGGART. I was asking what the capital expenditure was for the last year and the last six months. The hon. gentleman quotes the ordinary revenue and expenditure.

Mr. EMMERSON. I thought I had the capital account with me but I shall furnish my hon. friend with it. I am not dealing with the capital expenditures. I have not seemingly brought the papers to the House I could give the working expenses.

Mr. HAGGART. There is an item in the minster's report which gives the expenditure as $1,880,856. I suppose that is expenditure on capital account ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. But, there is nothing about the six months. I would like to know that.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can readily furnish that. The item which the hon. gentleman has quoted shows the expenditure for the year ending 30th June, 1904. I was going to refer hon. gentlemen to the report of the department which has been before the House. It affords full and complete details in respect to both earnings and expenditure for the past fiscal year. I think it is to be found in the report of the Department of Railways and Canals for 1904, about page 60, and the following pages. In dealing with the capital expenditures for the past six months or discussing that feature or phase of the question, I have not apparently charged my notes with these items.

Let me say in conclusion that while I regret not being able to present a more pleasing picture in connection with the Intercolonial Railway I feel that the statement I have made shows the actual conditions relating to the railway. I have endeavoured to present the facts relating to the railway and the facts alone. I have said elsewhere that I have great faith in the future of the Intercolonial Railway. I have great faith. I look upon the Intercolonial Railway as a public work that has done more for Canada than any other expenditure made by Canada since we became a Dominion. I think it has cemented the people together in a way that would never have occurred had we not built that road in the way in which we did. I feel that as to the future the possibilities of the Intercolonial Railway are very great indeed. I know that too frequently we forget the fact that the Intercolonial Railway had at its inception, and still has, very many drawbacks. I think we are too apt to forget that in so far as its freight rates are concerned it is handicapped. It is handicapped by reason of the water competition between the great commercial metropolis of Montreal and points down by the sea. Take the operation of the Intercolonial Railway from Montreal to Sydney; there you have the railway practically climbing the hill, not in respect to grades, but in respect to competition. During quite a number of months in the year at least it encounters the competition of the great waterway between Montreal and the Sydneys. At nearly every point along the line of the Intercolonial Railway you find good harbours connected with the Intercolonial Railway. It has been the policy of the government to expend large sums in connection with the Intercolonial Railway and doing everything possible to perfect its terminals. At the same time it has been the policy of Canada to furnish splendid shipping facilities at the different harbours. One is brought in competition with the other, although we would not have it otherwise. It is in the interest of the people of Canada, and yet at the same time we should not forget that these conditions do exist; that although the Intercolonial Railway when built and opened up in the early seventies had to meet that competition and

has had to meet that competition from that day to this. It has been a live competition and in addition to that the parliament of Canada has expended large sums of money to do what?—to provide another competitor for the Intercolonial Railway, in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway short line between Montreal and the harbours of the sea. It was created by Canada in competition with its own road. Who will say that it shoud not be so? It was necessary, I admit it. But, this fact creates some excuse for the Intercolonial Railway. We must look the facts in the face. We must not condemn the Intercolonial Railway because the people or parliament of Canada felt that it was in the interest of all Canada that there should be this competition. I have said to-night that there, perhaps, is a remedy and that remedy may necessarily have to be applied. I have endeavoured to show that the time may come, and must necessarily come, when there will be applied as a remedy an increase in the rates on the Intercolonial Railway, but that that remedy should not be applied until the Intercolonial Railway is placed in a fair position, until it is properly equipped, until it is placed in a position whereby it can, to the best possible advantage, carry out its objects and its aims, and can transport its traffic to the best possible advantage at a minimum cost. I know that a good deal of capital is sometimes made—I do not say unfairly made,—but there seems to be an attempt to make capital against the Intercolonial Railway from a sectional standpoint. I have stated over and over again in this House, whenever I have had an opportunity to speak at all with respect to the Intercolonial Railway, that I believed the Intercolonial Railway was doing as much good for the great cities of Quebec and Ontario as it was doing for any section of the maritime provinces. Nay more, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is accomplishing and doing more good for the manufacturing and industrial interests of Ontario and Quebec than it is doing for any single industry or for all the industries in the maritime provinces. We talk about the deficits of the Intercolonial Railway. That railway was built as a great highway connecting the four provinces of the Dominion ; it was built in consequence of the pact of confederation. It was built because the delegates at Quebec and at Charlottetown agreed that it should be built and that it should be built at the expense of Canada. It has been operated, and year in and year out when parliament has been asked for a vote for the work of improving the Intercolonial Railway there has been cavilling. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to think of the results of the operation of the Intercolonial Railway and to compare them with the results of the operation of the canal system of Canada. Canada has expended some $72,000,000 on the Intercolonial Railway ; has expended upwards of that sum on the Canadian Pacific Railway and has expended some $80,000,000, at least an amount equal to the amount expended on the Intercolonial Railway and Prince Edward Island Railway, on its canal system and it is costing to-day to operate these canals a sum of money somewhere between $800,000 and $1,000,000 per year. Are there any complaints because of the deficit in connection with the canal system? Do you hear any cry from the east or west, from any section of Canada, as respects that expenditure ? You do not, Sir. Why ? Because the people of Canada realize that the canal system is in the interest of the trade of the country, is in the interest of the business of the country and in the interest of Canada. The Intercolonial Railway was placed upon the same plane as were the canals of Canada at the time of confederation. They were looked upon in the same light ; they were both designed to be great highways for the use of the people of Canada, and there should not now be any niggardly business with respect to the Intercolonial Railway any more than with respect to the perfecting and maintaining of our canal system. We charged, until the past two seasons, a toll upon every ton of traffic that passed through our canals. Two years ago it was thought to be in the interest of trade, in the interest of the export and import business of Canada that those tolls should be abolished. We did it, we did it willingly, and the people of all Canada approved of that Act ; and I am sure that the people of Canada would approve of any steps that may be taken by this parliament to perfect the Intercolonial Railway, to make it a railway that shall be the pride of all Canada, a railway that will serve the interests of the country and even although there is a deficit, because of extra wages, we cannot turn the screw and put up the rates as can be done in connection with other railways. We cannot do that because it would be a violation of pledges to which this country committed itself in 1867. We cannot do it except as a final resort. But why should there be any outcry against making the road one that will meet the demands of the country and be a credit to it? I trust that the estimates which have been placed before hon. members and to which their consideration is being invited will be generously discussed and that they will be readily approved by this House.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). The hon. gentleman at the head of the Railways and Canals Department (Mr. Emmerson) in treating of the Intercolonial Railway, has at least given us a candid statement of the position of that road. Where is the glowing future that was promised us three or four years ago after the acquisition of the Drummond County Railway,

after the bargain for the entrance into the port of Montreal by an expenditure of $140,000 ? Life was to be put into the old road and the expenditure was to be justified in the future. The minister at that time compared the position of the road to that of a business concern moving from a back street into a front street ; there might be a large expenditure but he promised it would be fully recouped to the country. The hon. gentleman has given a candid statement in reference to the condition of that road. We have expended on the Intercolonial Railway, on capital account alone, $72,000,000. Besides that, if I remember rightly, that does not include last year's acquisition of that road in New Brunswick, that great addition to the Intercolonial Railway for the purchase of which we expended $1,250,000, and perhaps an amount nearly as large for the purpose of making it a road fit to travel on.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would say to my hon. friend that only $800,000 was paid for that road.

Mr. HAGGART. If I remember rightly the minister was to pay nearly $900,000 in cash and there was an amount required for equipment which made it $1,250,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) is certainly forgetful of the facts ; the amount was simply $800,000 in cold cash and that is all there was.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no expenditure besides that on the road?

Mr. EMMERSON. Nothing.

Mr. HAGGART. $800,000 in cold cash for the purpose of acquiring that road on which the total revenue was in the neighbourhood of $37,000. I think that perhaps I am doubling the amount and it was not able to pay the expenses during the year.

There was also an expenditure on account of the Drummond County Railway of $1,400,000. The minister promised, when he acquired the road in New Brunswick, that a separate account of it would be kept so that we would know what the acquisition had cost the country, but we have not that statement—the hon. minister has evidently forgotten his promise altogether—and it is very difficult to separate the accounts from those of the Intercolonial. The hon. gentleman makes a comparison between the railways and the canals. He says that the expenditure on the canals amounts to $87,000,000, which counterbalances the expenditures on the Intercolonial. Unfortunately, it does not do anything of the kind. Let us look at the expenditures on the Intercolonial Railway for the last few years. The hon. gentleman states that the deficit for 1903-4 is in the neighbourhood of $900,000; but looking at the statement of the actual receipts and expenditures given in his report, I find that the actual deficit is $871,398. The expenditures on capital account on the Intercolonial Railway for the last few years have been as follows : In 1896, $259,000; in 1897, $145,000; in 1898, $252,000; in 1899, $1,081,000; in 1900, $1,796,000; in 1901, $3,633,000; in 1902, $4,621,000, and in 1903, $2,254,000. Now, let us look at the receipts. In 1898 there was a surplus of $70,000, in 1899, a surplus of $210,000, in 1900 a deficit of $150,000, in 1901 a deficit of $525,000, in 1902 a surplus of $57,000, in 1903 a surplus of $110,000 and in 1904 a deficit of $871,398. The hon. gentleman says that for the last six months the deficit will be in the neighbourhood of $482,000. The hon. gentleman stated last year, when he was addressing the House, that the deficit on eleven months of the year was $585,000; but the result at the end of the year is a deficit of $871,398.

Mr. EMMERSON. I said at the same time that there would be a very much larger deficit.

Mr. HAGGART. Here is what the hon. gentleman said:

> In 1903 the receipts for eleven months were $5,790,876 ; expenses, $5,720,550. This shows a profit for the eleven months ending May 31, 1903, of $70,317.63, as against a loss during eleven months of 1904 of $585,382.39. It also shows that the receipts for the eleven months ending May 31, 1904, were $5,621 in excess of the same period in the previous year.

Applying the same system of calculation this year the deficit will be in the neighbourhood of $1,500,000. However, the fact remains that for the last four years we have been expending on capital account on the Intercolonial Railway an average of over $3,000,000 a year, and we have a larger deficit besides. Now, when is this going to end? The hon. gentleman says that we cannot help it—that the only prospect in the near future is that when the Intercolonial has the proper equipment there will be an increased revenue. He says that the reason for the deficits is that from Montreal to Halifax the Intercolonial runs along the St. Lawrence river and along the sea coast. The modern idea is that a canal along the line of a railway assists the railway instead of being an injury to it financially. Probably the most prosperous railways we have in Canada run along the St. Lawrence river. Is this thing to go on for ever? Are we always to have a capital expenditure of over $3,000,000 a year and a deficit of over $1,000,000 upon the Intercolonial Railway—a road which was managed by myself with entirely different results. We have also the extraordinary statement of the hon. gentleman that this road could not carry the freight which offered last year for lack of freight cars and locomotives, and that to equip the road fully we require seveny-five more locomotives. Yet it was only about a year and a half ago that there was such a plethora of locomotives that the Intercolonial Railway was able to lease 36 to the Canadian Pacific Railway. What amount of

increased freight has there been during the last year? Looking at the figures I find that there has been a very small increase. The hon. gentleman says that the increased expenditure is occasioned partly by the increased cost of mechanical repairs—that he has to pay more for engineers and workmen than formerly. This is a pretty state of affairs.

The hon. gentleman and his predecessor have been furnished to any extent with new locomotives and freight cars, and yet expenses for repairs are greater now than ever they were in the past. He states too that one of the reasons for the large expenditure is that you have to pay the men modern wages. Well, we heard the same thing last year. He then accounted for the deficit by saying he had to pay men up to the standard paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway and other railways. Have we got an increased standard now? Has the standard increased since last year to such an extent that he is enabled to account for the deficit between this year and last by the increased expenditure on this head. But the generosity of the hon. minister is easily accounted for. He says that in December—perhaps it was in November—occurrences happened which caused him to make an arrangement that I think is without precedent in any railway management or corporation in this or any other country—an arrangement under which he only provided for an increase of wages in the future, but for an increase during the six months past. That is a generosity which no doubt should commend itself to the Canadian people? The particular time in which these occurrences happened is rather significant. True, the hon. minister said it was the beginning of December, but I am strongly inclined to believe that though the Order in Council may have been passed at that particular time, the understanding, from one end of the road to the other, was that the men were to receive six months increase of pay on account of the severity of the fall or the probable severity of the winter which was to follow.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was a mere coincidence.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman must not take this in a joking manner. There are two or three things to be considered in this connection. Can a government conduct a railway as economically as a company can? My experience on the Intercolonial Railway shows me that the government could, as the minister says he can, purchase anything for the use of that railway as cheaply as any railway company. I believe he can do it cheaper for the merchants prefer to deal with the government; and I believe he can get men for cheaper wages than any other corporation in Canada can.

Mr. EMMERSON. Do you think we should?

Mr. HAGGART. I think that you do it. I think you get them as cheap as any other railway in Canada does.

Mr. EMMERSON. You said we could get them cheaper.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. EMMERSON. Do you think we should?

Mr. HAGGART. The wages in the maritime provinces are cheaper than in the west, and we are paying higher wages on the Intercolonial Railway to our employees than the Canadian Pacific Railway pay their employees in a similar portion of the country.

The hon. gentleman tell us of the advantages he offers the people of the east—that he has put on a fast freight train for the purpose of accommodating the people of Ontario and Quebec. But the hon. gentleman should show some facts or results to warrant the enormous expenditures he has made. Can he tell me that the through freight has increased at all during the last eighteen or twenty years? I tell him that the through freight over the Intercolonial Railway, notwithstanding its extension to Montreal, notwithstanding its right to pass over the bridge into Montreal, is less than it was fifteen or sixteen years ago. Then he has made an enormous expenditure on the 'Ocean Limited.' What was the necessity for that? You have an express running down from Montreal to Halifax, but in addition to that you put on another in competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway and as he has told us it starts, these two express trains start within fifteen minutes of each other and arrive at the same time in Halifax. Why was that done? I venture to say that the hon. gentleman lost over $200,000 per year on that train.

Mr. EMMERSON. It paid its way.

Mr. HAGGART. He says there was no loss, but he must take into account the amount of passengers and freight it takes from the other express train on the Intercolonial Railway from Montreal to Halifax. I have heard railway experts say that the loss to the country for the time the hon. gentleman has been running that train, say five months in the year, would be $225,000. It is all very well to give the finest possible accommodation to people travelling on that road, and the people in this section of the country have no objection to anything of the kind, but what we require is that there shall be some economy in management and some reasonable proportion between expenditure and revenue. There can be no justification for saddling this enormous deficit on the surplus earnings of the people of this country; and no sane man will for a moment entertain the idea that this $4,000,000 of

a deficit could not be much better expended than losing it in that sink hole, the management of the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentleman has made a candid statement. Every year we have had promises from this government of more economical administration and less unsatisfactory results, but, as I shall show at another stage, the expenditure has been increased from year to year. Take for instance the Prince Edward Railway road, on which there has been no increase in the mileage. From 1888 up to 1898 there was an expenditure on capital account of only about $8,300 and since then it has amounted to $17,541 in 1898, $22,000 in 1899, $53,000 in 1900, $280,000 in 1901, $829,000 in 1903 and $698,000 in 1904. I suppose that includes the branches built to that road. In 1890-91 the working expenses were $257,990 and the gross earnings $174,-258. In 1891-92 the working expenses were $289,706 and the gross earnings $157,442. But let us come down to modern years. In 1900-01 the working expenses were $261,766 and the gross earnings $193,833. The following year the working expenses were $270,-159 and the revenue $197,999. In 1902-03 the working expenses were $259,637 and the gross revenue $217,714. Last year, 1903-04, the working expenses increased to $335,693, as compared with gross earnings of $234,-390, showing a deficit of $100,000 in that one year. This is but a sample of the increase in the working expenses and in deficits on all the railways under the control of the government. The hon. gentleman says he is going to remedy these things in the future when he has sufficient rolling stock.

He requires at least seventy-five locomotives in order to furnish an efficient service. But he does not think it likely that he will get more than twelve locomotives a year. That is, six or seven years must pass by before he can have the road in what he considers an efficient working condition. Last year the hon. gentleman got twelve locomotives and about $1,000,000 for capital expenditure. The year before he got $3,000,-000 or $4,000,000. In order to get the road up to the standard the hon. gentleman contemplates we must expect a large expenditure. But it is noteworthy that both the hon. gentleman and his predecessor have carefully avoided telling the House and the country what these proposed improvements will cost, or when we may hope to have the road upon a paying basis. For my part, I protest against all this. I believe that, with proper management, but without increase of the passenger rates or the freight rates, the road could be operated without a single cent of deficit. I know parties who looked into the matter, and they came to the conclusion that, with ordinary good business management, the road ought to yield good returns. And they were willing to take over the road and pay a handsome sum for it, believing that good profits would accrue under efficient management. There is no reason why the Intercolonial Railway should be used as a political engine to further the ends of hon. gentlemen opposite. Any advantage from such a course must soon cease. The time will come when the repetition of these things to win political favour will be a weakness rather than a strength. If the hon. gentleman wishes to show successful management, let him run the road as other roads are run. Look at the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Northern—look at every enterprise in the country that is managed on commercial lines. For the last two or three years the condition with them has been one of plethora. But we find the reverse on the Intercolonial Railway. That road has been going from bad to worse. If the present negligent, loose management continues, instead of a deficit of $4,000,000 a year, we may find the operation of the road to cause even greater loss to the people of Canada.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to capital—Intercolonial Railway—to increase accommodation at Sydney, $81,500.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister will please make an explanation of each item as it comes up.

Mr. EMMERSON. Of this $81,500, $66,-000 is a revote. This was the old balance due on the station building under construction there and other improvements. The improvements and the need for them was explained last session.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is this being built by contract, and who are the contractors ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is under contract, the contractors being Messrs. Chappell Bros.

Intercolonial Railway—original construction, $2,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to settle claims for land and damages that come up from time to time which, apparently, have been overlooked in the construction of the road. We got $2,000 last year for that purpose, but I believe we expended, up to 1st January last, only about $14. But, as a precautionary measure, we ask for $2,000.

Intercolonial Railway—to strengthen bridges, $142,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is a revote.

Mr. BENNETT. Last year the amount voted was $385,000. How much of that vote has been expended ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Only about $8,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Do I understand that only $8,000 has been expended of a vote of $385,000 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes ; and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) will readily understand it. This vote was not passed until late—too late for much work to be done.

Of course, contracts were let. There are a number of bridges for which tenders were asked and contracts entered into. The works are now under construction. There are several contractors—the Canadian Bridge Company and the Dominion Bridge Company have the greater number of the contracts.

Mr. BENNETT. How much is under contract to-day ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Sufficient to require about $235,000 to be paid to these companies up to the 1st of July, and this $142,000 re-vote will be required from the 1st of July in the next fiscal year.

Mr. BENNETT. Then do we understand that $250,000 will be required up to the 1st of July for the work now under contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, $243,000 to be exact.

Mr. KEMP. Could not a portion of this money be properly put to revenue account instead of capital account ? Is it not actual repairs to some extent ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. KEMP. Well, repairs to bridges.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is another item altogether.

Mr. KEMP. What did that amount to last year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is a separate item. This is for the purpose of making stronger and heavier bridges. We are using a class of locomotives that will, in many instances, be double the weight of those that were in use on the Intercolonial a few years ago. Necessarily we have to have all equipment to correspond, the bridges, the roadway, the round houses, the turntables, everything must correspond as to quality, class and size.

Mr. KEMP. Is it all for new bridges ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. KEMP. What was done with the old bridges ?

Mr. EMMERSON. As a rule they are doubled up and put into smaller spans, making them stronger ; that is making them equal in strength but with shorter spans.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Where are the new bridges ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They are on the Intercolonial. One of those bridges taken from the Intercolonial, that is the south-west Mirimachi bridge, has been removed to Prince Edward Island and is being put up over the Hillsboro' river. It is not up yet, but it is in course of erection.

Mr. KEMP. The point I was trying to get at this : It seems to me a part of this money should be charged to revenue account. The cost of the original bridges was charged to capital account, then the new bridges which are to replace them are charged to capital account. There is a certain amount of wear and tear, and it seems to me it is putting into capital account that which should properly go to revenue account.

Mr. EMMERSON. The same system of book-keeping has been in existence for many years.

Mr. KEMP. As a matter of fact, last year capital account was nearly $2,000,000, and I see in capital account a very large number of items that should properly go into revenue account. Of course if you do that, it will increase the deficit, and I suppose the hon. gentleman wants to avoid that as much as possible.

Mr. BENNETT. As I understand the minister, there are now under contract $243,000 worth of bridges. Will he give us a list of those bridges, where they are, and the cost of each of those that are under contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is the Sackville bridge, which will cost upwards of $62,000. I have stated that there were bridges under course of construction on which we would require to pay $242,000, which is part of the $385,000 voted last year. There is the Laplante bridge, a small one requiring $6,930 ; the Sutherland river bridge, $21,619 ; Salmon river bridge, about $19,800 ; Nicolet river bridge, $59,000.

Mr. KEMP. Are you already strengthening bridges on the Drummond County Railway ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We want a class of bridges that will meet the strain of the heavy engines. That is one of the disadvantages under which we labour in connection with the operation of the road between Lévis and Ste. Rosalie. Then there is another Nicolet bridge, No. 2, $55,000. Then there are some smaller bridges, making a total of $242,000.

Mr. KEMP. Are the heavier bridges necessitated on account of the freight traffic or passenger traffic, or both ?

Mr. EMMERSON. On account of heavier engines used for both passenger and freight traffic.

Mr. KEMP. Is the hon. gentleman contemplating going into the grain carrying business to Halifax again, or is any of that traffic being taken over by the Intercolonial the same as the season previous ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We were obliged this year to refrain from entering into a contract in connection with the Allan Line of steamships for certain export trade of the maritime provinces, in consequence of our inability to furnish cars for that grain. We hope with the facilities that will be furnish-

ed before next year, that we can engage in that traffic.

Mr. KEMP. I see that in the months of November and December, 1903, and January and February, 1904, there was a considerable amount of grain carried from Parry Sound to Halifax for export, wheat and corn The arrangements which were made with the Intercolonial required the rate of freight to be divided between the three roads over which this grain went, the Canada Alantic Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial. One rate was 5·15, another 4·90, and in one case, 4·94. I see 31,836 bushels were carried from Parry Sound to Halifax, at 4·90 per bushel. Now the mileage was 346 miles for the Canada Atlantic Railway, 34 for the Grand Trunk, and 828 for the Intercolonial. The rate was divided in this way: The Canada Atlantic Railway received their share 2:15 cents, the Grand Trunk Railway ·60 and the Intercolonial Railway 2·15, exactly the same as the Canada Atlantic Railway while the Canada Atlantic Railway mileage was 346 miles and the Intercolonial Railway mileage was 828 miles. Is that a proper way in which to conduct this kind of business? Can the Intercolonial Railway enter into a bargain of that kind and consider that it is profitable? I would like to have an explanation from the hon. minister.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can easily give the explanation that has already been given to this House. That was a transaction in connection with the carrying of certain traffic to Halifax and at the same time the bringing back of certain imports brought in by steamer to Halifax, and the two together—this traffic going down in the cars and the other traffic coming up in the return cars—made a profitable transaction for the Canadian Pacific Railway. That transaction was deemed to be, from the financial standpoint, in the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway, taking into consideration the traffic that came in by the steamers at Halifax and was transported to Montreal and other ports.

Mr. KEMP. I may say that I do not take any stock in the explanation which has been furnished the hon. minister in respect to this transaction. I look upon it merely as a political transaction. On almost every occasion when it is thought that there is an election coming on it seems necessary to demonstrate to the people of Halifax that in some way or other Halifax is to become a great grain shipping port. This is one instance, and an instance of a similar character occurred a few years ago. The fact of the matter is that the Canada Atlantic Railway did not make very much money on the carrying of that grain 346 miles for 2:15 cents and if that is the case with the Canada Atlantic Railway, what a loss must the Intercolonial Railway have suffered in carrying it at the same price 828 miles? It stands to reason to my mind that this is a transaction that will not stand argument on its merits. I say it is a political transaction rather than a business one.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend is not warranted in making that statement. It is easy to make such a statement. It does not prove anything. I think the traffic manager of the Intercolonial Railway ought to be quite as competent and quite as capable as the hon. gentleman in reaching a conclusion. This matter was not preceding an election. This was something that transpired in the fall of 1903.

Mr. KEMP. When it was thought there was to be an election. The election was postponed.

Mr. EMMERSON. Nobody thought that but somebody who wanted to figure and speculate on elections. You can hardly have a business transaction without connecting it with some political occurrence, and if these things are to be discussed purely from that standpoint, if every expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway is to be a political transaction it is a very strong argument against the government ownership and operation of railways, I grant you. But, it does not do away with the statement which I have made on the authority of the traffic manager that the two transactions, the carrying of the traffic down to Halifax and the entering into a contract to bring a certain quantity of imports up to Montreal made it, certainly, if not a very profitable transaction, at least one that was in the interests of the Intercolonial Railway. We had the cars and we had the men, we wanted to give them employment, we wanted the traffic, and if that traffic can be secured and that employment given without serious loss it is to the advantage of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. KEMP. Why is it that the earnings are divided up in that peculiar manner when the mileage is more than double on the Intercolonial Railway? Why will the hon. minister allow the Canada Atlantic Railway to get so much more than their fair share in respect to a transaction of that kind?

Mr. EMMERSON. For the reason that all traffic arrangements in connection with the Intercolonial Railway and all passenger arrangements have to be calculated on the basis of the least mileage; that is to say that a passenger ticket from Montreal to St. John on the Intercolonial is sold at the same price as a ticket over the Canadian Pacific Railway to St. John, although the route over the Canadian Pacific Railway is much shorter. That is necessitated by reason of the conditions. Whether we have the traffic or not we have to run our trains. We have to base the rate at the minimum mile-

age and of course it places the Intercolonial Railway at a disadvantage. But, it is better for the Intercolonial Railway to take that traffic down, because these cars are furnished with a return traffic in the imports which are brought to Halifax by the steamers. Instead of taking the cars down as empties, we have the advantage of this traffic down and it gives business to Canadian ports. The earnings arising therefrom make it a paying transaction for the Intercolonial Railway and it is to the advantage of the Intercolonial Railway to accept such traffic.

Mr. KEMP. The St. John mileage is 346 miles. It is the same mileage as that of the Canada Atlantic Railway, yet the Intercolonial and the Canada Atlantic Railway had exactly the same earnings.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is based on the minimum mileage. The mileage of the Canadian Pacific Railway would govern. We have to make a detour around by the St. Lawrence and the Baie des Chaleurs, but in the calculation of the freight rate of the mileage we are controlled and governed by the shortest distance from Montreal to Halifax by way of the Canada Pacific Railway.

Mr. KEMP. I have been unable to make myself clear, I am afraid. The shortest mileage is 346 miles, while as a matter of fact the rate which the Intercolonial Railway got was exactly the same as that which the Canada Atlantic Railway got for 346 miles. That is the point I have been endeavouring to make clear to my hon. friend.

Mr. EMMERSON. I recognize the point made by my hon. friend, but to the extent of that increased mileage on the Intercolonial Railway the Intercolonial Railway suffers because it has to accept freight based on the shorter distance although its own mileage is greater.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the hon. minister how much grain, if any, was received and exported through the government elevators last year at St. John and Halifax ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Do you mean the current year ?

Mr. BENNETT. During the season of navigation of 1904.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a return. I cannot carry it in my mind, but there was some.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman has officers there, perhaps they could tell us within 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 bushels how many bushels were received at St. John or Halifax ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot tell. There is a return before the House. It was brought down last session. It was no very substantial amount, but my hon. friend over there has been telling us about it and there has been a discussion about it already.

Mr. BENNETT. My reference is to the quantity of grain carried in 1904, and I am serious about it because of the fact that I am informed that the Canada Atlantic Railway carried more grain to Depot Harbour last year than in any preceding years, and I wish to learn who took care of that grain afterwards and whether the government got the benefit of carrying it over the Intercolonial.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend is asking about the period between July, 1904, and this date. We have not carried any and I explained to the committee the reason why we did not carry any. We were unable to undertake to enter into any agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway and the Allan Line of steamers to accept certain export traffic that was offered because we could not furnish the cars to go on the Grand Trunk road, and we feared to enter into this engagement lest we would be held for damages by the Allan Line of steamers. That is to say, there was certain traffic offered by way of our maritime ports and in order to secure it, it would be necessary for us to send our cars up on the Grand Trunk Railway. They had not the cars, they would not furnish them and we could not, and therefore we had to decline the business. I hope in the interest of the Intercolonial Railway and of Canadian maritime ports that that difficulty will be removed, and removed this session of parliament, by a vote that will enable us to have sufficient rolling stock to meet the requirements.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I would like to make a few remarks on this item with regard to the carrying of grain to Halifax. In the last campaign one of the great arguments used by government candidates was that by the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific to Moncton that road would be in a position to carry freight from the west to Moncton, and that it could be taken from there to the ports of Halifax and St. John by the Intercolonial Railway. If the Intercolonial Railway to-day is not in a position to carry grain, then I think the hon. minister should show to this House to-night when it will be in a position to do so, and what the cost will be in order to make that railway capable of carrying grain. There is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that this is a great industry, and that the road to-day should be in a position to carry all the grain that can be taken to St. John and Halifax. We have been told for many years in parliament that these two ports were to be the great winter ports of this country, and that Portland, which is now used by the Grand Trunk Railway will not be the port which will be used by the Grand Trunk Pacific but that they

will use St. John and Halifax. I think that if these two ports are to be used for the export of grain and other commodities from the west, the minister should fully explain to this committee how much it will cost and when he will be in a position to put that road on a fair and proper basis for the carrying of these products.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not quite understand the relevancy of the remarks of my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island. He started out by speaking about some argument used by government speakers during the last campaign to the effect that Grand Trunk Pacific traffic was to go to St. John and Halifax by way of Moncton. Undoubtedly that will be true, but that freight will go over the Grand Trunk Pacific, which does not go over the route of the Intercolonial Railway. The argument made by hon. gentlemen opposite and especially by the hon. member for Toronto, as I understand it, is that it is impossible to carry traffic over the Intercolonial Railway because of the greater distance. A great deal of that difficulty is imaginary in the mind of my hon. friend, but if that is a difficulty it will be obviated by the shorter distance over the Grand Trunk Pacific to Moncton, the direct short line through New Brunswick. The Intercolonial will not take charge of the carrying of all that traffic down to Moncton and I assume that the cars when they reach Moncton will go on to St. John and Halifax.

Mr. KEMP. What I wanted to make clear was that I thought the Intercolonial Railway was not getting a fair share of earnings so far as the mileage is concerned.

Mr. EMMERSON. The mileage is apportioned by the shorter distance and we must be governed by that distance. Although our actual mileage distance may be longer, we cannot collect for the full distance as by arrangement among all the railways we are bound by the shortest distance between certain points.

Mr. KEMP. You call the haul 346 miles from Montreal to Halifax.

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot recall the exact figure; of course my hon. friend would not expect me to be familiar with such details. I am only speaking in a general way. I know it is much less than the actual distance, but we are governed by the short haul distance.

Mr. BENNETT. Do I understand the minister to say that the two elevators at St. John and Halifax were standing practically idle last year and that no grain passed through them? Can the minister tell where the grain was exported that the Booth system took in at Depot Harbour, because I understand they received over 15,000,000 bushels last year.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not in a position to say: I know it did not go over the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. BENNETT. Was any received at either St. John or Halifax?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have said that from the 1st of July down to the present time this year we have not received any grain at the elevator at Halifax or St. John. I cannot make myself any more explicit.

Mr. BENNETT. Is there a staff at each elevator, and what is the cost of keeping it up?

Mr. EMMERSON. There are watchmen there, we do not keep a staff of men; we only keep men when there is business and unfortunately, on account of the conditions prevailing this year, we could not accept the business and therefore could not do it through these elevators.

Mr. BENNETT. How much grain was exported by the Canadian Pacific from St. John?

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot say.

Mr. BENNETT. I would think a matter of that kind would be of some interest to the minister or to the officers of his department.

Mr. EMMERSON. That information is not in our possession; we cannot get that. My hon. friend could possess himself of that information as readily as I.

Mr. BENNETT. The department could easily find the sailings of the different ships during the season.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not all grain.

Mr. BENNETT. The quantity of grain could be arrived at pretty well.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think the department is chargeable with any negligence for not having that information.

Mr. LENNOX. I understand the minister to say that they could not carry this grain because of not having the proper equipment of freight cars. I also understood from remarks of the minister and of the hon. gentleman from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) who replied to him that a large amount of money is now required in order to properly equip the line. We also had a statement in the House to-night that we have been spending on capital account during the last seven or eight years, millions of money yearly, not only to keep it up to an efficient condition, but to place it in a more efficient condition than it was before. In 1903, in the matter of passenger cars, which we need not deal with at present, and in the matter of engines and freight cars, the Intercolonial was represented to be one of the best lines in Canada. In that year the Grand Trunk Railway had for every 100 miles of its

railway 775 freight cars, and the Intercolonial 774, a difference of one; and for every 100 miles the Grand Trunk had 22 locomotives and the Intercolonial 21. So that practically these two lines were upon the same basis as regards equipment for carrying freight. Since 1903, the Intercolonial has not been going back, but going forward, by leaps and bounds, in the matter of expenditure on capital account for equipment. Therefore it seems extraordinary that the minister should be in the humiliating position to-night of having to admit that the Intercolonial is practically unable to compete for the carrying trade of the country by reason of not having the necessary means of transportation either in engines or cars. Will the minister explain how that happens?

Mr. EMMERSON. I thought I did explain. I said that in order to get that traffic the Grand Trunk complained of a very great shortage of cars and that the Canadian Pacific Railway was in an equally deplorable condition. I also said that the Grand Trunk required us to furnish cars to go on its lines to gather up the traffic that would go over the Intercolonial and that we were not in a position to do that.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the minister state what equipment per mile or per 100 miles the Intercolonial should have in order to promptly handle the traffic which would legitimately come to it?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not in a position to state that.

Mr. LENNOX. Then, how are we to deal with this question? The hon. gentleman is not in a position to handle the freight delivered at the elevators on his own line.

Mr. BENNETT. That was easy, because there was none.

Mr. LENNOX. He is not in a position to tell us the amount of freight carried by the rival railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway. These are matters that an up-to-date minister, such as we have, should know. He is not able to tell us what equipment the Intercolonial requires. How is the committee to judge what amount of money should be voted, if the minister, who is substituted for another minister who was not found to be efficient, cannot tell us the first conditions which should be the basis on which we can vote this money.

Mr. EMMERSON. I must say that I have not the information down to the niceity that my hon. friend would like.

Mr. INGRAM. Is any part of this expenditure to be on the Prince Edward Island Railway?

Mr. EMMERSON. No. This is simply for the Intercolonial Railway proper.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman tell us what he proposes to do on the Canada Eastern Railway respecting the bridges?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is not involved in this vote at all.

Mr. INGRAM. It is involved in my question, and there seems to be no other item on which I can discuss it. The hon. gentleman stated that the government had paid $800,000 for the Canada Eastern Railway, and he left the inference to be drawn that that was the total expenditure on that road.

Mr. EMMERSON. I hope the hon. gentleman will not draw any such inference.

Mr. INGRAM. That is the inference I was justified in drawing from the hon. gentleman's bald statement that the road cost this country $800,000; but that statement is not justified by the facts. In the first place, the government must know that it will require a very large expenditure to put that road in a good state of repair. We should be informed whether the government intends to use large engines, to strengthen the bridges and to replace the iron on that railroad or not, and we will wait with a good deal of patience for the hon. gentleman to give us some information on these points.

Mr. GERVAIS. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals whether or not he intends to grant passes on the Intercolonial Railway to the twenty-four legislative councillors of the province of Quebec. As a matter of fact, I know that the members of the Legislative Assembly of that province have been receiving passes on the Intercolonial for years, and I think the members of the Legislative Council are entitled to the same privilege for the same good old reason which militates for the granting of passes to the members of the Legislative Assembly. I have been asking the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals many times for the granting of these passes, and I would like to know whether or not he intends to grant the prayer of our legislative councillors.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would be very sorry if my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) inferred from any remarks that I made, either to-night or last year, that some expenditures would not be required on the Canada Eastern Railway. I stated that we had paid the Alexander Gibson Railway Company $800,000 for that road such as it was. We have operated it with an improved train service. The road is in such a good condition that we are running fast trains over it with small engines, it is true. We will not require to put on our heavy engines. We will not require to strengthen the bridges in the same way as we are doing on the main line. This is practically a branch line, and on all our branch lines we are not making the road up

to the standard of the main line. Therefore, I do not expect there will be any necessity for any very great expenditure on the Canada Eastern.

Mr. J. D. REID. When the minister was submitting to the House the purchase of the Canada Eastern, he showed us that that railway had made, in the year before we purchased it, the magnificent sum of $2,900.

Mr. EMMERSON. More than that, was it not ?

Mr. J. D. REID. No ; I think it was $2,900. Can he tell us if this year it is paying operating expenses ? Will he be able to show the House that, after operating it one year, it has given a revenue sufficient to pay 3 per cent on the money the government had to borrow to pay for it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The conditions on that road, as on all other portions of the Intercolonial Railway this year, are such that I cannot promise any very great surplus. In fact, it is only a question how far down we can keep the deficit. But we are not to be judged by this year. I am in hopes that our climate will get back to its normal condition, and that things will go more favourably on the Intercolonial Railway and the Canada Eastern.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are the operating expenses of that particular road now being kept entirely separate from those of the main line of the Intercolonial Railway, as is done in the case of the Prince Edward Island Railway ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, it is treated just the same as any other branch of the Intercolonial Railway. The Prince Edward Island Railway is a railway separate and apart from the Intercolonial Railway, although under the management of the general manager of the government railway.

Mr. J. D. REID. But that is not the system followed by private corporations. Take the Canadian Pacific Railway branch between Prescott and Ottawa ; it is part and parcel of the main line, and yet its expenses are kept entirely separate from those of the latter.

Mr. EMMERSON. But, although operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway, that road is run as a separate railway.

Mr. J. D. REID. Why should not this be run in the same manner ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That would necessitate greater expense. Our book-keeping is done at Moncton for the whole system. We do not want to have a separate superintendent and separate officials and separate books for this road.

Mr. J. D. REID. But the road I refer to between Prescott and Ottawa has not got a separate superintendent or separate shops or anything of that kind, yet its accounts are kept separate, and this does not necessitate any extra officials in any shape or form. Its accounts are kept separate in order that the Canadian Pacific Railway shareholders may know whether the purchase of that branch is a paying investment or not. I do not see why the same thing should not be done on the branches of the Intercolonial Railway. There is no reason why the same superintendent at Moncton should not operate this particular branch. In fact, it ought to be operated more cheaply than when it was an independent line, because then it had a superintendent of its own and special car shops, whereas now it is managed by the general superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway, and its repairs are done in the car shops of the government line. But there is no reason why separate accounts should not be kept of its operating expenses and revenue, so that we might know the result of this investment by the government. According to the statement of the minister last year, the profits on this Canada Eastern were practically nil, and I can quite understand that the result this year will be much worse, but it would be interesting to the country to know what that result actually is.

Mr. EMMERSON. The same course is being pursued with regard to the Canada Eastern as has been followed all along when purchases were made of other lines as branches for the Intercolonial Railway. Many years ago, when the late government purchased the Cape Breton line, that was made a part of the Intercolonial Railway, and its accounts were not kept separate. There was no distinctive line drawn between that portion of the road and any other. When Sir Charles Tupper, in 1879, bought, as Minister of Railways, the River du Loup branch, there was no distinction made between that branch and the main line. The same course was followed when the St. Charles branch was built. None of those branches can be shown to have been successful or unsuccessful, as far as the book-keeping of the Intercolonial Railway is concerned. The same is true with regard to the Drummond branch. There has been a return asked for in connection with the Canada Eastern, and that return is being prepared in so far as the information asked for is available, but there is no distinct operation of that road as against any other portion of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. J. D. REID. Because twenty-six years ago a certain system was followed is no reason why that should be persisted in. If the hon. minister wishes to be progressive and manage the Intercolonial Railway and its branches as other railway corporations manage their lines, he would keep his accounts differently, and we would be able to know exactly what portions pay and what do not ; and having this knowledge, we

ought to be able to stop the leaks and effect some economy.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have simply been stating the facts as they are, but the argument of the hon. gentleman is one open for consideration.

Mr. J. D. REID. I understand from the hon. minister that his intention is strictly to follow in the lines which Sir Charles Tupper laid down some twenty-six years ago, and, rather than break away from that precedent, he is prepared to go on in the dark for all time to come and leave the country in ignorance as to really what portions of the railway system pay and what do not. I think we are entitled to be put in such a position that we may be able to judge whether these branch lines will pay or not; and so may be able to come to a wise decision in case other branch lines are offered to us. The Canada Eastern was added to the Intercolonial Railway through the influence of the present minister. I, for one, would like to know the result of that purchase. I believe that the minister should keep that entirely separate. I think that, at least as long as he occupies the position, he should afford us information from which hon. gentlemen could judge what the result of that purchase has been. I understand that other branch lines have been offered for sale to the Intercolonial Railway, and, no doubt, some of these propositions will be brought to the House. We ought to be in possession of information which will enable us to decide whether such purchases should be made or not.

Mr. GERVAIS. I would like to have an answer to the question I put to the minister about granting passes to the legislative councillors of our province.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will inquire into the matter and let my hon. friend (Mr. Gervais) know to-morrow.

Mr. SPROULE. Did I understand the minister to say that he cannot ascertain whether this branch of the Intercolonial Railway is paying or not? If that is the case it seems to me to be a very strange thing.

Mr. EMMERSON. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) been absent from the House?

Mr. SPROULE. No, I have been here all the time.

Mr. EMMERSON. I hope I made myself understood. I stated that there was no branch of the Intercolonial Railway for which separate books were kept, that all the branches were operated as part of the system. The Rivière du Loup branch, the St. Charles branch, the Cape Breton branch, the Drummond County branch—all these as they were acquired were taken over and run as part of the system.

Mr. SPROULE. When the Prince Edward Island Railway was proposed to be extended we are told that it would add to the mileage and make the Intercolonial Railway pay.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was taken over when Prince Edward Island entered confederation.

Mr. SPROULE. But the argument that was put forward when we where asked to vote money for the extension of it is what I have stated. When the Drummond County Railway was purchased, we were told that it was to bring the Intercolonial Railway up to the great metropolis of Montreal where it would gather freight to make it a paying road. And we were told that when the accounts were analysed it would be found a paying part of the road and would help to put the Intercolonial on a paying basis. And, last year, when the Canada Eastern was purchased, we were told that it would help to make the Intercolonial pay. But when the government went to the country in the general election, one of the arguments advanced from that side was that the Intercolonial never had and never would pay, and so the government would not be justified in undertaking to build and operate a transcontinental line as proposed by the leader of the opposition. It was said that the more branches we purchased for the Intercolonial the worse it would be. I made up my mind either that the arguments presented in support of purchasing the Canada Eastern were misleading and improper, or those who used them were dishonest in that use, or else that they were wholly ignorant of what would take place. We have not the advantage of time to prove the correctness of our policy, but we can only reach the conclusion that the government were very unwise in buying the Drummond County road if the Intercolonial was running farther and farther behind. And the same was true of the Canada Eastern.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says that when the Prince Edward Island line was purchased, the statement was made that it would make the Intercolonial a paying road. The hon. gentleman is an old parliamentarian. He must have been here when Prince Edward Island came into the union, and he knows that the taking over of the Prince Edward Island road was part of the terms of the confederation.

Mr. SPROULE. I know that.

Mr. EMMERSON. Then the hon. gentleman cannot say that it was promised that this would be the means of making the Intercolonial pay.

Mr. SPROULE. I said that it was stated that the longer a through line was the more likely it was to pay.

Mr. EMMERSON. But this is an isolated line on an island in the gulf.

Mr. SPROULE. But it was practically to be an extension of the line with boats connecting.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is not a connection in that sense. There is a steamship company that runs a boat, but not as part of the railway.

Mr. SPROULE. Does it not carry freight?

Mr. EMMERSON. Just as any other vessel would. But they are not run in connection with one another. I think he must admit that he was mistaken in putting the Prince Edward Island Railway in this class. His contention practically comes down to the Canada Eastern. He says I made a statement last year that, in order to help in making the Intercolonial pay the Canada Eastern should be purchased. I did not say that, or make any promise——

Mr. SPROULE. But the hon. gentleman said that it would be a paying concern——

Mr. EMMERSON. No, I did not even go as far as that. What I said was that it was in the interest of the Intercolonial to purchase the Canada Eastern for the purpose of protecting its own territory and preventing it being invaded by the Canada Pacific Railway—that is, the northern section of the province. I said it would be to the advantage——

Mr. SPROULE. In what way?

Mr. EMMERSON. To save to the Intercolonial the traffic it has hitherto enjoyed. If you did not secure that road you were in danger of having a large proportion of the traffic which has heretofore gone over the Intercolonial diverted from that road. That was the ground I took. I made no promise that the branch would pay. It is true, as the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) has stated, that the statement of the road for the last year preceding the purchase was a good one. I showed from the returns that there were years when the road had paid $30,000 or $40,000, and I think that one year it went as high as $50,000 of net earnings. It was for the House to draw its own conclusions from those figures. I gave no promise.

Mr. SPROULE. That is along the line I made the statement—it would be an advantage to the Intercolonial to gather up the freight and save its traffic. If you save its traffic, do you not help the road, and help to make the Intercolonial a paying concern?

Mr. EMMERSON. We save the traffic that originates on the Intercolonial itself and has originated, but which would or might be gathered up by the Canadian Pacific Railway if they acquired the Canada Eastern. The Intercolonial now has complete control of that traffic by acquiring the Canada Eastern and preventing any other railway from getting it. They save it for themselves and they prevent it from going out over the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. SPROULE. Strange to say, we find the Intercolonial running further and further behind even after that is done. I think the government's book-keeping is wrong all the time. It should be an easy matter to know whether any portion of the road is paying or not. I understood the explanation of the minister was to the effect that it would be to the advantage of the Intercolonial, it would be a better paying concern if we had the Canada Eastern, and therefore he purchased it. Now he has to admit that the road is running still further behind than before he purchased the Canada Eastern.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to hear the Minister of Finance on this question. The Minister of Railways has stated that for the last twenty-nine years they have not changed their mode of book-keeping in regard to the Intercolonial. Now could not the Minister of Finance join me in an appeal to the Minister of Railways to have this particular branch kept separate the next year or two, so that we may see exactly what the results are?

Mr. BLAIN. If the minister will not keep a separate account perhaps he would lay before the committee now a financial statement of the Canada Eastern for the last two or three years, so that we may have the opportunity of making some comparisons. I am only asking the minister to give us the information that his government had already secured before they entered into the purchase of this road.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have already furnished it to the committee.

Mr. INGRAM. When this matter was up for discussion last year some hon. gentleman from Nova Scotia advocated the government purchasing a lot of these small lines of railways. I want to say, as a member representing a constituency in Ontario, a province in which the people have built their own local railways and paid for them, that we have no right to contribute towards purchasing these small lines of railways or assisting in their construction. It is about time that kind of thing was stopped. If the other provinces desire to have local roads of a purely local character, they should, as the older provinces have done, construct them for themselves. As a representative from Ontario I desire to protest against this thing going any further. It is only fair to that province that other members from Ontario constituencies should enter a protest, let some of the members sitting on the government side raise their voices against it. Ontario has been compared to a milch cow for a number of years,

it is about time that she was dry to calls of this kind.

Mr. KEMP. I would like to inquire from the minister if he is still carrying hay or other commodities free of charge ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, we are carrying some hay that was ordered during the time of free transportation, but we could not furnish cars to carry it in consequence of difficulties in transportation.

Mr. KEMP. That will go on indefinitely, I suppose ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, there is a limit to the quantity ordered.

Mr. KEMP. Would the minister say on what principle he has been carrying hay free on the Intercolonial ? What precedent has he for that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We had a precedent when there was a coal famine in Ontario and Quebec in 1902, when a like privilege was given to the municipalities to transport coal free over the Intercolonial from Nova Scotia coal mines, or from any point on the Intercolonial.

Mr. KEMP. I never heard of any coal being transported to Ontario points free of charge.

Mr. EMMERSON. There was. I dare say things have happened which my hon. friend has not heard of.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would inquire from the minister if there is a suit pending, or some commission inquiring into a bargain that was made between the Intercolonial and the Grand Trunk when the Intercolonial was extended into Montreal, as to the Grand Trunk handling the traffic not specially routed to be handled over the Intercolonial. I ask, because I can inform the minister that I know of a case where freight was specially routed to be handed over to the Intercolonial at Montreal, and instead of going that way it was sent through to Boston. The bill of lading was to Montreal and thence by the Intercolonial to Halifax. I saw the bill of lading myself.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would be glad to have the information from my hon. friend. I may tell him that there is pending an arbitration between the Grand Trunk and the Intercolonial as regards the traffic exchanged at Montreal and Ste. Rosalie. That arbitration is being held under a clause in the original contract and Act of parliament, which provides that where a dispute arises arbitrators shall be chosen, and the method of choosing the arbitrators is stated, and that has been done. There have been disputes which have reached a culminating point, the case is being heard, and evidence is being placed before the arbitrators. I cannot say as to the state of the proceeding but I know it has been pending for some time.

Mr. KEMP. What ground do the government take in regard to this—that the Grand Trunk are violating their agreement by sending freight to Montreal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That the Grand Trunk Railway Company who were bound to hand over all unrouted traffic from the west to the Intercolonial Railway have handed it over in some instances to the Canadian Pacific Railway and in other instances they have allowed it to go by other routes and in that way the Intercolonial Railway has been damaged.

Mr. GERVAIS. Mr. Chairman, before this item is passed I would like to say a few words about the fish trade in Montreal in relation to the management of the Intercolonial Railway. Every one knows that the Intercolonial Railway has not been doing a very paying business for the last few years, or in fact, since its inception, but on the other hand, not many people know that in Montreal the fish dealers are paying a large amount per week to the Grand Trunk Railway Company for the transportation of fresh fish from Boston, or Portland to Montreal. Not many people know that in Montreal the fish dealers are paying about $25,000 per week as the price of such American fish. I was taught when I was at school, because I was not born in the maritime provinces, that there are quite a lot of fish in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Baie des Chaleurs. It is a matter of regret to the fish dealers of Montreal that there are no proper express facilities to bring up to the fish market in that city the fresh fish which can be caught in the gulf and around the shores of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. I have been calling the attention of Mr. Tiffin, the traffic manager of the Intercolonial Railway, to these facts, but no satisfactory answer has been conveyed to me. I now call the attention of the committee as well as that of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to this condition of affairs. I think something should be done to secure for the Intercolonial Railway several thousand dollars per month and many thousand dollars to the good fishermen in the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

Mr. EMMERSON. I quite concur in the laudable object which my hon. friend has in view, but I would point out to him that this traffic is all done by the express companies. There are furnished on the Intercolonial Railway from Mulgrave and from Cape Breton right up through the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick facilities for the transportation of fresh fish with proper refrigerator cars and during the fishing season these facilities are available for those who wish to engage in that traffic. A very large business is done, comparatively speaking, between the Cape Breton fisher-

men and the people in Montreal, and at other points in the west. This can be done as well by those along the Baie des Chaleurs if they are prepared to engage in this trade. I think the principal reason why fish from Baie des Chaleurs does not find a market in Montreal is that the fishermen in that section years ago sought out a market in the United States, and when you get traffic going in a certain channel or groove it is very apt to continue in that groove unless by some extraordinary means it is diverted from it. I am sure that this matter largely depends upon those engaged in the business. I can assure my hon. friend that we want the traffic. If it can be doubled or trebled it will be greatly to the satisfaction of the management of the Intercolonial Railway, and we are at all times ready to facilitate that traffic as much as possible.

Mr. GERVAIS. I have been discussing this matter somewhat thoroughly with hon. members from down by the sea, and I am informed that many fishermen in the maritime provinces prefer to ship their fish to Boston and Portland and that the good people of Montreal are reimporting that fish from Boston and Portland. The reason of this is that the Intercolonial Railway is not thoroughly equipped with modern transportation facilities according to the German system by which live fish can be transported from the sea to the market. I beg to dissent from the statement of the hon. minister that proper transportation facilities are provided for fish dealers in Montreal. That is not so. I was a passenger on a train coming from Nova Scotia to Montreal last summer. There were three or four parties in the three or four cars attached to the engine. When the express reached Metapedia three or four fishermen were on hand prepared to ship their fish, but the good employees of the Intercolonial Railway said: it will delay the train too much; we have not time to load the fish, whereupon the train started for Montreal at full speed. If you wish to secure the fish trade, proper transportation facilities must be provided on the Intercolonial Railway trains and the Intercolonial Railway employees must be courteous and obliging to the shippers. This is the only way in which we can secure a profitable trade for our Railway. I am bringing these facts to the attention of the chief official of the Railway Department. We want proper transportation facilities according to the modern type, according to the German type.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Before the item is finally disposed of, I might say, in regard to some of the matters to which the attention of the committee has been directed by my hon. friend from St. James, Montreal (Mr. Gervais), that in so far as I am aware, and I think I have a knowledge of the facts, the fishermen of the maritime provinces are fairly well satisfied with the transportation facilities afforded them in recent years on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. GERVAIS. We are not in Montreal.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. That is the fault of the people of Montreal. The statement which my hon. friend makes that the people of the maritime provinces are shipping their fish to Boston and from thence to Montreal I do not think will be borne out by the facts. Their fish to-day is carried from the maritime provinces to the markets of Montreal and various other Canadian markets. I think if my hon. friend would consult the returns of the Intercolonial Railway he would find that the traffic in fresh fish in recent years from Port Mulgrave on the Intercolonial Railway is very large indeed. He will find that no fresh fish from that portion of the maritime provinces goes anywhere else than over the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal and various other Canadian cities. I say this because I have heard on several occasions during recent years, men engaged in this fish trade expressing themselves as reasonably satisfied with the transportation facilities afforded by the Intercolonial Railway. I do not assume that the Intercolonial Railway is finished in this respect. I believe it is improving every year, and I have no doubt whatever that the purpose of the Intercolonial Railway is to still further perfect the transportation facilities for carrying fresh fish from the maritime provinces to the markets in Montreal and to the American markets. That is the position so far as I understand it among the fishermen in the maritime provinces.

M. GERVAIS. I would like to ask the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Alex. Johnston how he can explain the fact that the good people of Montreal are paying large sums per week for express charge to the Grand Trunk Railway Company for the transportation of fresh fish from Boston or Portland? I would also ask him to explain why our fish dealers in Montreal are paying over $25,000 per week for American fish caught on the shores of Maine or Massachusetts. I would like the hon. member to explain these two facts, to explain why the good people of Montreal should have their fish supplied from the United States when they could obtain such a splendid supply from our sister provinces down by the sea.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. These two facts which my hon. friend (Mr. Gervais) has mentioned are susceptible of explanation. The people of the maritime provinces are selling all the fish they can catch at the present time and I assume they are selling where they are getting the best price. The Montreal dealers, I presume are importing fresh fish from Boston because they cannot get it anywhere else. My hon. friend will not suggest that the good people of Montreal should be deprived of the privilege of

having fresh fish. If they cannot get it in the maritime provinces I take it they are going to get it somewhere.

Double tracking parts of line, $100,000.

Mr. KEMP. Where is this double tracking?

Mr. EMMERSON. This double tracking is being done coming out of Halifax, out to Windsor Junction where the D.A.R. branches off and also between Stellarton and New Glasgow.

Mr. SPROULE. There are some of these items that I know some members who are absent wish to discuss. We have made a pretty good run and I think we should stop here.

Some resolutions reported.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the hon. minister inform us what work will be taken up tomorrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. There is a Bill standing in the name of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries which I think it was understood would come up to-morrow. If that does not come up or if it is not ready we will go into supply and the Minister of Railways will continue with his estimates.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 2, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 86) respecting the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 87) to incorporate the International Terminal and Bridge Company.—Mr. T. G. Johnston.

Bill (No. 88) to incorporate the Athabaska Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

QUESTIONS.

VETERINARY INSPECTORS.

Mr. CLEMENTS—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. How many inspectors or veterinary surgeons have been employed by the government for the years 1902, 1903 and 1904, for the prevention of hog disease, or other animal disease in West Kent ?
2. Who were the officials, and who are engaged at the present time ?
3. What salaries were paid to each, and what is paid at the present time ?
4. Does the government intend keeping present officials retained at present salaries ?
5. If that said disease, known as hog plague, has abated in the said county, what are the duties of above officials ; and are they allowed expenses outside of present salaries ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture).

1. In the year 1902, three veterinary inspectors were employed. In 1903-4, the number was increased to 5, while at the present time, 4 officers are engaged in dealing with animal diseases in West Kent and adjoining territory.

2. In 1902 the only resident officer was Dr. J. Kime, jr., V.S., of Chatham, but in the latter part of the year, owing to an extensive outbreak of hog cholera, it became necessary to transfer to the district, Dr. M. B. Perdue, V.S., formerly of Kingsville, Dr. G. W. Orchard, V.S., of Windsor, and Dr. J. H. Tennent, V.S., of London.

In 1903 the officers engaged in the work were Drs. Perdue, Orchard, Kime, and for a short time, Drs. Hopkins and Whyte of Ottawa. Towards the end of the year, Dr. W. B. Rowe of Blenheim, and Dr. M. Philips of Chatham were also engaged.

In 1904, Drs. Perdue, Orchard, Philips, Kime and Rowe looked after the work without outside assistance. Dr. Orchard has recently been removed, and the staff at present consists of Drs. Perdue, Kime, Rowe and Philips.

3. 1902. Dr. Perdue, 8 months at $75, 4 months at $100. Dr. Kime, $650. Dr. Orchard, $500 p. a.

1903. Dr. Perdue, $1,200 p.a. Dr. Kime, $250 p. a. Dr. Orchard, 3 months at $500, 9 months at $1,000. Dr. Rowe, 3 months at $250 p. a. Dr. Philips, 1 month at $600 p. a.

1904. Dr. Perdue, 3 months at $1,200, 9 months at $1,400. Dr. Kime, $250 p. a. Dr. Orchard, $1,000 p. a. Dr. Rowe, $250 p. a. Dr. Philips, 6 months at $600, 6 months at $800.

Present staff : Dr. Perdue, $1,400 p. a. Dr. Kime, $250 p. a. Dr. Rowe, $250 p. a. Dr. Philips, $800 p. a.

Drs. Tennent and Whyte, both permanent officers of the department, were in receipt of salaries of $1,200 p. a.

Drs. Kime and Rowe, being resident practitioners, are paid $250 per annum, with an allowance of $5 per day for each day above fifty, in which they are employed by the department in any one year.

4. The policy of the department is to maintain within the quarantined area a sufficient number of officials to deal in an effective manner with outbreaks of disease.

5. Although the disease has abated to a considerable extent, the outbreak is by no means at an end, fresh cases still being reported, though not to so large an extent as formerly. The district is still under quarantine, and all hogs are inspected and passed,

under permit, by one of our inspectors before being allowed to leave the infected area. The inspectors also deal with outbreaks of other contagious disease in animals.

There are also a large number of farms still under quarantine, the necessary cleansing and disinfection not having been yet completed.

All the inspectors at present employed in West Kent are allowed their actual travelling expenses.

DOMINION LANDS.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. What are the lands referred to in the speech of the Prime Minister on the 22nd instant, Hansard, page 1518, as follows :—' Or if the price of government lands for sale were to be increased over the present very moderate, &c.' ?
2. At what price are these lands offered for sale, and under what terms and conditions ?
3. Are they open to purchase by any applicant who applies for them ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister).

1. Ordinary Dominion Lands in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories which were sold at the rate of $3 per acre.
2. $3 per acre was the price fixed by Order in Council ; but the lands are not offered for sale, but sold to settlers only.
3. No.

Mr. FOSTER. In reference to that question which the right hon. Prime Minister has answered does he know just at present whether such lands on sale at $3 per acre are open to all applicants who are settlers or all who are applicants ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, except where it would be a special hardship to refuse an application.

Mr. FOSTER. Such have to come before the minister to determine whether it is a case of that kind or not ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know that.

AUDIT OFFICE AND TREASURY BOARD.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

Does the government propose at the present session to introduce legislation with a view to secure the harmonious and more efficient and satisfactory working of the Audit Office and the Treasury Board ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The government are not aware that there is any inefficiency in the administration of the Department of the Auditor General of the character indicated in this question, and we hope it will not be necessary to introduce legislation to correct such a class of inefficiency. However, the whole matter may still be held to be under consideration.

CHILD IMMIGRATION.

Mr. U. WILSON (Lennox). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to call the attention of the government to a paragraph that appeared in yesterday's ' Citizen ' to the following effect:

Admiral Freemantle presided at a meeting at which was placed before the Southwark ratepayers Mrs. Gloses' scheme for the emigration of pauper children to Nova Scotia. It was explained that the Canadian government, Lord Minto and the Duke of Argyle all favour the scheme, which furthermore would be a great pecuniary saving to the ratepayers.

I may say that there has been a good deal in the papers about the kind of immigrants who are coming to the cities and town of this country. Some of the benevolent associations have been taxed to their full capacity and a little more to provide for them during the winter, and I hope there is nothing in this paragraph because I do not think this would be a desirable kind of immigration for us to bring to Canada.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Would the hon. gentleman send me the information that he has and I will give him an answer to-morrow ?

Mr. U. WILSON. I may say that I sent the right hon. gentleman yesterday a notice of this matter and I inclosed a clipping from the ' Citizen.'

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend told me that he was going to bring the matter up on going into Committee of Supply. The House will be going into Committee of Supply shortly.

Mr. U. WILSON. I saw the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) outside afterwards and he said he would inform the right hon. First Minister and that he would much prefer that the matter be brought on the Orders of the Day saying that he himself would answer it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will send over to the hon. gentleman the information placed in my hands.

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of Day are called I wish to refer to a matter of considerable importance to my own province of Ontario and to put myself in order I intend to conclude with a motion. The matter to which I purpose calling the attention of the House is the somewhat equivocal position occupied by the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) in this House. Ever since the last general election the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Sutherland), who sat in this House for North Oxford, has not

been here. I understand that he is very ill. I am sorry to know it. I have a great respect for that hon. gentleman and I believe he enjoys the respect of every one in this House, but in strenuous times like these we have a constitutional practice to uphold, and I do not think the position occupied at the present moment by the hon. member for London as acting Minister of Public Works is quite within the constitution. Nay, I will go further and say that I believe that the hon. member for North Oxford has already placed his resignation as Minister of Public Works in the hands of the right hon. gentleman who leads the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Probably he may have in his pocket to-day the resignation of that hon. gentleman but, at all events if he be ill—and I am sorry to say that he is ill—in times like these I say that if we are to respect the constitutional practice it is the duty either of the hon. member for North Oxford to resign his position as Minister of Public Works or it is the duty of the right hon. Prime Minister to ask for that resignation, and if he desires the hon. member for London to fill that position the constitution requires that that hon. gentleman shall go back to his constituents for their endorsation. My object in calling attention to this condition of affairs is that matters of high policy are before the people of Canada to-day and a splendid opportunity is presented to test public feeling on these questions. If the right. hon. gentleman has confidence in his policy ; if he has confidence in his great majority—I would ask him what his majority is ?

An hon. MEMBER. Seventy.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I understand it is over sixty if there have not been some defections within the last day or two. Be that as it may the constitutional practice requires that the man who is filling the portfolio of Public Works should enjoy the confidence of his constituents and be re-elected. If the Prime Minister has the resignation of Mr. Sutherland in his pocket he ought to make the country aware of it. It is putting the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) in an anomalous position. Then there is another thing; the man who does the work is entitled to the pay, and if the member for London does the work he ought to draw the salary. As a man from the province of Ontario, I am anxious to see our cabinet ministers occupy their positions in good standing, and I do not wish it to be pointed out that a minister from that great province is declassé in the cabinet. Let him have all the honours he is entitled to and let him have them in a constitutional way. I believe the Prime Minister is possibly in a position to declare that the seat for North Oxford is vacant, and at the same time he is in a position to declare that the seat for London shall be made vacant. Perhaps my hon. friend from London (Mr. Hyman) would prefer to run in North Oxford, but I do not care particularly about that so long as he has the endorsement of the people of his own province and his own neighbourhood who ought to be permitted to pass judgment upon him and upon those with whom he is associated in the government. I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) is getting into the habit of moving the adjournment of the House daily. If he finds some pleasure in that nobody can find any very great displeasure, and I do not think it concerns the House very much that he should continue to pursue such a course. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) says that if I had in my pocket the resignation of the member for North Oxford (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) it is my duty to give it to the House. The hon. gentleman is quite right in that; it is the only thing in which I can agree with him. For once, I congratulate him on being correct in his law if not in his facts. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) stated that he had reason to believe that I had such resignation in my pocket. I would be glad to know where the hon. gentleman has obtained such information. I do not think he will venture to give it to the House, and if he does I shall afford him an opportunity of doing so.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I will tell the right hon. gentleman what I think.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, no; I want my hon. friend to tell me where he got the information that at this moment I have in my pocket the resignation of the Minister of Public Works. I think I know his source of information, and I think it is to be found in the fertile imagination of the hon. gentleman from South York. I am afraid there is no other source than that, because as a matter of fact I have not the resignation of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. He has never offered it to me. If the Minister of Public Works had offered me his resignation simply because his health was not good, I can tell the hon. gentleman from South York that I would have asked the Minister of Public Works to keep his resignation back.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would have told the Minister of Public Works that members on both sides of the House, with one single exception, would be glad to know that there was hope that he would take his place again in this House as Minister of Public Works. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has not offered me his resignation and I am very thankful that he has not. One observation more; the

hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) says that the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) who is acting as minister ought to have the pay —well, apparently that question does not trouble my hon. friend from London (Mr. Hyman) and I cannot see why it should trouble my hon. friend from York (Mr. Maclean).

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). The Prime Minister has two great weaknesses; he has the weakness of making the effort of his life and he has the weakness when violating the constitution to take refuge in personal friendships.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Hon gentlemen opposite may jeer, but what are the facts? It is all very fine to say that we have a constitution, but if we have we ought to respect it. We ought not to be constantly violating it, because it suits party considerations, and because the Prime Minister is afraid to test public opinion in the province of Ontario. That's what's the matter. It is very nice to hear about personal honour and about regard for an hon. minister who happens to be ill, but there are more than personal matters to be considered in the conduct of public business. We want a Minister of Public Works who has the endorsation of his constituents, and that we have not. We do not know how long we may be without such a minister, and though that may be the Prime Minister's view of the constitution it is not the view of the constitution that obtains in England.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is wrong there.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The right hon. gentleman asks me how I know that he has in his pocket the resignation of the hon. member for North Oxford. Well, I believe that the hon. member from North Oxford from a sense of honour and responsibility to the public, would have long since placed his resignation in the hands of his leader. I leave the case there and I say that the present state of affairs is not satisfactory and ought to be corrected. I hope yet to bring the Prime Minister to my way of thinking on this matter. He is not above changing his mind; I believe that since yesterday a wonderful change has come over his mind and perhaps over his heart as well, and that we will see a very pronounced modification of the policy which he announced the other day. I have the greatest respect for the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman); I meet him every day and I am glad to meet him, but I would like to see him in this House enjoying all the honours he is entitled to. I trust that the Prime Minister will give the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) his full dignity and at the same time maintain the principles of the constitution.

Motion to adjourn, negatived.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Intercolonial Railway—diversion of line at Mitchell, $15,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is a revote. By the 1st of July next we shall have expended about $10,000 of the vote of $25,000 made last session. There is at that point a very bad curve of seven degrees which it is proposed to bring down to two degrees. There is also a bridge, which it is proposed to replace.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is Mitchell?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is on the Drummond Counties line.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the work supposed to cost altogether?

Mr. EMMERSON. $25,000. The contract for grading is $12,000, and the rest of the amount covers land damages for right of way, the cost of the permanent way, ballasting, changing the telegraph line, and so on.

Mr. FOSTER. How much of a diversion does it make from the main line?

Mr. EMMERSON. The present line is 8,740 feet in length, and it will be reduced by 1,237 feet. The grade will also be reduced to four-tenths.

Mr. FOSTER. There is also a diversion of the line at St. Leonard Junction. Is that on the same line?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the reduction there in length, in curve and in grade?

Mr. EMMERSON. We reduce the curve from five to two degrees, the grade to about eight-tenths, and the distance about 128 feet in 5,850 feet. We do not make the diversion in order to shorten the distance, but in order to reduce the grade and the curve.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there any other diversions on the Drummond line?

Mr. EMMERSON. These are the only two, I think.

Mr. INGRAM. How far is this curve from the bridge?

Mr. EMMERSON. Both the curve at Mitchell and the curve at St. Leonard Junction are near the bridges.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the change involve raising the grade of the bridge at the other end?

Mr. EMMERSON. I can show the hon. gentlemen a plan, which was here last session. The bridge as located was too low, and it was necessary to raise it anyway.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This curve is partly in the county of Drummond and partly in Nicolet. It is in the form of an 'S' and a really bad curve.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there many such curves on that road ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The minister says there are only two.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose there will be many more at the next election.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This was voted long before the election ; there are no votes there.

Mr. OSLER. Has any separate account been kept as to what was spent on the Drummond County line since the government took it over ? I think the House is entitled to that information and it should be kept separately.

Mr. EMMERSON. There has been no special account ; I do not think the amount has been very large in the main. This change is one of the largest made in connection with this road.

Mr. MORIN. Would the minister be good enough to tell the committee the difference in the location of the old bridge and the new bridge that he proposes to build ? How far will the new bridge be up the river from the old bridge ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The plan will show that.

Mr. MORIN. I fail to understand the position of the government in 1898 and its position to-day. In 1898, when this road was bought, it was stated in the House, time and time again, that it was a first-class road, it was a cheap road, and the government could not get along without buying it ; they were buying a mint in buying that road. I have known that road for a very long time. When the road was first built it was a straight road without curves, and to-day it is a road with sharp and heavy curves. How was that done ? Would the minister explain that to me ? The minister was not in office at that time and I do not propose to charge him with false representations made at that time, but nevertheless they were made.

Mr. EMMERSON. Two swallows do not make a summer nor do two curves on a road condemn the entire road. I think it certainly speaks well for the accuracy of the reprsentations made as regards that road that it has been found necessary to change only two curves on it. The Intercolonial Railway is recognized as one of the standard roads of Canada, and yet we find it necessary to correct curves on it. We are asking $60,000 to correct the curvature at Birch Cove the approach to the city of Halifax, and there are other curves and other grades on the Intercolonial Railway. But because of that you would not condemn the Intercolonial Railway ; you would say that, generally speaking, it is one of the best roadways to be found in all Canada.

Mr. MORIN. I agree to that, but as I said before that road was highly recommended in the House.

Mr. EMMERSON. This does not condemn it.

Mr. MORIN. There is a place, not far from that point called St. Germain, where the roadbed is overflowed for about 6 miles every year. The government, some years ago, had to put rails on the ties to keep the road from floating out. Then they raised the road about three feet. How does it come if the road was so good in 1898 that it has become bad since then ? The road then had light curves ; now it has heavy curves ; then it had good bridges, now you are taking bridges away and building others. What is the use of trying to blindfold people in that way ? I know very well that the road at that time was not even a second-class road. I understand what a good road is as well as any man in the House and that road, at that time, was not a second-class road, yet it was highly recommended, and to-day it has very much deteriorated. How can you account for that ?

Mr. HAGGART. The statement of the minister is correct. There is a great deal in his statement that the road must have been of an excellent character when it was necessary to take out only two curves. The House requires a little more authority than the bald statement of the minister in reference to that. If I am not mistaken a good many more improvements have been made, and as the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Morin) said when we were asked to take over that road, it was said to be a first-class road, capable of running on the same time schedules as the Intercolonial Railway. We paid $1,429,000 for it at the time and the minister of that day promised to keep the accounts separate just as he promised to keep a separate account of the Canada Eastern. The House is entitled to know from the minister what the expenditure on capital account on that road has been since it was purchased in 1898. Then we will be able to judge, outside of the mere statement of the minister, whether it has been found necessary to make only two improvements on the road. If I remember rightly when the road was taken over, there was a report from the Department of Railways and Canals in reference to the character of the road. The report from the department stated that there was one very heavy curve which it might be necessary to take out and to change the gradients on the ap-

proach to it. What amount of money have we expended on what has been alleged in the House was an entirely second-class road at the time of the purchase, and what expenditure have we made on capital account on that road up to the present day.

Mr. L. LAVERGNE. (Translation.) The hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Morin) does not know what he is talking about when he says the government have added three feet to the roadbed at St. Germain. That statement is entirely inaccurate. Nothing was done but to extend the yard so as to devote more space to the traffic which has considerably increased since the purchase of the Drummond by the government. In reference to Mitchell, at that place there is a dangerous curve and the government does very well in rectifying the error made at the time of the establishment of that line. I think it is incumbent upon the engineers in charge of the Intercolonial to see to it so as to prevent the accidents that might occur at that particular place, instead of waiting any longer. Far from deserving any blame, the government are entitled to our congratulations on account of the wise measures taken. Moreover, we must bear in mind that the Drummond brings a good revenue to the Intercolonial. If there is a division which covers all its expenses and yields profits, it is that of the Drummond. We must not be stingy about the necessary repairs in order to better accommodate the traffic in that part of the country and to protect the lives of the travelling public.

Mr. MORIN. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman (Mr. L. Lavergne) has spoken in French. I could reply in French; but I am going to reply in English. I have been talking about one thing and my hon. friend is talking about another. There it is. I stated to the House that the facts had been misrepresented in 1898, when the road was bought. That is what I said before, and that is what I say still. My hon. friend says that this place St. Germain is a grand place with a great traffic. I have not the least doubt about it; and I do not say a word against St. Germain. I am only talking about what the government then told the House. They told us that this was a first-class road, and that by buying it we would give the government a great chance to make money. They told us: We are going to have a through road from Halifax to Montreal, and it will be a grand help to the road we have now. Well, where is the grand help to-day? A deficit of a million dollars. How do you account for that? It only shows that that side of the House tried to blindfold this side in 1898, and they are trying to do it to-day; but they will not succeed. The proofs are there; the words that were spoken are there. And the money has been paid out—$1,600,000. That is what I said before, and that is what I say now; and I do not take one word back.

Mr. OSLER. The hon. minister (Mr. Emmerson), replying to me a moment ago, said it would be easy to get these figures showing the capital expenditure in connection with the Drummond County road. Will the hon. gentleman kindly furnish the figures so that we may have them before the matter is taken up again?

Mr. FOSTER. And I think that the minister, when bringing down that information, should bring down further information concerning which, no doubt, discussion will arise. It is possible for ministers to make statements in the House when bringing new schemes before parliament, which statements may not turn out to be true. Various reasons may be urged in excuse. But it is always an excellently good thing to sift these statements and promises made when a new scheme is brought before parliament and compare them with the actual results. That is what I think we ought to do now. We ought to know how far these statements made by the ministers when they were purchasing this road have been proven true. Now, not only were statements made with regard to the condition of the road—its grades and curves, and so on—but there was also a most important consideration in the way of traffic advantages that we were to gain from this purchase. Certainly parliament at that time would have taken a very different view of the question if they had been told that they were merely purchasing an extension for the Intercolonial Railway without any advantages in the way of interchange of freight and consequent increase of through traffic for the Intercolonial Railway. Statements were made as to the kind and amount of traffic that the Grand Trunk Railway were to hand over to the Intercolonial Railway, especially freight traffic. Has that forecast made by the ministry been realized? Has that agreement been carried out? I have had an opportunity to look over what is called the 'statement of the case' before the arbitrators, whose labours, I imagine, are just now about finished, as to the points in dispute between the Grand Trunk and the Intercolonial. And there can be no stronger condemnation of the promises made and statements put forth by the Minister of Railways and other members of the government in support of the proposed purchase of this railway, than the statement of the government a few years later, as to the absolute non-fulfilment of the conditions that form a part of the consideration paid for in the purchase of that road. If these statements are true—and at least they embody the view of the government on the subject—the non-diversion of freights is established. As to whether the Grand Trunk Railway can be held in damages is another matter. But no one can read this 'statement of the

case' and not be convinced that the results that were so rosily pictured and that were anticipated by the government, have not been realized. Consequently, the money of this country was paid for a consideration the country has never received. We did get the road. It certainly was not a first-class road. A large amount has been spent on capital account in order to make it a running road at all in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. That expense has to be borne. But we got none of the vast gathering of traffic from the west which was to be picked up by the Grand Trunk Railway system and handed over to the Intercolonial Railway. Instead of the promised delivery of traffic to our road, we have practically a systematic diversion of traffic carried out by the Grand Trunk, if the allegations of the government in these latter years are true—and I presume they are. Now, we must go into that question. We must hold the government responsible for the pretenses under which it makes a purchase with the people's money. We want to know exactly how their scheme has turned out. So I would like the minister to bring down a statement showing for each year what traffic has been transferred to the Intercolonial according to the agreements, we were told, had been made. Without going into details, the minister will know what we need, and will afford us such information on this subject as he has in his possession. My hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) was not responsible for this purchase. I do not know whether he would have recommended it if he had been minister at that time. It is well, for his sake, as well as for ours, that we should know just how things have turned out up to this date, and how we stand with reference to the Drummond County road and this promised transfer of traffic.

Mr. EMMERSON. The information asked for will be produced. I might say in this connection that the contract entered into in 1898 might very well have been a good contract, a justifiable contract, on the assumption that both parties to the agreement would carry out the promises made under it. I think parliament had a right to assume that the Grand Trunk Railway, in entering into a contract to do certain things, would, bona fide, fulfil their obligation. Upon that assumption, the contract could very well have been approved by parliament. And yet the contract may not have been fulfilled. The Grand Trunk may have failed to carry out its obligation in later years. That would not be a condemnation of the contract; rather would it be a reflection upon one of the parties to the contract who had obligated themselves to do certain things and failed to do them. However, that is neither here nor there.

Mr. FOSTER. That will appear better when we get the information.

Mr. EMMERSON. It can be discussed then, and we will be in a better position to determine whether it has been fulfilled, either in the letter or in the spirit.

Mr. OSLER. In reference to what the minister has just said, it was pointed out from this side of the House in the strongest manner possible when that contract was made, that the obligation on the part of the Grand Trunk was an obligation in word only, and that there was absolutely no reason to suppose that the contract was binding on the Grand Trunk.

Mr. EMMERSON. Lawyers differ.

Mr. OSLER. But the government took no step whatever to try to make that contract more binding; and if it has turned out as the opposition said it would, then the government are entirely to blame, as they knowingly entered into a contract with this grave defect in it.

Mr. EMMERSON. 'Wilfully and with malice afore thought.'

Mr. OSLER. If the minister says that, I will accept it—that they wilfully entered into a contract knowing there was a weakness on one side. It was not a bargain made between two parties who were anxious to effect a business transaction.

Increase of accommodation at Moncton, $110,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. Last year we voted $210,000, and we have expended $100,000 during the year, so this is a revote of $110,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How much altogether do you propose to expend down there?

Mr. EMMERSON. If it becomes necessary to build additions to the general offices at Moncton, the total, with what has been already expended, would amount to half a million dollars. That involves the enlargement of the machine shop and also erecting another shop, and putting a second story on the car shop. There are quite a number of large items. It also involves the purchase of additional land, some fifteen acres near the present station; it is between the north line and the line which runs to St. John. We are much cramped for room, and besides are expecting the entry of the Grand Trunk Pacific into the city of Moncton, which will make it necessary for the Intercolonial to acquire some of that land. My hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) who was Minister of Railways, must know that the purchase has been under consideration for some years, and now it will have to be effected.

Mr. FOSTER. What has been done to the general offices?

Mr. EMMERSON. If the work of the railway increases, there will have to be an-

other wing. Within two or three years we have furnished a third story. There is no elevator in the building. If it is not possible to add another story, we will have to build another wing. They are very much cramped for room now. I had an opportunity a few weeks ago of going through the building, and I certainly felt that, for sanitation purposes, the condition should not be allowed to continue—for that consideration alone, if for no other.

Mr. FOSTER. Bad drains?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, too many in a room.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that could be arranged without making any capital expenditure.

Mr. EMMERSON. Perhaps my hon. friend means to intimate that we might dispense with some of the officials there; it might be arranged in that way no doubt. But I think that is a proper capital expenditure on the road.

Mr. OSLER. Would it not be better to face this matter at once? We are year by year increasing the debt of the country, nominally, by increasing the capital expenditure on the Intercolonial. Let us wipe off the deficiency year by year and face it, else we will have a debt running up into a hundred millions, on only nominal assets of the country. We have been spending everything on this road out of capital, let us change the system so that the people may see exactly what it costs each year.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think there are other railways besides the Intercolonial that have to make expenditures on capital account, and to do so they have to come to parliament for power to issue additional stock. Since I have been in this parliament, although it has been but a few years, I have seen great railway corporations of the country coming here and asking for power to make betterments on their roads, construction, and improvements of their terminals, and improvements in their offices and their buildings. I think it is not an unusual thing for railways to do that, and it is not to be condemned, if it is necessary, even on the Intercolonial.

Mr. OSLER. The minister is quite right in that, but there is this difference, that these companies who come asking for power to increase their capital, have to go to the public to borrow it, and they could not borrow it unless they increased the capital to pay interest. But in this case there is no possibility that these expenditures are going to pay interest.

Mr. MORIN. The minister is quite right in what he says. But while some companies come here asking for changes in their Acts of incorporation, others come here and sell their roads out and out to the government. We have a sample in the Drummond County road and another in the Canada Eastern. Those people got rid of their roads, and got their money.

Mr. EMMERSON. They say they lost money by it.

Mr. CROCKET. I would ask the minister if it is the intention of the government to provide a new station for Fredericton? The station of the Canada Eastern in that city is entirely inadequate and unsuitable for a city of the importance of Fredericton. I may say also that the station of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Fredericton is not sufficient to meet the requirements of that community. I have heard it frequently suggested that the matter should be taken up by the Minister of Railways with the Canadian Pacific Railway, to see if some agreement could not be arrived at by which a union station could be provided for that city. I call the attention of the Minister of Railways to this matter so that he may give it his consideration.

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend will only square himself with my hon. friend who sits in front of him (Mr. Haggart), I think I may safely take that into consideration. But I do not want the Canada Eastern to earn the title of being a sink hole for expenditure, as it was alleged to be by the hon. member for Lanark. The purchase of the Canada Eastern has been so recent that I have not had time to consider making any serious betterments. The station that was used in connection with it at Fredericton has been of some service I think, but I am not personally aware whether or not it meets the requirements of the traffic. Of course, all these things have to be taken into consideration in connection with the road. I have felt that the Canada Eastern must in a measure work out its own salvation, and if the traffic on that road and the conditions prevailing on it justify improvements, they will be provided. But I have not ascertained yet that there is any great necessity of the immediate construction of a new station at Fredericton.

Mr. FOSTER. In reference to the minister's statement that part of this is to go towards expenses upon the general offices there, I would like to have from the hon. minister a very short statement as to the line which he draws between capital expenditure and expenditure out of current revenue as regards those different matters of construction along the Intercolonial Railway. In looking over the matter and from the discussions which have taken place here in the past, it would seem that there has been a very easy, if not a very excellent method of reducing deficits by charging to capital expenditure, when you have the country to draw upon, what ought properly to be paid for out of the current earnings of the railway. I know there is sometimes difficulty

in drawing an exact line between capital expenditure and expenditure out of current income, but there must be, and I believe there is, a pretty well defined line all along the course of railway construction,and maintenance and I would like to have the hon. minister give us the principle upon which he is now administering the road in that respect and also give to this committee some information as to the principle which is carried out by other railway corporations both in our own country and in the United States. The hon. minister will surely see that unless great care is taken in that respect there could be no fair statement made to the country, and no fair inference drawn as to the Intercolonial Railway in the matter of its expenses and its income and as to how it is being managed. From impressions which I have had I think a great many things are being charged to capital now which were not formerly charged to capital. However, it will open up way for a proper apprehension and subsequent criticism if the hon. minister will now state what the line is on each side of which he puts respectively capital and expenditure and expenditure chargeable to current revenue.

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very easy to lay down the rule which has been adopted, and I think fairly well followed on the Intercolonial Railway. It is recognized by all railway authorities that any expenditure to the extent to which it is a betterment of the railway is a fair charge against capital account. The creation of something which has not heretofore existed, some work in connection with the road which is necessary for its successful operation, any improvement in the matter of appliances, that is some appliance which has not heretofore been in existence in connection with the railway, I think constitutes a proper charge against capital account—anything which is not in substitution of something else. There may be a necessity on the railway of replacing something that existed—there are modifications to that rule—but to a certain extent that is not chargeable to capital account.

Mr. FOSTER. To what extent ? Give an instance.

Mr. EMMERSON. To the extent to which it is a non-existing improvement it may be chargeable to capital, but to the extent to which it is a substitution of something that has heretofore existed it will be fairly I think, a revenue charge. It is very difficult to define the exact line between the two.

Mr. FOSTER. For instance if the hon. gentleman were taking up 60-lb. rails and and putting down 90-lb. rails ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a difference. There has been a special rule and it has been followed in connection with that. That has been discussed in this House time and again. I am making a general statement as to the course which is followed. I think that when my hon. friends opposite were responsible for the Intercolonial Railway and since, there have been special expenditures chargeable to capital account which would not perhaps comply with the strict rule or come under the definition that I have referred to.

Mr. HAGGART. The remarks of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) open up a very nice question as to what should be charged to capital and what to revenue account. An extravagant minister, a minister who is lavish in expenditures,——

Mr. EMMERSON. That does not apply to me.

Mr. HAGGART. Not at all. There should be no capital account on the Intercolonial Railway from Montreal to Halifax or any portion of it as at present constituted. I am laying down a principle, not my own, but the principle of the leader of the Liberal government, Mr. Mackenzie, who contended that a capital account is only an excuse for bad management of the road. It is no use of making comparisons between the expenditures of one government and another. If a minister is allowed to charge things to capital account which otherwise will go into ordinary expenditures there is no limit to the extravagance which may take place. The idea of the hon. gentleman expending on a road which has been finished for nearly forty years a sum of money equal to nearly $4,000,000 a year for three or four years——

Mr. EMMERSON. It is only 30 years really since the northern division was opened up to Rivière du Loup.

Mr. HAGGART. Part of it was finished before confederation.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am speaking of the road, from Moncton to Rivière du Loup That was not opened up until 1875.

Mr. HAGGART. Never mind, about a year or two. The hon. gentleman is concerned about small matters. It is 40 years fully. This is 1905 and part of the Intercolonial Railway was running in 1865. Is that not 40 years?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is perfectly right, but I was speaking of the northern division to Moncton.

Mr. HAGGART. I was speaking of the Intercolonial Railway as constituted then and making a comparison with it as constituted now. Mr. Mackenzie said that there should be an end put to the capital account on the Intercolonial Railway. Yet, we have a capital account on a road that has been running from Montreal to Halifax for 40 years for the purpose of covering up expenditures for betterments on the road. You

will go down there and find perhaps $8,000,000 or $10,000,000 have been expended on improved facilities along the line, lengthening sidings, building sheds, and upon the smallest possible improvements and in order that the hon. gentleman may have a good showing in the House he charges these to capital account. The hon. gentleman says that these items were charged by the Conservative government in exactly be same manner. Let me tell him that when I was managing the concern such an expenditure as that at Moncton would be charged to ordinary revenue and not to capital account.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am afraid you did not know much about it, if you make that statement.

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman would have a little less of that nigger minstrel style in him and adopt a little seriousness it would add to the dignity of the proceedings and of the hon. gentleman. He has adopted that style a little too much lately and he must expect a lesson or two. He is hardly rightly seated in his position up to the present, and he is new to the proceedings of this House, but I can tell him that we have not been accustomed to that hitherto. We have been accustomed to seriousness in the debate and seriousness in answering questions, and not shifting it off in that easy, laughing, nigger minstrel style. I said that under the Conservative administration expenditures for renewing rails on the Intercolonial Railway and such like would be charged to ordinary revenue and not to capital account. That system was changed at the instance of the late Minister of Railways, and so there can be no fair comparison made between the management of the railroad under the Conservative government and its management under the Liberal government. The only real solution of the difficulty is that proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Osler) and that is, that it is high time that the capital account upon the Intercolonial Railway should be closed, so that the country may see at once what we are really expending on the operation of that road. It does not make much difference to those who know, how the thing is done because they can look at the expenditure on capital and the expenditure on revenue and tell at once how matters stand ; the present system only deceives the general public and it deceives them in their efforts to make a comparison of the management of the Intercolonial Railway as between the government and the late government.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is to be regretted I suppose that any criticism of mine should cause the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) to forget the ordinary courtesy that one member owes to another. No doubt I have a great deal to learn about the proceedings of this House as well as about all other matters, but I believe I will have to travel further than my hon. friend to seek a competent teacher, for I fear I can learn nothing from him. The hon. gentleman made the statement that it is 40 years since the Intercolonial Railway had been completed, and that the expenditures on it have been going on since. The Intercolonial did not come into existence as such until after the year 1871, and it was not completed between Truro and Rivière du Loup until the year 1876. Before that, there were in existence two railways : one known as the European and North American running between St. John and Shediac ; the other known as the Nova Scotia Railway running from Halifax to Truro and thence to Pictou. I made the statement, and I repeat it, that since it has been an Intercolonial railway there has been a uniform rule adopted as to the charging of expenditures either to capital account on the one hand or to revenue on the other. That rule has been followed ; and it is supposed to be in accordance with the standard laid down by railway experts. There may have been variations from time to time, but that is true under every administration of the Intercolonial. I ventured to call in question the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart), that when he administered the Intercolonial, if there were new car shops or new offices constructed at Moncton, the expenditure would be charged to revenue. What seems to have made him very angry, was my statement that he would not have given utterance to such an assertion if he were familiar with the transactions connected with the Intercolonial during his time. I speak whereof I know. I say that since it has been an Intercolonial such things as new car shops and new machinery for the construction of locomotives were charged to capital account.

Mr. HAGGART. Do I understand the minister to say that in my regime it was so charged ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. I deny it.

Mr. EMMERSON. Had I known that my hon. friend would have questioned this fact, I would have brought the proof ; the public accounts will show it clearly. But, this discussion takes place year after year and is somewhat academic, for, after all so far as the people of Canada are concerned, it is a question of bookkeeping. The bills have to be paid by the people of Canada, and whether the charge is made to capital account or to revenue account, it makes very little difference to them. Since I have been in the department, I have endeavoured to have the accounts appear as they really were. I am not afraid of deficits——

Mr. FOSTER. Evidently not.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am no more afraid of deficits, incurred on the Intercolonial, than were the gentlemen on the other side of the House afraid of deficits which were incurred on the canals of Canada. I recognize the true cause of deficits on the Intercolonial, and the people who are interested in carrying out the obligations assumed at confederation also recognize that cause. We all know that the deficits on the Intercolonial are charged against the maritime provinces. But, the International is surrounded by conditions which are peculiar to that railway and to its location. I would apologize for deficits that were due to unwarranted expenditure ; I would apologize for deficits that were due to extravagance ; but I am not going to apologize, I do not think there is any necessity for apologizing, for deficits that are due to causes over which I have no control, and to conditions which were connected with the Intercolonial when it was first established.

Mr. OSLER. I take issue with the minister when he says that this is an academic discussion; it is a most important discussion. The accounts of the Intercolonial Railway as rendered show that the amounts charged to capital account are to a very considerable extent amounts that would not be charged to capital account by any business railway. I am not going to grumble at the cost of the Intercolonial Railway to the country. It is necessary to this country that that railway should be operated, and operated efficiently, even if it be at a loss; but it is an absolutely wrong principle to charge up that loss year after year to capital account. Let the country see and realize exactly what this railway is costing; that is the proper and the honest way of rendering accounts. We are now face to face with a vaster problem than that of the Intercolonial Railway; we are face to face with the problem of the Transcontinental Railway fathered by this government ; we are face to face with the question whether, in connection with that railway, we shall face the true position as it may turn out, or try to fool the people by adding year after year to capital account what should be charged to maintenance account. This is a most serious question for this country, because we may find ourselves in a position with respect to that road in comparison with which the deficiency in connection with the Intercolonial may be a mere bagatelle. I think it is a recognized principle that the capital expenditure on a new road during the first ten years after it is opened equals the original cost; but after a road has been running for twenty years or more, and has reached the highest standard—and the Intercolonial is at a very high standard, in my judgment, after having travelled over it last year—all charges on it should go to expenses and should not be added to the public debt of this country. There are charged in this capital expenditure, amounts which no railway company, having to make a report to its shareholders, would dare to charge to capital account. I would like the minister to tell us the amount that has been expended on rolling stock, for instance and charged to capital account since 1896, also to give us a list of the rolling stock as it now exists, with a statement of its value; and I think we shall find that millions of dollars properly chargeable to revenue account, have been charged to capital account. I do not think the minister can point to a single railway report in the library which shows the same class of items as are contained in this list charged to capital account. This is a good time to bring this matter up, so that we may know how these charges are going to be made in connection with the Transcontinental Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. We have come to a point in reference to the Intercolonial Railway and its management which I think is somewhat of a crisis; and, so far as I am concerned, I propose to push the question until we get down to some settled system of making a balance sheet which will show the general results of the operation of that road. I take exception to one remark of the hon. minister, and I do it with all kindness to him. He says that it makes no difference whether you charge the expenditure on the road to capital account or to running expenses, that it is a mere matter of bookkeeping, and that in either the country has to pay. I take strong exception to that. It makes no difference, may be, so far as the total amount of money to be paid by the country in a single year is concerned; but it makes very great differences in other respects. If you are going to charge these expenditures to capital account just as it pleases you for the time being, and that becomes the practice, it tends inevitably to extravagance in the management of the road. The minister may be the best possible kind of a minister ; but so long as he can dip into the public till for expenditures of different kinds, with the tremendous pressure which is behind him—and no one knows that better than the minister himself—he will be met by regular appeal, what does it matter to you? Just charge that to capital expenditure, and it does not appear in the deficit. I say it has a most injurious effect, and it tends to extravagance which will increase from year to year. It has another effect. It not only tends to extravagance so far as the administration of the department by the minister is concerned, but it puts the whole business in a false light before the country, and tends to prevent the country from being aroused to the real facts of the case, and to the necessity of making its protest and its pressure for improvement. The country is not so apt to take into con-

sideration the capital expenditure upon a road as the difference between the running expenses and the current income. If, therefore, by this easy method, which is nothing more than bookkeeping, you can charge to capital that ought to go into current expenditure, and which would therefore swell the deficit, you prevent the people from knowing the real state of things and consequently prevent the remedy from being applied. Now, the Prime Minister, not once, but many times in the province of Ontario, if not elsewhere, made this statement in the course of the last election, that the Intercolonial Railway was an instance which would serve as a compleate warning to any government undertaking to operate a road under government ownership. He said that it never had paid, that no minister had been able to make it pay, which was not quite correct, so far as meeting the ordinary yearly expenses by the receipts was concerned. Of course, if you take interest into account, no minister ever made it pay.

He bethought himself just then that he would make a condemnation of his own ministers in that respect, and he gave the reason why; he said it was because it was managed under a vicious system. That was a very strong statement for the Prime Minister of a country to make, that an immense road, the operation of which involved millions of dollars of current expenditures and capital expenditures, was an unproductive road, and was in a state of constant and chronic deficit, because, forsooth, it was managed under a vicious system. The country has come to the point, I think, that it wishes to inquire into that system, and to see whether there is not a better one. It will certainly not be helped in that inquiry by a loose system of charging to capital expenditure what ought to go to current account, even although it would swell the deficit. There is another remark to which I wish to take exception. I notice that the minister of late has taken it into his head to make a ready answer to all allegations of large expenses and inadequate returns, as compared with other roads, by saying that it was never intended that the Intercolonial Railway should pay, that it was a road conceived under conditions which were not considered absolutely essential to a paying road; that it is a convenience for transportation and connection between outlying and distant provinces, and consequently is not to be treated as a commercial road. There is something in that argument, but it can be made too much of, and I think the minister is making too much of it in using it every time as a mitigation of large deficits and expenses. It is true there were deficits, but it is also true that it was never contemplated, and never need be contemplated, that the Intercolonial Railway, if well managed, would not be able to pay its current expenses and, at the same time, be run as an up-to-date railway. I have no doubt that the Intercolonial Railway, if it were run under a proper and not under a vicious system, would be able to pay its expenses from year to year, and conduct its business on the same lines as other great railways do with regard to capital and current expenditures. In one of the best years in a series of the best years Canada has had, during which all other railways are showing increased traffic and decreased expenses or, if not both of these, increased net profits year by year, here we have at the end of these prosperous years the Intercolonial Railway, which has been in operation for thirty years, with a settled road and a fine roadbed, with all its initial expenses paid, showing a larger deficit than it has ever had before. These are things that need to be taken up seriously by both sides. I am not finding fault with the officials of the railways; I believe that one of the good characteristics of the management of the road by my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) was that he largely threw the responsibility of management on the officers of the road, that he largely gave to them the power of employing as many men as they wished and no more than they wished, and of dismissing men who were inefficient. How is it to-day? We find the vicious system that the Prime Minister spoke of, this miserable system of patronage which, from the furthest end of the Intercolonial Railway until you get up to Montreal, is the bane and curse of that railway. I say that there is not a shadow of doubt in my mind, that if you were to put the management of that railway in the hands of a commission of men who were free from the annoyance and expense of partisan appointments, and were held responsible for the management of that road, the Intercolonial Railway could be made to pay. It cannot be made to pay under the present arrangement, under which, from end to end of the road, there is a constant fight carried on by outsiders to shove men into the service, and few ministers are strong enough to stand up against that pressure. These are matters to which I wish to call the minister's attention. They will be discussed in this House, and the country is in the mood for seeing them discussed and settled. I hope we will take hold of this subject, not so much by one making charges and another defending himself against the charges, but by sitting down together on both sides of the House trying if we cannot make the Intercolonial Railway a better road than it is, not so much in equipment of rolling stock and perfection of roadbed, as in the methods of management and the returns it makes to the country.

Mr. BARKER. I have in the last three or four sessions discussed the questions that have now been discussed by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler);

and I do not think that the long discussions we have had upon this subject of capital account were wholly without effect even upon the government. The hon. gentleman has told us this year that his loss in working the Intercolonial Railway was something near $1,000,000. That was dead loss to the country in the operation of the road at a time when all the other companies are working with very handsome profits. What I have contended year after year since I have had the honour of being in this House was that the government were so keeping the accounts of this government railway that it was absolutely impossible to compare the management under this government with the management of previous governments, and that it was even impossible to compare the management in one year under the present government with the management in another year. There ought not to be any difference whatever between the system of keeping the accounts of this government railway and the accounts of ordinary railway companies. If anything, the government should be more determined even than other companies to abolish, if possible, the capital account. Instead of the government doing that, it has been their policy year after year to avoid the fair responsibility for working expenses, and to make fictitious profits or reduce the actual losses of operation by what would be called hocussing the accounts if the same things were done by an ordinary corporation. I have on many occasions in this House had to call attention to the manner in which the rolling stock was maintained, and I am glad to say that during the past year the hon. gentleman who now is at the head of the department has done something to improve matters in that respect. I think that the account he has brought down, bad as it is, far as it is from being what it ought to be, is far better than, as regards rolling stock, it has been during the last five years. He has got back near to what the maintenance of rolling stock was under the administration of the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart). But the hon. gentleman has charged up to capital account, that is he has added to the debt of this country, the cost of 235 articles of rolling stock, from locomotives down to flat cars.

Now, while the hon. gentleman has done that, he has actually had dead stock that he ought to have repaired and put into service, charging the expenditure to working expenses, to a greater number than he bought at the cost of the country. At the end of the year he had 268 articles of rolling stock absolutely out of service, unfit for any use and not capable of repair, according to his own statement. With this number of all descriptions out of service, he buys an extra 235 and charges them up to the debt of the country. Now, what possible excuse can there be for anything of that kind? The hon. gentleman may say, perhaps, that a few of them would fall into decay or be broken up in the last few months of the year. But 119 of these were actually out during the whole year, and returned by him the previous year as being unserviceable and requiring to be rebuilt. He shows that on the face of his report. He starts with 585 out of service at the beginning of the year. He rebuilds 466, and the difference 119, he carries as dead stock, old lumber, for the whole twelve months not spending one dollar upon them. He is enabled to do that of course, because he has a splendid paymaster behind him, and charges the new stock to the debt of the country. What could exemplify more clearly the danger and folly of carrying out this system? It has been pointed out over and over again, and shown by the figures from the minister's report, that the predecessor of the hon. gentleman when, in certain years, he showed a small profit in the working of the railway, had he kept his accounts according to the ordinary system of companies, instead of a profit would have had a very large deficit. Yet, in the face of that fact, we had the Finance Minister telling the House and the country how gratifying it was to find that under the administration of this government the Intercolonial line, which had formerly been worked at a loss, was now a source of profit to the country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) is reaping some of the results of that course. He has had to go into the repairing of rolling stock. If these 585 articles of the rolling stock had been kept up as an ordinary railway company would have kept them up, the hon. gentleman would have been saved a large expenditure. But he has had to do this year more than his predecessor had to do in the same time. His predecessor would have made a very vigorous effort to show a profit instead of this loss of over a million dollars. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) himself has not had the backbone to face the situation, but has carried over 268 articles of rolling stock and replaced them with 235 at the expense of the country. I do not wish to spend time on this subject. The matter has been fully dealt with. All I say is that on a government railway every effort should be made—and I do not see any difficulty in carrying it out—to absolutely abolish the capital account. It has been laid down by many writers on railway subjects that the true principle is this: Once a railway undertaking is in operation, it should maintain itself, and, according as it succeeds or fails in doing that it is to be judged as a profitable or losing concern. It may be very difficult to carry that out in the case of a private corporation that has to borrow money from the banks and from the public and must sometimes yield to necessity. But there is no reason whatever why a great country like the Dominion of Canada should have to make any pretense in these matters.

If our great railway is failing to carry itself, why should not that fact be made known to the public? It may be said that in the east they do not desire to have a bad showing for the road at the end of the year. I think that is a mistake. I think, that, in the interest of the maritime provinces the actual working operations and conditions of the road should be shown. No person in the western provinces desires to interfere for a moment with the operation of the Intercolonial line. No one wants to look upon it as a drag upon the country. We recognize its usefulness; we know what its object was, and we are prepared to stand by it. But, in the interest of the country, in the interest of the maritime provinces themselves, whose people, I am sure, are just as anxious to see the accounts properly kept as we are, a change should be made. Therefore, I never had any hesitation, any more than I have at this moment, in criticising fairly what I think is wrong on the part of the government in the management of this road. And, with regard to this matter of rolling stock and other items that will come up presently, I say, unless the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) makes a reform in the keeping of the accounts we shall never know, during the existence of this government, what that road is earning or losing.

Mr. HENDERSON. I gladly add my opinion to those that have been expressed by hon. gentlemen within the last hour or so as to the mode of keeping the accounts of the Intercolonial line. I have never hesitated in this House, in years gone by, to declare that I thought the time had arrived, even with the public accounts of the Dominion of Canada, that there should be no capital account. There can be no question about it that throughout the country many people are misled as to the actual results of the financial operations of any particular year. Last year, we were told that we had a surplus of some sixteen and a half millions of dollars; and, doubtless, many people in the country believed that such a surplus actually existed. But the public accounts tell a very different story, when we put the two accounts together and compare our total revenue and our total expenditure. I hold that it is not treating the public fairly to keep the accounts any longer in this way, because there is doubtless a very great misapprehension in the mind of the general public. Now, if that applies to the Dominion of Canada, it applies with at least equal force to the Intercolonial Railway. There are many people who believe that in bygone years, more particularly under the regime of the present government, the Intercolonial was a paying institution, notwithstanding the fact that during the first five years of the present government that road actually cost the country some $13,000,000 more than the revenue derived from it.

I say that condition of things ought not to exist. It is the people's road, and the people ought to know without any doubt what it costs to operate the road. I heartily approve the sentiments expressed here today, that some change ought to be made in the system of keeping the accounts of this road. At any rate, the public should be made aware at the end of every financial year exactly how much the road has cost, all told, more than the revenue derived from it. I am not one of those who want the Intercolonial to be a money-making institution for the country, I do not consider that is the purpose of public works. We do not expect to get profit from our canals, we do not expect to get profit out of the expenditure we make on the St. Lawrence river and other rivers, or out of the many harbours that we dredge and spend public money on—we do not expect to get a direct profit; the profit comes in an indirect way, and the same with the Intercolonial. It is the people's road, it is there for a purpose, and as long as it accomplishes that purpose without a loss to the country, I think the country will be satisfied. But the country will not be satisfied to find out in after years that we are loaded up with many millions of addition to our public debt on account of the operations on this road, when from time to time and from year to year they were given to understand that a surplus had been earned by the road. I trust the minister will give consideration to this question. I will hail with delight the time when a change will be made in the whole system, and when the people of this country who own that road shall know each year what the road is costing over and above the earnings. In no other way do I believe that the expenditure will be brought within the revenue. I think a change of system in the book-keeping on that road would be the first means of drawing attention to it and bringing the cost of maintenance within the scope of the revenue derived from the earnings of the road.

Drummondville—improvements at, $23,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the improvements at Drummondville?

Mr. EMMERSON. A new station, a platform, the purchase of land, and converting the present station into a freight shed. It is also required to put in a tank there, and we want additional sidings.

Mr. FOSTER. Now would the minister in this case, as a sample of what he ought to do in every case, read the details of the estimate, how much for each thing that is going to be done?

Mr. EMMERSON. Station and platform, $12,500; land, $2,000; extension and making new engine-house to meet additional sized engines, $1,500; freight shed, $1,500; building a tank, $5,500; electric wiring,

$500; additional sidings and cost of engineering, $4,500, making in all $28,000. We estimate the expenditure made this year at $5,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the cost of engineering?

Mr. EMMERSON. The whole cost of engineering, with advertising and inspecting, $1,500, leaving a balance of $23,000, $11,000 of which is a revote.

Mr. FOSTER. What have you there now?

Mr. EMMERSON. We have an old station that we have to abandon, but it will be used as a freight shed. We have to build a new station and acquire land for it.

Mr. OSLER. Surely charging a new tank to capital is going too far.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not replacing one.

Mr. TAYLOR. Among the improvements that ought to be made at Drummondville, I think the hon. gentleman ought to either put in an improved system of switches, or to have better attendance. I was coming up on the 'Ocean Limited' in August last, and we stopped at Drummondville station. I was on the last car on the train, a pullman, and I stepped out on the platform and walked along in front of the train, thinking that when it started off I would jump on a forward car. I did so, and passed through the train, and as I stepped on to the last car on the train I noticed a switch and an engine standing on it. The switchman threw the switch too soon, with the result that the front trucks kept on the main line, but the hind trucks took the siding and came into collision with the engine. The car I was on, broke loose from the others and stopped instantly, and threw me out fully fifteen feet on my head in the ditch, injuring me considerably. I think that either the management of the switch was very bad, or there was a bad switch. I never brought it to the attention of the minister before; but I was so badly injured that two or three accident insurance companies I was in had to pay compensation for the time I was laid up. I think the management of the Intercolonial ought to handle its passengers better than that. Besides, there was the severe damage that was done to the pullman car that struck the engine. I do not know whether the circumstances were ever brought to the knowledge of the minister.

Now I want to say in reference to keeping the accounts of the Intercolonial, that if any business concern in this country—and this government is supposed to be a business government and to do business on business principles—if any manufacturing concern, of which we have hundreds in this country, if the president of any manufacturing concern were to come down to his shareholders with such a statement as the minister has just given the House, he would lose his job in twenty-four hours. Every manufacturing concern in the country shows a statement every year, there is a property account and a machinery account, showing the cost of running that machinery during the year. The repairs made to it, and so forth are not charged to the machinery account, they are always charged to the expense account, as it should be on the Intercolonial Railway; running expenses, wear and tear, all ought to be paid out of current expense. What will the capital account amount to now?—three or four times the value of the road, or the amount that a similar plant could be erected for to-day, because it has been the practice, and it is more so to-day than ever before, to charge every expenditure up to capital account. Business concerns keep their machinery in perfect running order from year to year, and in their annual report it is stated that their machinery is being kept in first-class condition and that the cost is being charged to current expenses. Then, if a business concern has profits there is a credit to wear and tear of machinery against that account every year. It ought to be the same way on the Intercolonial Railway. If you have earnings you should credit something for the depreciation of property every year. That is done by every business concern in the country.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman means a charge instead of a credit. So much depreciation of property should be charged up against the profits.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is credited to the machinery account. The machinery account is reduced in value ten per cent every year and charged to profit and loss.

Mr. EMMERSON. The result is the same.

Mr. TAYLOR. But the hon. minister does not take the expenditure out of current revenue, but charges it to capital as he has done at Drummondville in connection with the building of a new platform when there is already a good platform there. I notice in the estimates an item for new machinery for locomotive and car shops. This is the ordinary machinery required to repair something that has gone out of order, yet, it is charged to capital account.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can explain that to my hon. friend.

Mr. TAYLOR. In addition, I find semaphores charged to capital account and the replacing of a building which has been worn out in the service is also charged to capital account. There surely ought to be something taken out of current expenditure to replace a building and to replace ordinary rolling stock. This is a matter to which my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) referred a short time ago. A lot of new cars were bought to replace old ones which had been worn out in the service and they were

charged to capital account. I do not think it is in accordance with business principles to allow expenditures that ought to be chargeable to ordinary expenditure to be charged to capital account. These expenditures should be charged to capital account so as to let the people know at once how much this road is losing for them. If that were done the people of this country would soon say : Let us try running this road without a political head. Let us put it in the hands of a commission and run it on business principles. I do not know that the tariff of rates should be as high as those on other railways, although it is pretty high. I am a large shipper over that road down through that eastern country, and I find they charge good rates going down, whatever they may be coming up. Let the rates be fixed at a price to pay running expenses if they do not pay interest, but certainly the accounts, should be kept in a different manner.

Mr. FOSTER. In this case where you make a freight shed out of an old station do you charge the making of the change to capital account ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, because the other building is still in existence as part of a capital investment and this is a new station, something that they have not had before. They have not had facilities there.

Mr. FOSTER. But, you have a station there now and you are going to build a new station.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a freight shed now. There has been no such thing previously.

Mr. FOSTER. You called it a station.

Mr. EMMERSON. It was a so called.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, you are going to make some little changes in the station and call it a freight shed.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, it is absolutely a new station.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not talking of the station. I am talking of the freight shed.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is to be converted into a freight shed.

Mr. FOSTER. You say it is a freight shed now.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, it is a building that has been utilized as a station. We are going to utilize it as a freight shed.

Mr. FOSTER. How much work are you going to do on it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is very little work to be done on it.

Mr. FOSTER. And yet you charge that to capital ?

An hon. MEMBER. Do they charge a door knob to capital ?

Mr. FOSTER. Do they charge a door knob to capital ? Yes. Why, they charge for renewing a portion of a partition simply in some of the offices in Moncton. I am making a list. I will have a very interesting list when we take up this discussion again. Items of $7.50, $4 and $5 for little things that are necessary improvements are all zealously charged to capital account, small in themselves, but in the whole going up to tens of thousands of dollars.

Mr. EMMERSON. The machinery referred to by my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) is machinery that is required for the construction of engines. A session or two ago the hon. gentleman who was then the member for Jacques Cartier and who to-day represents that constituency (Mr. Monk) pointed out, that it would be in the interest of economy on the Intercolonial Railway that locomotives should be constructed, and he advised, and at that time the committee advised, that the work should be extended so that they could with facility and under economical conditions construct locomotives. In accordance with that idea a new erecting shop is about being constructed and new machinery to equip it is being furnished. This vote includes these provisions.

Mr. FOSTER. Here is another sample I have just got hold of. There was a baggage-room somewhere. It had been in use, I do not know how long, but it came to be necessary to remove that baggage-room a little way and they charged that moving, costing a few dollars, to capital account.

Mr. EMMERSON. Where was that ?

Mr. FOSTER. I will find out where that was.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the hon. minister to give the committee the benefit of his experience in respect to the manufacture of locomotives and cars under the management of the Intercolonial Railway as compared with those that have been purchased elsewhere.

Mr. EMMERSON. The year before last three or four locomotives were turned out from the workshops at Moncton. I have understood, and I make this statement on the authority of the practical men who run these locomotives, the locomotive engineers themselves, that they are really a class of locomotives superior to any that have been purchased either in Canada or out of it. That may be a natural prejudice on the part of the men in favour of the products of the Intercolonial workshops, but it is the testimony—given for what it is worth—of the employees of the road who are locomotive engineers. I have heard machinists say the same thing and these locomotives

are of a very superior class as I believe. They are very durable. They have a number of locomotives on the Intercolonial Railway that have seen pretty hard service, that have been in use for years and they are said to have proved the durability of the work that has been done there. They do not make any new cars as far as I am aware. They reconstruct them and in this connection I will deal with the question raised by my hon. friend for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) and I will be able to place him in possession of more information in connection with these operations. But, I think I can fairly say that during the past year there has been more of that reconstruction work in the workshops at Moncton and elsewhere on the Intercolonial Railway than has ever before been the case, and that increased efforts are being made in that direction.

Mr. BARKER. I said so in regard to the last four or five years.

Mr. EMMERSON. When another item is reached I will be able to furnish my hon. friend with additional data to confirm him in his judgment.

Mr. FOSTER. To what account are the wages charged when you replace light rails with heavier rails.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am told they are charged to revenue.

Mr. BLAIN. Were these four locomotives constructed at Moncton, built as cheaply as locomotives of the same kind and capacity could be purchased outside ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Until the past couple of years I do not think there was a strict account kept of the cost of each particular locomotive. Under the present administration of the mechanical department, I understand that such is being done. There have been no locomotives constructed during the past year, so that we have no record to go by. I have been informed by the superintendent of motive power, that engines can be built at Moncton as cheaply as they can be purchased elsewhere. Of course I am speaking generally, and I do not say that that takes into account interest on the expenditure for shops and machinery. My statement is simply from a conversation which took place on this very point, and I would not wish to be bound to exact data in that respect.

Mr. OSLER. What is the capacity of these shops ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have explained that all the parts were not constructed at Moncton because we did not have the necessary machinery. Certain parts of the locomotives were purchased and brought to Moncton, but it is now proposed to get machinery to enable us to construct practically everything that goes into a locomotive.

Mr. OSLER. How many engines a year will you turn out ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We probably cannot turn out very many, but this machinery will enable us to begin.

Mr. OSLER. To expend money for the purpose of erecting shops with the idea of experimenting on turning out four or five engines a year is an absolute waste of money.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is the abstract truth, but I may say that we have large shops at Moncton, and while we are not going into the business of constructing locomotives, yet we intend to have machinery which will enable us to do all kinds of repairing. Incidentally, when the men are not engaged in repairing work their time can be devoted to the construction of new locomotives. I do not think it would pay to put up a shop for the construction of locomotives, especially when these shops would only have a limited capacity, but I do believe it would pay to do all our repairing and incidentally to construct locomotives.

Mr. OSLER. It will not pay to build them in any shape or way.

Mr. BLAIN. This expenditure is not in the interests of the people. It ought to be the policy of the government to establish a complete repair shop, manned to meet the requirements of the road, but to speak of purchasing machinery to enable men not otherwise engaged to produce new locomotives is a thing that no successful business man would think of. When the minister asked for this vote of $92,000 he surely must have had some carefully considered plan, and he should be able to tell us what results can be obtained from such an expenditure. Is it the intention of the government to commence the manufacturing of locomotives.

Mr. EMMERSON. I thought I made myself understood. It is not necessary for us to commence the building of locomotives. We have been building them, and it is proposed to continue, and incidentally to utilize the machinery which is absolutely necessary for the economical repairing of engines.

Mr. BARKER. With regard to the four locomotives which the minister said he had constructed, were they constructed on revenue account or on capital account ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They were constructed on revenue account.

Mr. BARKER. Then I presume the hon. gentleman is not able to give us the exact cost of these ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Oh, no.

Mr. BARKER. And there are no means by which we can ascertain whether the locomotives are being expensively built as

compared with the cost of purchasing or not ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, only a general statement.

Intercolonial Railway—increased accommodation at Antigonish, $9,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is a revote. Last session $14,000 was voted for a new station. The total cost of the work will be $14,000.

Intercolonial Railway—improvements at Newcastle, $25,500.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a new vote, and we want a full explanation of it.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is for an enlargement of the engine house to meet the necessities in connection with the new locomotives.

Mr. BARKER. How many additional stalls ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There are eighteen stalls. This does not increase their number, but it lengthens them to enable us to accommodate the new and enlarged engines.

Mr. BARKER. How much does the hon. gentleman propose to use in enlarging the engine house ?

Mr. EMMERSON. $20,000. We propose also to put in a water service at a cost of $4,000, and the cost of engineering inspection is $1,500, making a total of $25,500.

Mr. OSLER. Are these charges in connection with your own men on the railway ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We have engineers employed in connection with capital expenditure.

Mr. OSLER. Will this be let by contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. OSLER. What is the cost of the engineering ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not given separately in the details furnished to me, but I am told that it is between $400 and $500.

Mr. OSLER. On almost every item which has been under discussion this afternoon, there is a considerable charge for engineering. I would like to know what engineers these are ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We have on the Intercolonial Railway what are called construction engineers. They are not connected with the maintenance of way engineering department ; but construction work required anywhere on the line or on the Prince Edward Island Railway is done under their supervision, and the time expended by them in connection with each work is chargeable to that work.

Mr. OSLER. How many such engineers have you employed, are they on the permanent list, and if so will you give us their names ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Including the draughtsmen there are about ten.

Mr. OSLER. If there are ten on new construction work, I think we are entitled to know their names and the salaries paid to them.

Mr. FOSTER. And where they are stationed.

Mr. EMMERSON. The headquarters of all of them are at Moncton.

Mr. OSLER. We would like to know what their pay is and under whose supervision they are.

Mr. EMMERSON. They are under the supervision of Mr. W. B. Mackenzie, the chief engineer, and comprise his staff. Some of them are draughting engineers, others are those who go out and supervise construction, make surveys and examinations. They are really a permanent staff. Their salary is apportioned and charged up against each particular work in proportion to the amount of time these officers spend on it. That system has been in vogue for a long time.

Mr. OSLER. They are appointed by the chief engineer ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think most of them have been there for years. I do not know who made the appointments, I know that I have made none ; the staff was there when I went into the department. The members of the staff are :

W. B. Mackenzie	$3,000 00
A. C. Selig	1,400 00
R. W. Simpson	1,540 00
John Forbes	1,570 00
F. Beauleau	900 00
J. E. Brouseau	900 00
E. C. Cook	1,080 00
R. A. Frechette	1,080 00
M. McKean	1,080 00
A. Sincennes	960 00
A. G. Tapley	800 00
R. T. Wilkes	960 00

Mr. OSLER. Then each year about $15,500 of salary is charged to capital account ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. OSLER. They are all charged to capital account whether there is any work done or not ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I can assure my hon. friend that they are all at work. I personally know that.

Campbellton—improvements at, $12,000.

Mr. BARKER. That is a new vote.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, that is a new item. We are putting in there an ash conveyor, to cost $1,000 ; a sand drying apparatus and building, at a cost of $2,000 ; an extension of the water supply to cost $3,000, and we are putting up a building

for express and baggage and conductors that will cost $3,000 ; a freight shed, $1,500, and a building for car inspector to cost $300. Here comes in again the engineering item of $1,200, making a total of $12,000.

Mr. OSLER. It appears to me that the total of the amounts voted in this way for engineering in the different items come to more than the $15,500 for salaries.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not all for engineers ; it includes the inspection work. There has to be an inspector on all these works employed by the day. The specifications are prepared, the plans are all made and it is advertised ; the contract is entered into, and the inspector employed and is paid per diem.

Mr. BARKER. Is he a regular officer of the department ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, generally we employ some skilled man, usually in the community.

Mr. BARKER. As a rule, it is somebody who has had experience in that line. He may be a friend of the contractor if he is a local man.

Mr. EMMERSON. We generally succeed in avoiding that.

Mr. BARKER. The man who gets the contract is generally a friend of the government, and I presume the inspector is too.

Mr. EMMERSON. As a rule, the local men do not get the contract. I do not know how it is, but not in one case in fifty does a local man get the contract.

Mr. OSLER. Why does the hon. minister employ inspectors for this work when he has his own staff of engineers ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We want a man there by the day.

Mr. OSLER. But the minister has his own staff. Why, then, should he employ an outsider ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Because it is absolutely necessary. You would not want to have an engineer from Moncton on each of these works and staying on the work from early morning until night. We want a man who is a practical, skilled man, a man with knowledge of the actual work. He stands over the contractor and sees to it that the specifications are carried out.

Mr. OSLER. Pretty expensive men.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think it pays.

Intercolonial Railway—diversion of public road to eliminate a crossing at rail-level between St. Cyrille and Drummondville, $500.

Mr. MORIN. How about this crossing?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is a re-vote. The work is done under arrangements entered into with the municipality to change the roadway. It is a saving to the railway.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the municipality pay part?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Intercolonial Railway—additional sidings and spur lines, $135,800.

Mr. BARKER. I think we must ask the minister to give us detailed information about this, and I doubt whether he would be able to do it now.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can hardly do it before six o'clock.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Intercolonial Railway—additional sidings and spur lines, $135,800.

Mr. BARKER. I would ask the minister, with regard to this item and all similar items, to give us as minute details as possible. We want to know where the sidings are to be constructed, and we want to know it, I may tell the minister, for this purpose : Eighteen months or two years hence we will be discussing the expenditures now authorized, and whoever will occupy our seats at that time will want to be able to refer to what the minister says to-day of the purposes for which he asks this money. I would like him, therefore, to tell us what sidings he proposes to construct, where they are, and the amount for each.

Mr. EMMERSON. Hon. members will see that last year we had a vote of $23,700 for spur lines, aside from the sidings. Now this year we have combined the two. There is required for a spur line from Fort Lawrence, in Cumberland county, to the government wharf, estimated to cost $15,000, it is 1·23 miles in length. We will require a spur line west of Rivière Ouelle which is estimated to cost $8,000, and is 1:45 miles long. We will require a spur line at Trois Pistoles, estimated to cost $16,500, length 2½ miles. We will require an extension of sidings at Jefferson's, to cost $1,000.

Mr. BARKER. What is the length ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We have not got the length, it is an extension.

Mr. BARKER. That is just one of the particulars we desire. You have a siding there now, we want to know how much you are going to add to it.

Mr. EMMERSON. We want to extend that siding in order to accommodate the longer trains we are now hauling over the Intercolonial.

Mr. BARKER. How many feet ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not here the length of these sidings.

Mr. BARKER. I would point out to the minister that before he authorized the application for this $1,000 to His Excellency the Governor in Council, the minister must have satisfied himself from the officials of his department that it was required. Now we want to know that, because we have been going on year after year authorizing millions of money for this road, and we have come to the conclusion it is about time a little effort were made, on the part of the opposition at all events, to know just what the money is wanted for.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am endeavouring to give that information. It is a mere matter of the extension of a siding. On the advice of the engineers, I authorized it to be put in the estimates, relying upon the accuracy of their judgment and their bona fides as to the estimated cost. It could not be expected of me that I would be able to judge personally as to whether their figures were correct, even though an exact limit were given. I hardly think it would be expected of me to figure out and compute in all circumstances, the exact cost. They make their report, and they say a certain amount of money is required for an extension of a siding. They state that the siding at Jefferson's will cost $1,000.

Mr. BARKER. Will the minister allow me to interrupt him ? What we object to, and what we have been continually objecting to for three or four years, is that the minister of the department—I am not finding fault only with the present minister—has asked for $150,000 or $135,000, as the case may be, for a lot of sidings. He may spend $500 on one siding, on this one for instance, instead of $1,000 and then, if he pleases, he may spend the other $500 on some other siding that he has not been authorized to spend it upon. We want to know exactly what is wanted for these sidings, how many feet the extension of each is and all about them.

Mr. EMMERSON. As far as the money that is appropriated now is concerned, the money in each particular item is applied to that item. It is not diverted. We discussed this matter last year, the items were gone over in detail and I have required this year a specific statement as to the cost of each particular extension of a siding. I have not asked particularly for the information as to the length. I suppose I might have done that. But, each particular item asked for, the details of which I am endeavouring to give, is for the particular work named and is to be applied to that particular work.

Mr. BARKER. I think we are entitled to know the length, but I do not wish to delay matters. I understand the hon. minister now to say to us that this vote of $1,000 is appropriated specifically to Jefferson's siding, and that if it is not used for that purpose it will not be used for any other purpose.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, it will not be.

Mr. BARKER. So that the Auditor General will be governed accordingly. The hon. minister will recollect the reason why I make the point. Two or three years ago money granted in bulk was taken by the minister of the day and used for purposes quite outside of the vote. The Auditor General then said that he thought it was wrong, but if the hon. minister puts himself on record now that this $1,000, if not used for this purpose, shall not be used for any other purpose, I am content.

Mr. EMMERSON. Certainly, we discussed the matter and I remember my hon. friend taking the same ground last year that he takes now. I was quite in accord with him and at that time in the supplementary estimates there were more particulars given in reference to these sidings than had been given in the main estimates. I had nothing to do with the preparation of the main estimates last year, but this year in preparing the main estimates particular amounts were assigned to the particular works for which they are asked and they will be so applied. At Monastery, there is to be an extension of the loading siding which is estimated to cost $300. At South River a loading siding is estimated to cost $800. Between New Glasgow and Woodburn there is a crossing siding required that will cost $3,500. At Pictou Landing, opposite the town of Pictou, there is a siding in connection with the shipments of coal which will cost $4,000.

Mr. BARKER. Why should that not be a specific grant ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, with the view of not multiplying the number of resolutions in the estimates, I have grouped these together in such a way that there will not be such a mass of detail or such a number of specific items as there otherwise would be.

Mr. BARKER. That is another point, if the hon. minister will allow me, that we called attention to last year. The hon. gentleman, for instance, in these preliminary estimates—I presume they are only a small part of what we will ultimately have before us—is asking for $2,676,000 in about three quarters of a page. The saving of a page or two of printing may be very important to the hon. minister, but it strikes me that if a little more expenditure was devoted to printing, say, about two pages more in these estimates, thus giving us such a detail as $4,000 for the siding at Pictou, it would be somewhat to the public advantage. I call

the hon. gentleman's attention to his own estimates in the canal department, because the hon. gentleman there does not object to giving us an item of $500, or $600. He takes up three or four pages with those estimates.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have in these given an item of $500.

Mr. BARKER. I know, but here are the whole estimates amounting to $2,676,000 given in about three quarters of a page. He cannot help what is past, but I appeal to the hon. gentleman that this point will not be overlooked in the preparation of the supplementary estimates. He knows exactly what I am driving at. He knows what has been said year after year here, and I ask him to be a little more specific in these things. It does not add any appreciable amount to the expense of printing. The cost of printing is nothing to the cost of the time that we spend in discussing the matter here and which would be saved if he would give us some details in these estimates.

Mr. EMMERSON. I had in view the idea of saving a little of the time of the committee in preparing the estimates in this way. I see what my hon. friend contends for. Then, there is the Glengarry loading siding which is estimated to cost $500. At Windsor Junction we want additional sidings and these will cost $10,500. Windsor Junction is the point where the Dominion Atlantic connects with the Windsor Branch Railway which is part of the Intercolonial Railway system and also connects with the Midland Railway which runs through the counties of Hants and Colchester to Truro.

Mr. BARKER. Will the hon. minister allow me to use that illustration to show what I mean ? He is asking for a vote of $135,800 of which he proposes to spend $10,500 for sidings at Windsor Junction. Gentleman from New Brunswick or Nova Scotia taking up these Intercolonial estimates and seeing that item of $135,800 cannot give any of us the slightest information, but if they were so set out as to show these items of $10,500 for sidings at Windsor Junction, $4,000 for a siding at Pictou and $500 for the Glengarry loading siding, these gentlemen would tell us at once that these were all right or the opposite as the case might be. I think some hon. gentleman told us last year that it cost us $28 a minute to carry on the proceedings of the House. We lose five minutes discussing a question of $500 when, if these estimates were printed in a little more detail, all these items might pass without observation.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think I would be willing to make almost any sacrifice of principle in order to save the time of the committee.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to say that the hon. minister has given us a number of sidings that he is asking $59,500 to construct. He has $19,700 more than he wants, but he does not tell us how many sidings he proposes to construct with that money. The engineer, and in some cases the roadmaster, is sent out to make a report on the extent of the siding needed and its probable cost, and the railway authorities must have that information. Unless the House gets it we cannot know what the minister is doing with the money. We should know how many feet will be built each year, or else it would be quite possible to take this money and devote it to some other purpose.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will give the details. At Enfield, extension of siding, $200 ; Oxford junction, additional siding and loading ground, $7,000 ; Springhill junction, additional siding, $7,000 ; Aulac, loading siding, $1,000 ; Bloomfield, extending crossing siding, $1,500 ; Penobsquis, extending crossing siding, $4,000 ; Catamount, extension of siding, $200 ; O'Brien's crossing, three miles west of Beaver Brook, siding, $500 ; at a point two miles west of Bartibogue, siding, $500 ; at Bentpoint, crossing, siding, $4,000 ; at Beresford, extension of loading siding, $4,900 ; Dalhousie junction, extension of siding, $700 ; Flat Lands, crossing siding, $4,000 ; Causapscal, extension of siding and crossing siding, $4,400 ; Amqui, loading siding, $500 ; Cedar Hall extension of siding, $600 ; top of grade west of St. Moise, siding, $2,700 ; at Kempt, loading siding, $1,250 ; Rimouski wharf, branch siding, $500 ; Sacre Cœur, extension of siding, $1,500 ; top of the grade west of Bic, crossing siding, $3,000 ; St. Fabien, extension crossing siding, $2,000 ; St. Cimon, extension of loading siding, $750 ; St. Arsene, extension crossing siding, $500 ; Rivière du Loup wharf, branch siding, $4,000 ; Old Lake road, crossing siding, $4,000 ; St. Andre, extension of crossing siding, $1,200 ; Ste. Louise, extension of crossing siding, $1,250 ; Elgin road, extension crossing siding, $500 ; St. Jean, Port Joli, $1,200 ; Trois Saumons, $600 ; L'Islet, siding, $3,500 ; Cap St. Ignac, construction of a 'Y,' $2,500 ; St. Francois, extension of crossing siding and loading siding, $1,500 ; St. Henri junction, crossing siding, $3,500 ; siding for transferring cars from Intercolonial Railway to Quebec Central Railway, $500 ; St. Jean Chrysostôme, extension of loading siding and filling for loading ground, $1,500 ; Chaudière, curve siding, $500 ; St. Nicolas, siding, $500 ; Nicolet, siding, $1,100 ; Carmel, to extend loading siding, $1,500 ; contingencies covering items of engineering, &c., $7,950.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman has about forty-five items running from $500 to $18,000, and I am quite sure that he will see that there is very little use in the opposition criticising these estimates unless the gentlemen who represent the districts affected

have an opportunity of knowing what the proposed expenditures are. If we had in the estimates these particulars which the hon. gentleman has read in about fifteen minutes, they could have been given in about a quarter of a page. We would then have had the information in regard to every one of these items, and we would have known whether they were proper items from our point of view, or whether there was anything to criticise in them. As it is, we come here and have about one minute's consideration to give to each item. We cannot do our duty in criticising the estimates, and we may occupy time which is valuable and costly. The hon. gentleman will expend in a discussion of this kind more money than would build one of these short sidings.

Mr. INGRAM. It is unfair to expect this side of the House to approve of this vote with the limited amount of information which is given us. The minister might as well offer no information to the House at all. Every year similar votes are asked for. I think the parties who have recommended the construction of these sidings should have stated the number of feet to be constructed, and the supposed cost. If we had that information, the report of the minister of the following year would tell us exactly what had been done. Otherwise, we are in the dark, and the hon. minister might as well expect these items to go through without offering any information. I for one protest against it.

Mr. EMMERSON. The items are purely departmental, recommended by the engineer and the management of the Intercolonial, and I thought I would save the time of the committee by having them grouped together.

Mr. INGRAM. I think I can figure out exactly how these items have come to be placed in the hon. gentleman's estimates. Supporters of the government through whose constituencies this railway runs, go to the department and say, it is necessary, in order to meet the requirements of this particular district, that the sidings should be extended. The railway officials in the department ask: What will it cost? The answer is that it will cost $1,000, $2,000, $3,000, or $4,000, as the case may be. The item is recommended to Council, and it appears in the hon. gentleman's estimates, and when he is asked for the information in this House, he is not able to give it, because I venture to say that his officers have not figured out the number of feet or the estimated cost of the siding. That is the way it occurs to me that these items have been placed in the hon. gentleman's estimates; because if the engineer asked for any of these sidings, he would state the number of feet and give the estimated cost in a businesslike way. In one instance, where $59,000 is to be expended, the hon. gentleman has told us the number of feet; but in another case where he is going to spend double that amount, he cannot tell us the number of feet. There is not a railway company in America that would make a proposition of that kind to its directors without giving the particulars.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend has drawn on his imagination. I do not know what weight any assurance I could give to my hon. friend would have, but I can only say to him, and I say it with a full knowledge of all that my words import, that there is not a single item of all these sidings mentioned here that has been the subject matter of any representative of a constituency going to the officials and making representations in the way my hon. friend has described. More than that, there is not a single siding that has not been surveyed and been the subject matter of inquiry by the officials themselves; and I have no doubt that all these details as to the length of each siding are in the possession of the engineers. I have said very frankly that I have not that, that I had not asked for it; because, relying upon the reports of the engineers that a certain siding was required and that it would cost so much, I authorized the vote for it to be placed in the estimates. I am quite sure that was the case with all these items.

Mr. BARKER. Will the hon. minister be able to give us the lengths of these various sidings if we allow the item to stand until to-morrow?

Mr. EMMERSON. I would have to send to Moncton for that. I will furnish that information afterwards in connection with some supplementary estimates, so that it can be placed in 'Hansard.'

Intercolonial Railway—station at St. Moise, $2,300.

Mr. BARKER. When there are several items for the one place, as at St. Moise, they should be all placed together.

Mr. EMMERSON. This work is west of St. Moïse station.

Mr. INGRAM. How large a place is this?

Mr. EMMERSON. St. Moïse is a summer resort on the lower St. Lawrence, a growing place.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the population?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know the exact population, but I know that this station serves a very large back country. It is not simply the cluster of houses around the station that is to be considered, but the amount of traffic that is assembled there from the surrounding districts.

Mr. INGRAM. I think this is another case in which the minister is drawing on his imagination.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am familiar with the place; I have been there.

Mr. INGRAM. A freight shed was moved and extended there last year on which you spent $3,500; now you propose to spend $2,300. That is $5,800 at this very important place as the minister says, drawing on his imagination.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am open to all kinds of charges, but I do not want to be charged with drawing on my imagination when I have given the facts with respect to any one of these votes. There is a dwelling for the agent, which is necessary to have, and which will cost $1,000. There is also a station which is to cost $3,500 and grading and contingencies will cost $1,300, making $5,800. We have an appropriation for the current year of $3,500, leaving $2,300 to be voted for 1905-6.

Increased accommodation at Memramcook, $4,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. There was a vote last year for this.

Mr. BARKER. You are adding $3,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, we asked $5,000 last year. I explained at that time that this was not the full cost of the station. We will expend in this year $3,000 and it is estimated that that will leave $2,000 of a revote, and we will require $2,000 more in order to complete the total work which will come to $7,000.

Mr. BARKER. What is the nature of that work?

Mr. EMMERSON. We have a new station and we are converting the old station into a freight shed, and we also require to do certain grading. There has been practically no freight accommodation there and the freight shed will cost $5,000. We have to buy some land there which will cost $200 and the grading will be $1,000.

Mr. BARKER. You add that to the debt of the country?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is an improvement; a betterment. There are contingencies of $800, making a total of $7,000.

Mr. BLAIN. What would the revenue be in a station of that size ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a very important station.

Mr. TAYLOR. They all are.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, in their own opinion they are; it is so represented. The revenue is about $5,600. This is a large parish and a growing station. They are developing oil fields in that section of New Brunswick and an oil refinery is now under construction not very far from the station.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice that the hon. minister has several votes for converting the present passenger stations into freight sheds. Might I ask the minister if along the line of the Intercolonial, at places such as that under discussion, it is the policy to have the freight shed separate from the passenger station?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is the policy. It would be impossible and it would be very poor economy indeed to have a freight shed as part of a station.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It is a very common thing.

Mr. BAIN. It seems to me that where the revenue is less than $6,000 in prosperous years, a well constructed station with passenger station at one end and a freight station at the other would be all sufficient and would be very much more compact and very much better in the interest of the public than to have two separate buildings. I may be wrong about that, but in Ontario there are many stations of this kind at points where I am sure the revenue is very much in excess of $6,000 per annum. I was very much surprised to notice that the old shed is so often discarded and that we are now adopting the policy of converting passenger stations into freight sheds and erecting new passenger stations.

Mr. CROCKET. I notice that, there is no provision among these items for any improvement to the roadbed of the Canada Eastern Railway recently taken over by the government. Would the minister be good enough to state to the committee what the intentions of the department are with regard to the improvement of the roadbed of that line? I understand that when the minister proposed this purchase to the House last session he spoke glowingly of the earning prospects of the line, and intimated that if it were put in good condition and properly equipped it would pay. In the course of that discussion the hon. minister, questioned in the matter by one of the members from Toronto, said :—

It would not necessarily require to be up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway, because it is not a trunk line and never will be. Without getting a report from an engineer, I have been over the road and am satisfied that $1,000 a mile will make it a splendid, up-to-date road, and in my opinion this road, in the course of next year or so, will be worth $1,000,000, especially considering the situation of the government as regards the Fredericton bridge.

I would like to know if it is intended to take up this work to any extent during the present season ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We have already been improving the Canada Eastern, paying out of revenue account. We have put in quite a number of sleepers, and that work will go on gradually. I made the statement last year that I believed $1,000 a mile, or about $100,000, would put that road in a condition to meet all the requirements. I

still stand by that. We are gradually improving it, but as it is paid for out of revenue, I do not ask any special vote. As to the necessities that may arise, I am not, at the moment, able to advise my hon. friend. The road now has better cars and engines and runs faster trains than before. This was done without great outlay because we could take from the Intercolonial Railway some of the smaller cars which are outclassed on the main line. In this way we are able to give the better service without material increase in the cost to the Railway Department.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the minister a report from an engineer showing what will be required to put the road in proper condition ?

Mr. EMMERSON. A report was laid on the table last year ; covering report of the engineer on the roadbed and bridges, reports as to the mechanical outfit and general conditions for the road. That return, which was furnished when the matter was under discussion, will be found to contain all the information.

Mr. CROCKET. I understood from the passage I have quoted that the minister at that time had not the report of an engineer. If there is no report, is it intended to have one during the present season ?

Mr. EMMERSON. If my remarks were made at the time the resolution was under discussion, there was a report of the engineer on the table of the House at that time. I was speaking about what I had gathered from going over the road.

Mr. MORIN. The minister said a while ago that he did not know the population of this place St. Moise. Would he like to know it ? Has he not the latest report of the population of that place ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I should be delighted to know it. I suppose I have the report, but it is not before me.

Mr. MORIN. The minister would like to know it ? Well, the census report shows that there are 908 people in that parish—not in the village, but in the parish.

Mr. BARKER. If the minister will allow us to go back for a moment I would like to refer to one of the details of this item of $135,800 for additional sidings and a spur line. That is an item of $18,000 for a spur track at Rivière Ouelle. 1 45-100 miles. This is at the rate of $12,000 a mile which is a fair estimate, perhaps, for a spur track. But, I find that while the hon. gentleman wants to spend $18,000 during the coming year on this spur track, he spent in the year ending June 30, 1904, $32,369. How much he has spent in the current year I do not know.

Mr. EMMERSON.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, that was spent on the branch line running down to St. Denis wharf, the Rivière Ouelle wharf.

Mr. BARKER. He told us that this was a spur track at Rivière Ouelle.

Mr. EMMERSON. Near Rivière Ouelle.

Mr. BARKER. That is one of the difficulties we get into by the hon. gentleman coupling them all up.

Mr. EMMERSON. I spoke of this spur track as west of Rivière Ouelle. The Rivière Ouelle branch is a short branch line connecting the Intercolonial Railway and the ferry wharf opposite Murray bay, a place that is frequented very largely by tourists. In the summer season we have a special sleeper which runs from Rivière Ouelle wharf through to Quebec with the American cities, so that tourists can get it at night.

Mr. BARKER. How far is the new siding from that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is over a mile west of Rivière Ouelle.

Mr. BARKER. Then, the hon. gentleman is building two tracks, one costing over $32,000 and the other $18,000 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Rivière Ouelle branch cost more than that.

Mr. BARKER. That is the expenditure for one year. These two lines are within a mile of each other.

Now surely we ought to have an opportunity of criticising expenditures of that kind. Who is there in the province of Ontario or in the west who can possibly criticise the estimates without that knowledge? If we had these details—I am simply making an illustration of what we want—if we had these details, any gentleman in that district could have taken the minister's estimate of $18,000 for a spur track at Rivière Ouelle, and he would have seen that we had been already, within twelve months, spending $32,000 within a mile of it. That would have been subject for criticism. As it is, though the hon. gentleman introduced a general blanket resolution for $135,000, and asks us, because he has confidence in his officers who tell him that they want $135,000, to vote it without a word.

Subway near St. Fabien, $7,650.

Mr. EMMERSON. This amount is required for a public road near St. Fabien station, which is located about 1,000 feet east of the station. There is a very steep hill there, and the people of that section coming down this steep hill are brought down to the track crossing, and that track crossing is very near a large snow shed. It is a very dangerous crossing. The people of that section sent in a petition representing the conditions, and I had them inquired

into by officers. They asked that the road, instead of stopping at the foot of this hill and crossing that track at a very dangerous point, should be extended onward where there is an embankment, and that there should be an under crossing, or a subway, built under the embankment, thus avoiding the dangers incident to that particular crossing. It crosses the railway at a point where everything is hidden from the approaching traveller until he is on the track.

Mr. BARKER. Just like this item of $125,000 which hides everything.

Mr. EMMERSON. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on his apt remark. But the hiding in that case was unintentional, and the hiding at this station inevitable.

Mr. BARKER. Going back to the previous item—in 1903-04 the hon. gentleman spent for a spur track at Rivière Ouelle $32,000, he is now asking to spend next year $18,000 at a siding which, he says, is a mile away from it. I do not know what he has spent in the twelve months intervening between these two expenditures; he may have expended $20,000 for aught we know. But how is it that we are expending at two places within a mile of each other so much money? What is the reason for it?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Rivière Ouelle spur line, as the hon. gentleman calls it, was not a spur line at all, it was a branch line, We have an engine there connecting the Intercolonial with Murray Bay. An amount was voted for it by parliament two years ago, and the work was let by contract. Parliament also voted a sum of money for a large breakwater or wharf, which is made a landing place for a ferry. It is about a year and a half since that branch was completed, and during the last two seasons it has been in operation as a branch of the Intercolonial. Last year $32,000 was paid out in a final adjustment of the contract.

Mr. FOSTER. How much did the whole branch road cost?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was before my time. I do not bear it in mind.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the length?

Mr. EMMERSON. About seven miles.

Mr. FOSTER. You built a branch line of seven miles in length down to the St. Lawrence.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, I think some call it Rivière Ouelle wharf, others call it the St. Denis wharf. Now the people of Murray Bay are entirely shut out from any railway communication other than that afforded by the Intercolonial and this ferry across the St. Lawrence. The Murray Bay people and Charlevoix people are shut out from railway communication. This year an attempt was made to keep the ferry open during the winter season so that the people on the north shore of the St. Lawrence might have communication with the outside world.

Mr. TAYLOR. We want to know why the minister is building another spur within a mile of it, running down to the same Rivière Ouelle.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, this is a spur line in connection with the loading and gathering up of lumber for the benefit of traffic on the Intercolonial. It is over a mile I think beyond Rivière Ouelle.

Mr. TAYLOR. What do you want the spur line there for?

Mr. EMMERSON. For the purposes of Intercolonial traffic.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is a mere siding on the Intercolonial, not a spur running out into the country?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a spur siding, not a branch line.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does it run to anybody's mill?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, Mr. Price has a mill there, I think it runs to more than one mill. It is 1·45 miles long.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the minister say anything as to the increased traffic which has taken place over the road since the branch line has been built, and the wharf with which it connects? I suppose the wharf was not built by the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think the wharf was built some years ago, and that it has been there quite a number of years. It was not built by the Intercolonial Railway, but the Intercolonial Railway connects with it. It was a Public Works Department construction, and built quite a number of years ago for the benefit of the Rivière Ouelle people. They had packets running over there. Now they have steamers, and by reason of the fact that the Intercolonial Railway has made connection, the tourists that go to Murray Bay are enabled to reach there much more quickly, and I think there has been quite an influx of traffic.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. minister look that information up, and give us the total cost of the six miles and a statement as to the growth of traffic within the last two years? What is the policy of the Intercolonial Railway in reference to branch spurs of a mile or a mile and a half or two miles in length? For instance, I am a manufacturer and have a mill a mile or two from the railway; I am anxious to get my products on to the road instead of hauling them by wagon or by sleigh, and I make application to the Intercolonial Railway to put in a spur—what is the policy of the railway in that respect?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am informed that the policy in connection with such sidings

is that the grading is done by the Intercolonial Railway and that the other parties pay so much for the rails.

Mr. FOSTER. The railway grade and the parties interested pay for the rails ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, they make some contribution. There is an arrangement reached between the parties. I think it is uniform and that it is open to all. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the details to make a definite statement as to this point.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that what has been done in this case ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There has been a contribution, I think, in this case.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. minister might look that up and give us that information too. There must be a general policy in connection with this work all through.

To increase accommodation at Amherst, $28,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is this ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is in connection with the Amherst station and yard. The Intercolonial business at Amherst has grown with wonderful rapidity. The establishment of the car works there and quite a number of other kindred industries, the new foundry and machine shop and the enlargement of the Robb engineering works, together with a new woollen industry and several other establishments, which I cannot at the moment recall, have added very largely to the traffic of the Intercolonial Railway at that point. The railway has under consideration the question of enlarging the yard and in some way improving the conditions as to the station accommodation. I do not know just exactly what form finally this will take. I was personally in company with the general manager, who was called to look over the situation, but as to how we can remedy it I am not in a position at this moment to say.

Mr. FOSTER. But some work has been done and some money has been expended ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That was in the outside yards. We have extended the yards and sidings away out towards Nappan. There is such a congestion of streets and houses encroaching on the railway, and there was originally such an insufficient quantity of land reserved for the purposes of the railway, that it is now found necessary to have all the shunting sidings placed at a remote distance from the station. The increase in the number of trains has proved the necessity of an additional track. Quite a number of passenger trains meet there during the day, and we will certainly require an additional track at that point. But there is not width enough between the station and the car works of Messrs. Rhodes, Curry & Co., Limited, which are directly opposite. There is back of the station quite a plot of land which belongs to the Intercolonial Railway. It has heretofore been utilized by the citizens of Amherst as a street, and the proposal is to have the station moved back on that plot in order to make it possible to have an additional track. We propose having, in that connection, umbrella sheds and a concrete platform. The traffic earnings of the Intercolonial Railway at that point, I think, last year were upwards of $280,000. I know there was a marvellous growth, and certainly the conditions would require some improvement.

Mr. FOSTER. How much is it proposed to expend ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am now asking for $28,000, of which $15,000 is a revote.

Mr. FOSTER. I know what you are asking for. How much is it proposed to expend ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The total amount of the proposed expenditure is $44,000. It is estimated that $16,000 will be expended this year, leaving a balance of $28,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. minister says that he does not know what he is going to do.

Mr. EMMERSON. To a certain extent. I do not wish to be misunderstood by the committee. We propose double-tracking the line for 3,500 feet. There is no question as to that. We propose an improvement in the yards, and in the lumber yard connected with the station we propose an expenditure of $8,000. We require some large cattle pens, because of the maritime winter show being held there, a show such as they have in Guelph every year. That involves an expenditure of $1,000 ; and we want to improve the water service, which will cost $3,000 more. We want to have an engine-house, which will cost $1,500. We must keep a shunting engine at Amherst all the time in consequence of the increased business. The concrete platforms and sheds are estimated to cost somewhere in the vicinity of $5,000. As to what shall be done in connection with the station, it has not been determined, but of this $44,000, we have asked for $15,000 towards that.

Mr. FOSTER. I acknowledge what the minister has been saying with reference to Amherst. Amherst is a busy little town, there is no doubt about it and it is growing. One thing that strikes me about a good many of these estimates is that the minister is entering into an expenditure without a defined plan as to how far he is going. He has had his officers I suppose to thoroughly investigate the whole matter, make their plans and base their estimates upon these plans, and he comes to the House for a vote, but before the vote is taken we should have some definite statement as to the entire cost. So much money is asked for now, but the

minister is not sure what it will run into before he gets through. The trouble of the whole matter is that the money seems to come very easily ; all the minister has to do is to ask parliament for it and get it——

Mr. EMMERSON. That is not easy.

Mr. FOSTER. It is comparatively easy, but it will never be so easy again as it has been, so long as some of us here are members of the House. The minister will have had put through about $2,000,000 to-night, and the information concerning it is all contained on one page of this small book of the estimates. What has caused delay to-night, has been that those who have been criticising have been unable to get information. I hope that the minister next year will be able to tell us the expenditure on every siding and that he will set it down in the estimates together with the length of the siding, so that we may be able to know what the vote is asked for. Then there will be no delay. But to bring down an item for $132,000 and to oblige us to find out after two hours work that there are fifty or sixty different sidings scattered all over the whole Intercolonial, which are to be built out of that money, is the cause of a great deal of trouble. The minister would consult his own convenience and help us very much, if, in making out his estimates next year he would detail all these different things. Here we are with a railway which has a very large deficit, which has a very large capital expenditure, which has run the country into large expense already, and yet to listen to the minister asking for thousands of dollars for works all over the most settled parts of that road, one would almost come to the conclusion that the people have had no facilities for business in all these years, and that during the last year or two the minister had come to the conclusion that some sort of accommodation should be given to all these places. No one will dispute that there should be such accommodation as the business requires. What we would like to know is that the business of the place warrants the expenditure. What is the rule that the minister observes with reference to these ? I suppose requests come to him from the inhabitants of the different places ?

Mr. EMMERSON. From boards of trade and town councils and members of parliament. I had a conference with the board of trade at Amherst for instance.

Mr. FOSTER. All these are legitimate sources whence these requests should come, but after all the requests are in I suppose the minister has reports from his officers who take into account traffic considerations only as a basis. In some cases it would be well for us to have these reports so that we may see just what the officers who are always non-partisan and look towards the traffic of the railroad rather than anything else, recommend with regard to these different things.

Semaphores at stations, $1,000.

Mr. BARKER. Has it occurred to the minister that he is seriously asking parliament to grant him 60 cents a mile on the Intercolonial for semaphores ; a railway that has been in operation for fifty years ? Does he realize that he is charging this to capital account? Surely that is running the capital account mad. It is an outrage that this item should be put on the estimates as a charge against the capital of the country. The line must be drawn somewhere, and I ask the minister to strike out this item. If it is not withdrawn I shall take some opportunity on concurrence, or at some other time, to have a vote of the House on this question.

Mr. EMMERSON. These are semaphores at stations where they have never had them before. The railroad must be increased in value to that extent, and as such it is a betterment. This is a vote that goes on year after year. It is not replacing something, but it is creating something that has never been on the railway.

Mr. BARKER. A few years ago I found an instance where a bucket at one of the intercolonial stations had been charged to capital account. Somebody wanted to do some whitewashing with the idea of improving the station, and so a water bucket was added to the debt of Canada. This vote is something on a par with that. I shall take the sense of the House on the question as to whether that sort of thing is capital expenditure or not.

Mr. PATERSON. Would not the hon. gentleman draw a distinction in the case of absolutely new semaphores——

Mr. FOSTER. It was a new bucket too.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not remember about the bucket, but there is a distinction between a new semaphore erected for a new station and a semaphore erected to replace an old one which originally had been charged to capital.

Mr. FOSTER. Supposing there were a ton of axle grease required on the railroad more in 1905 than in 1906, would that be charged to capital account ?

Mr. PATERSON. There is no analogy.

Mr. FOSTER. It runs much easier.

Rolling stock, $698,500.

Mr. OSLER. I would ask the minister to allow this item to stand until he gives the House the information which I asked for this afternoon, namely, the expenditure on capital account on the Intercolonial Railway from 1896, and previous to that date if he wishes, the amount of rolling stock that has been charged to capital account since 1896, with the amount of rolling stock that

was in use in 1896 and the amount that is in use now, and the number of engines and cars under the various classifications. We cannot discuss this item without that information.

Mr. INGRAM. And in addition to that, the rolling stock that was not in a proper state of repair on the 30th of June last, and on the 1st of January last.

Intercolonial Railway—improving grades on line, $22,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to improve the grades on the line between Daveluyville and St. Wenceslas. In connection with this work it will be necessary to build two arch culverts. The grades will be improved at two points. At one point, two miles west of Daveluyville, two reverse grades of 1 per cent—one 600 feet long, the other 700 feet long—will be taken out, and the track made level. A bridge of 21 feet span will be replaced with a 10-feet arch culvert. At the other point, one quarter mile west of St. Wenceslas, two reverse grades—one 0·75 per cent, 1,000 feet long, the other 1·12 per cent, 100 feet long—will be replaced by 1,000 feet of level track and 1,000 feet of a 1 per cent grade. A bridge of 25-feet span will be replaced with a 16-feet arch culvert.

Intercolonial Railway—extension to Sydney Mines, $50,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to connect the Intercolonial with Sydney Mines from the landing at North Sydney. Sydney Mines has recently forged ahead, the Nova Scotia Steel Company having enlarged its works there.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the distance ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is about two and three quarter miles.

Mr. FOSTER. Is all the expense being borne by the country ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. OSLER. The usual custom, where a railway builds a siding to a mine or a mill, is for the mill owners or mine owners to put up the money.

Mr. EMMERSON. Sydney Mines is a large town. It has a mayor and all the modern equipment of a town. Its population is about 7,000.

Mr. OSLER. As the minister mentioned Sydney Mines and the works of the Nova Scotia Steel Company, I thought the extension was to its mines. At any rate, what I say applies to several of these items. The usual custom is to require those who want a siding put in to a mine or a mill to deposit the money or pay a part of the cost, which is rebated to them from freight ; so that the railway company is not out of pocket if the enterprise is not a paying concern to the railway. I think that plan ought to be adopted by the Intercolonial Railway absolutely. If not, pressure is likely to be brought to bear, from political interest, to have lines built to mills or mines that will never pay the cost.

Mr. INGRAM. Has North Sydney anything to do with this extension ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No. This is two miles or a little over beyond North Sydney.

Intercolonial Railway—steel rails and fastenings, $380,000.

Mr. BARKER. Where is that to be expended ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We obtained last year $495,000, and it is estimated that this $380,000 will provide for the laying of 200 more miles of the Intercolonial Railway with the heavier rails.

Mr. OSLER. The cost of new rails is how much ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The cost at the present place would be upwards of $30 per ton.

Mr. OSLER. This is only the difference between the cost of the new rails and the value of the old rails as taken up, as the minister stated this afternoon.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. OSLER. How many tons of rails is this going to supply ?

Mr. EMMERSON. About 25,000 tons.

Mr. OSLER. That is $750,000, or at $28 per ton, $700,000. The minister is asking $380,000 for it.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am putting in the total of 80 pound rails and fastenings which include the angle plates, bolts, nuts and tie plates. The total is $822,415.49.

Mr. BARKER. That includes the fastenings without labour ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The labour is provided out of revenue.

Mr. BARKER. There is no doubt about that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. So I am informed by the engineer who ought to know. I know that in the estimate before me there is no charge for labour. This is, less the credit of the rails that are taken up as well as the angle plates and nuts, $442,490. This leaves a balance of $379,925.45 which for greater ease we call $380,000.

Mr. OSLER. Then you are charging the bolts and fastenings to capital ; there is no allowance for the old bolts and nuts.

Mr. EMMERSON. We are allowing for the old ones taken up.

Mr. BARKER. If the minister was taking up a 66 pound rail and replacing it with a new 66 pound rail how would he charge it?

Mr. EMMERSON. If the old rail were entirely worn out it would perhaps be properly charged to capital account. I do not know the custom, I have not had that particular phase of the question presented to me.

Mr. BARKER. But the hon. gentleman has been in the House for three or four years when this very question was being discussed.

Mr. EMMERSON. Oh that is hypothetical.

Mr. BARKER. No, it is a practical question. If the hon. gentleman were replacing 66 pounds of old scrap rail with 66 pounds of new rail, the whole expense would be borne by his revenue. Why does he charge 80 pounds when he is only putting in, and actually improving his track, by 14 pounds of rail.

Mr. EMMERSON. We give credit for the 66 pounds.

Mr. BARKER. That is scrap.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not worn out, we sell it for $20 a ton.

Mr. BARKER. But the hon. gentleman knows that the charges are all alike. If he takes up 20 pounds of old rail a large portion of it must be scrap as on every railway. Some of it may be good and may be sold as second-hand rail. I believe that some of it is placed on the Prince Edward Island Railway and some of it sold, but a large part of it must be scrap. The hon. gentleman puts in an additional weight of 14 pounds and instead of charging to capital only this 14 pounds he charges the whole 80 pounds to capital and gives a credit only for the scrap. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well and Mr. Pottinger his general manager will tell him, that he makes money and improves his revenue at the expense of capital by every 80 pound rail he puts in. When I asked Mr. Pottinger the year before last whether as a railway man he considered he was justified in charging the 80 pound rail to capital, his answer was : Why should I not do so if parliament votes the money ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We are asking a vote to relay the Intercolonial Railway with 80 pound rails. We are taking up the lighter class of rail and for the 200 miles taken up we allow $20 per ton. The difference is therefore a charge against capital account.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the weight of the present rails—66 pounds ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We are taking up 67 pound rails.

Mr. FOSTER. If the minister went into the market for 67 pound rails what would he pay per ton ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I presume he would pay the same price per ton. There is very little difference between the heavier and the lighter rails. I think, according to quotations which I have seen recently, they are practically the same.

Mr. FOSTER. What would be the proportion of mileage which the two classes of rails would lay?

Mr. EMMERSON. We are simply charging for the 200 miles that we have laid down. For the 80 pound rail the tonnage per mile is 125·7 tons to the mile and for the 67 pound rail 105·2 tons to the mile.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand that the minister proposes to lay about 200 or 250 miles of rail for which he will pay about $700,000. Last year he laid 161 miles of rail. Will he give us an idea of the cost of the 110-pound rail he laid ?

Mr. EMMERSON. These were special rail, purchased from the Chignecto Marine Railway Company, a rail that was brought to Canada for the purpose of the ship railway. The Intercolonial purchased them last year, I believe. I am not personally familiar with the transaction, as it took place before I had any connection with the department.

Mr. INGRAM. Do we understand that the minister has a big stock of these rails on hand ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They are all laid.

Mr. OSLER. The only amount that ought to be charged to capital account in this connection is for the increased weight of the new rail. The track was there, laid with 67-pound rails, which are replaced with 80-pound rails. There can be no increased value except in the increased cost of the heavier rails. The minister says that for these 250 miles, he will buy 25,000 tons at $28 a ton, which will amount to $700,000. He gives credit at the rate of $20 a ton for rails that are replaced. They are less cost —they would be lighter. Twenty dollars a ton for twenty-five thousand tons would amount to $500,000, and the difference between that and $700,000 is $200,000. There is no possible excuse even on the minister's own statement for charging to capital account more than this difference. The minister is taking $380,000, which means that $180,000 is an absolute mis-charge, and, to that extent, his statement is misleading. That $180,000 should come out of the earnings of this railway as submitted to the House. There is no excuse ; no explanation can be made ; it is an absolute falsification, so far as the revenue and expenditure of the railway is concerned, if these figures are allowed to go through and this sum to be charged to the capital expenditure of the railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is the course that has always been pursued——

Mr. BARKER. Not at all.

Mr. EMMERSON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon——

Mr. BARKER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I went into that three years ago. Hon. Mr. Blair made that assertion and I proved by producing the reports that under Hon. Mr. Haggart not only was no amount charged to capital that might not properly be so charged, but he charged to revenue even the increased weight of the rail, which he was not obliged to do.

Mr. EMMERSON. My information is that that was the rule, as applied to the Intercolonial. Whether there were such replacements of rails as far back as Hon. Mr. Haggart's day, I do not know.

Mr. FOSTER. When the hon. minister says that was the rule——

Mr. EMMERSON. I say it has been the rule on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. Under Hon. Mr. Blair ?

Mr. EMMERSON. And before Mr. Blair's time I believe.

Mr. BARKER. That was refuted absolutely.

Mr. EMMERSON. My information is different—I cannot speak of the matter personally. My hon. friend (Mr. Barker) makes the statement the other way. I am bound to accept his statement, but I can also rely, I think, upon the information given to me ; and that information is that this is the rule. I do not know what the rule is on other railways. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) is a director of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I believe, and would know what the rule is on that road. That company may not have been laying the heavier rails for many years, and perhaps are not put to the question of how to make this charge.

Mr. OSLER. The minister, I think, will know that I have always had a great reluctance in speaking on any subject in this House, to back up my opinions by saying what the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other company had done. I have great reluctance in mixing up with the discussions here, knowledge which may be said to come to me personally. But I may say that I do not believe there is a railway on this continent that, if it had an item like this before it would charge to capital as much as I am suggesting now should be charged—the difference between the weight of the rail taken up and that of the rail which replaces it.

Mr. BARKER. I would add that if the minister will look into the question, he will find that in the first year of Mr. Blair's administration of the Intercolonial, he charged this item of steel rails just as Hon. Mr. Haggart, his predecessor, had been charging it, and as we say it ought to be charged. It was afterwards that Mr. Blair changed his system, and began to save his revenue by charging expenditures up to the debt of the country that should have been paid out of ordinary working expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. The statement made by my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) was a very strong and very clear statement. If that statement is correct, and if the basis, the arrangement laid down by the minister himself is correct, that all that is to be charged is the added cost, then the two corroborate each other ; and if these two be true, the practice of the minister, as exemplified by the vote he is asking here to-night, is dead against both these positions. Then the minister falls back on the assertion that it has been the practice to filch—there is no other name for it—from capital in order to save the appearance of a deficit or diminishing of the revenue. He says it has been the practice in the Railway Department. Now, we want to know the facts in that case. Has it been the practice to do that ? How long has it been the practice to do that, and is the statement that my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) makes a true statement or not, that it was not the practice under the Minister of Railways of the previous government ? I think this is a very important matter. It has been talked of in this House in committee over and over again every year, and I think we have come to a point now where we must insist that attention should be given to it, and I think it is better that this item should stand to-night. The minister can inform himself from his department, he can take the time to do so, and give us the information, and let us come down to an honest and proper basis for making our estimates as regards capital and revenue. Now, if the minister will do that, we will get at least what was the practice of the department. He has an idea that it was so and so ; he is not supposed to know exactly what has been going on there all the time, because he is new to his position ; but he has officers who can give him that information, and a little search would enable him to state authoritatively on that point. This is a striking case. Now, let us know what we are going to do in the future. I, for one, have a strong opinion that we ought to make honest estimates, no matter where the deficiency falls.

Mr. EMMERSON. The facts are entirely before the House. It might be interesting to know, as a matter of research, what had been done in the past. I know that last year the item of $495,000 was voted in this particular way. I have followed the precedent established at that time so far as I am concerned. In the previous year, when

the estimates went through, the present Minister of Finance was the acting Minister of Railways. At that time there was a discussion the same as at present. There is no misunderstanding as to the application of the vote. Everybody knows for what purpose the money is asked and the circumstances under which it is expended. It seems to me that, under these conditions, this vote should pass as it is now. So far as I am personally concerned, I shall certainly take into consideration the features of the case presented by my hon. friend, who speaks with knowledge of what the Canadian Pacific Railway and other railways do. There is one thing about it; according to the views I hold with respect to the Intercolonial, I am quite prepared to insist that every dollar should be rightly placed. I am not afraid of the items appearing in the revenue charge if it is proper to place them there, and I do not want to put them in capital account if they do not belong there. Those are the views I hold. But this course was followed last year; there was not a very full discussion, certainly not so full as we have had to-night. I would ask that this vote be allowed to go as it is, and, so far as I am concerned and have anything to do with the matter in the future, I shall deal with it from the standpoint of inquiring into the actual facts. I am sure I shall be borne out, not only by my friends opposite, but by our friends on this side.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has been frank, and, so far as he has stated his position, it is satisfactory to the committee. But here is the point with me. Has the minister himself any doubt at all that upon this single item which is now under discussion the facts of the case are as stated by my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Osler)? Has he the least doubt in the world that he is asking for capital to do more than to replace the road in the exact position it was in before? Now, he has an answer to that or he has not. If his answer is that it appears from that reasoning and from the facts that he is taking from capital to run the road, then I think he is bound to take the matter into consideration and make his decision before this passes, no matter what the practice has been in the past. We ought to stop the very moment we are agreed that the practice is as bad as it has been proved to be in this particular instance. The minister would not ask us to give him a sum on capital account for the payment of his conductors, for the payment of his bills for coal for running the road, or for anything else than that which went absolutely into running expenses. Now, here is an item which runs up into the hundreds of thousands of dollars, in which, on a showing which is incontestible and as to which there has been no answer, he is taking about $200,000 out of capital and is throwing it into the running expenses of the road, taking $200,000 off this vote, and the minister is able to put on heavier rails in place of lighter ones, and have his roadbed, his track and everything just as it was before, and the difference between the cost of the two is all that he ought to take out of capital for that purpose. Surely there does not seem to be any doubt about that. Although we acknowledge the fairness with which the minister has met us, yet I believe it would be better for him to allow this to stand and to make up his mind with reference to the principle. It is no disparagement at all to a minister, when he finds that he is asking for something that he ought not properly to ask for, and if, after looking into it, he finds that it is not the right way, no matter what others have done, to say that he proposes to do what is correct in the matter from this time on, and not to step off a $200,000 platform of error on to his platform of true and honest estimates that he is going to rear after this particular vote is through. I want the minister to understand that this is a matter which I think is vital. We might just as well take our stand upon it and fight it out now on both sides of the House as to have it going on and being a perennial sore from year to year. I think the minister agrees with me in that respect, that he ought to make honest estimates.

Mr. EMMERSON. I certainly agree with my hon. friend that we should make honest estimates, but I am not convinced that the statement of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) is correct as to the way in which these estimates should be prepared. Now, it seems to me, from my standpoint at least, that in this instance, where an allowance is made for rails, and there is a difference in their value, as respects the worn rails, a sufficient allowance is borne by revenue, and the difference of the $380,000 should be borne by capital.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. minister is shifting his ground.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is no deception in respect to the matter. It is quite apparent on the face of it as to what is to be done, as to the actual facts and circumstances of the whole transaction and one can form a judgment in respect to them. It seems to me that as it stands the cost of the 80 pound rail, less the credit of the other rail, is a fair charge against capital account.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose that the hon. minister could not sell these 67-lb. rails that he has taken up for more than $10 a ton, would he consider it right to take the difference between $10 and $28, calculating it out as we have calculated it here to-night, and charge that to capital? Suppose he could not sell these rails for more than $5 a ton, would he consider it right to do that? Suppose he could not sell them for a dollar a ton, that they went just as scrap and poor at that, would he consider it right to take the

balance out of capital? Why could he not sell them for more than $10 or $5 a ton? Simply because they had been worn out in the service of the railway. When he was putting on new rails what is he doing? He is making provision for worn out stuff and provision for worn out stuff must be borne by the current revenue of the railway and not by capital. There cannot be any escape from that reasoning, surely. We are not trying to make arguments one against the other and seeing who will get the best of it. That is not it. We are trying to come at the truth. Why do you sell these old rails at $20, for I am coming to the hon. minister's own price? You sell them at $20 because they have been on the Intercolonial Railway for a number of years, they are worn and they are not worth more than $20. They have been worn in the service of the road. The service of the road has been to produce revenue and the hon. minister is replacing what was worn in the service of the road to produce revenue by getting capital to put a good rail in the place of the worn out rail. It seems to me so clear that the hon. minister must see it, as I think he does see it, and as I think we all will see it. If that be true, it is absolutely wrong—I am not going to say dishonest—to take capital to fill that gap.

Mr. OSLER. With the hon. minister's last word before he sat down I agree most thoroughly. He sat down with a statement that the difference between the cost of the new rail and the price of the old rail should be charged to capital. I agree with that Taking his figure of $20 as the value of the rail and his figure of $28 as the cost of the new rail, that is $200,000, which, according to that contention, should be charged to capital. But the minister is asking for a charge of $380,000. The hon. minister says there is no dishonesty at all—I do not for a moment suggest such a thing, but if that statement goes out in connection with the Intercolonial, and this is one of many items, the fact remains absolutely that there is a false statement in so far as the earnings and revenue of the Intercolonial are concerned to the extent of $180,000 in this one item. I am speaking only of it being a false statement in the sense that it is incorrect bookkeeping and that it conveys a false impression to the public in respect to that $180,000. It ought to be charged to revenue and not to capital, and if this item goes through then the Intercolonial statement for next year will be false to the extent of the amount which I have mentioned in this one item alone.

Mr. BOYCE. Would the hon. minister state what contracts for rails have been closed during the past year with the Lake Superior corporation and what deliveries have taken place?

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. EMMERSON. Two contracts with the Sault Ste. Marie Company, the first given in September for 10,000 tons and another in October, I think, for 10,800 tons more, were entered into. Twenty-eight thousand tons have been delivered. There have been no other contracts entered into or arranged.

Mr. BOYCE. What were the prices of these rails?

Mr. EMMERSON. The prices were to be fixed by the open market price plus the duty. The open market price, I think, on the 1st October was to govern the first 10,000 and the open market price on the 15th November was to govern as to the delivery of the 10,800 tons.

Mr. BOYCE. Could the hon. minister state what amounts have been paid for these rails or if they have yet determined the actual cost of them?

Mr. EMMERSON. That has not yet been determined. There was an amount paid them pro rata on the advice of the chief engineer pending the decision. The decision was to be made by the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. BOYCE. What was the amount that was paid?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think it was $23 a ton, but I will not be certain. At any rate there was a large margin reserved to protect the department, and I am endeavouring to get information from standard dealers in England as to the actual sales in order that I may determine the prices that ruled on the 1st October and 15th November last respectively.

Mr. BOYCE. Were these the dates that were to govern the price?

Mr. EMMERSON. I know the last was the 15th November. I am quite positive also that the first was the 1st of October, but I speak subject to correction. I am quite certain, however, the first was the 1st of October.

Mr. BOYCE. What other contracts for rails for the Intercolonial have been closed?

Mr. EMMERSON. No other contracts have been entered into other than these two.

Mr. BOYCE. I mean with any other companies or individuals. I am not speaking only of the Lake Superior Company.

Mr. EMMERSON. These are the only contracts that have been entered into by the Intercolonial.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister did not state at what points the new rails are to be laid down during the coming summer on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. On the eastern division about three-quarters of a mile ; between St. John and Shediac about sixty-two miles,

and the balance of the hundred miles between Moncton and Lévis.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask the minister to allow the item to stand until he will be kind enough to give us the information with reference to what has been the practice in the department.

Mr. EMMERSON. Could not the item be passed in the meantime ?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think we will ever get a simpler or a clearer point on which to take up our respective positions than this is, and no time will be wasted by allowing the item to stand.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have no desire to rush the items through.

Mr. INGRAM. Let me remark here that the statement made by the Minister of Railways last evening in reference to the Intercolonial was one of the most doleful and discouraging I ever heard a Minister of Railways make in this House. In view of the method pursued at the present time of charging to capital account, items which should be charged to revenue, the statement of the minister was even more doleful than would appear on the surface. I listened very attentively to the hon. gentleman and I regret that while he gave several excuses for the immense deficit, he failed to suggest a remedy. I disagree entirely with the statement of the minister, that it matters very little to the country whether items are charged to capital or to revenue, because the people have to pay them anyway. It is all very well for members of this House on both sides who fully understand the situation, but the people generally have not the advantages we have here, and they are consequently not in a position to judge of the merits of the management of the Intercolonial. The minister evidently wants to be honest in the matter ; I give him the credit that he evidently is not trying to hide anything. While I have always been in favour of government ownership of railways I have always held that the management of our government railways was not conducted on proper principles. I say now as I have often said before, that I do not accuse the Liberal party any more than I have accused my own party, with improper management of our railways. It does not make any difference how competent your general manager may be, there is too much interference with him to permit him to manage the railroad properly. Every officer on our government railways is being interfered with from time to time by politicians and others, and in consequence of that interference they are not allowed to use their judgment and their experience as they otherwise would. It is because of that interference that the people of Canada are called upon year after year to make up by indirect taxation enormous deficits on the Intercolonial. Let me say here that the Minister of Railways would do a good thing if he were to keep the accounts of the government railways as other railway corporations keep their accounts. If he did that he would show the people of Canada that under the present system of management large annual deficits cannot be prevented, and public feeling would be so stirred that a demand would come from the people of Canada for a change. If the government railways were taken out of the sphere of political interference and placed, say under control of a properly constituted commission, I feel satisfied that they would be an asset of which our country might be proud. I have had experience in supporting a government in this House years ago, and I know that members are frequently called upon to do certain things for their constituents which in their own good judgment should not be done. If our government railways were placed entirely under control of a commission, the supporters of the government would be relieved of this unpleasant task, and in their interest as well as in the interest of the country the outcome would be beneficial. I am not criticising our government railways in any carping spirit. I realize that we have 1,400 or 1,500 miles of government railways in Canada, and that the more politics is kept out of the management, the better it is for all concerned. I trust that the minister will bring down the information asked for to-night. I for one will hold up both hands in support of the minister, if he carries out that policy. I tell him that if he endeavours to control the government railways in the interest of the people of the country and in as economical a manner as possible he will be supported by public opinion.

Mr. EMMERSON. I court the fullest criticism of the management of the Intercolonial, so long as that criticism is based upon facts and not upon any political or partisan motives. I recognize that the Intercolonial by reason of the circumstances that surround it, has reached a time in its history when it certainly demands the earliest consideration of the people of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. I recognize that. I recognize the fact that there are two or three very large corporations that are looking with longing eyes on the Intercolonial, and I think I can also recognize the fact that it is a question between, and among, these corporations as to how the spoil is to be divided. I also recognize that anything that can be said in this House or before the country to the discredit of government management of the Intercolonial will only serve to improve the prospects of these corporations ; and, without mentioning the particular corporations, I can quite understand why it would be in their interest that the people of this country should be educated up to

the point of condemning every transaction in connection with the Intercolonial. Now, notwithstanding all this, notwithstanding the fact that I see the dangers ahead, I am quite prepared, as Minister of Railways, to have the whole situation exposed to the gaze of the public. I am not saying this in any heroic way, but I am speaking of it as a necessity in the interest of the road itself. If there are difficulties which are within the control of the department, those difficulties should be grappled with. I have endeavoured to point out, in a non-partisan spirit, difficulties which I believe exist and over which I think we could not have any control. I endeavoured, in my statement last night, to present the actual facts, and to show that in almost every instance in which there was a deficit, the expenditure was beyond the control of the department—such as the extra wages, the repairs to rolling stock, and the purchase of rolling stock out of revenue. My hon. friend from Hamilton has said that the conditions of the Intercolonial in this respect are much better to-day than they were on a previous occasion.

Mr. BARKER. They ought to be, too.

Mr. EMMERSON. So they ought to be; I grant it; the extent to which they ought to be is demonstrated by the extra expenditure in the working expenses during the past year and the current six months. With regard to the book-keeping, how long that has prevailed on the Intercolonial, I am not prepared to say. If you compare this year with last year or with the last four or five years, you find the same conditions. How far back they go I do not know; nor do I know whether there was any occasion in the years gone by to substitute a heavier for a lighter rail. For the reason stated, I am quite prepared to have the information with reference to this item brought before the House. I have given the reason why I think this vote should be passed; but, in deference to the views expressed, I am quite willing that it should stand in the meantime.

Mr. BARKER. In answer to what the hon. gentleman has said, I admit that the rolling stock is in a better condition; why should it not be? For years under the present government we have been voting enormous sums of money to buy new rolling stock. During the year 1903-04 we paid $643,000 for new rolling stock; for the current year the hon. gentleman took a vote of $1,000,000 for the same purpose, and as he is not seeking a revote of that, I presume he is spending it.

Mr. EMMERSON. What I said was that with respect to the rolling stock that has been purchased out of revenue, we are in a better position than we would have been last year.

Mr. BARKER. I admit that; but under what pressure from this side of the House has that been accomplished? For four years we protested against the fact that year after year the government were allowing greater numbers of cars to fall into disuse, to go on to the dump heap, until in the beginning of last year they had 558 cars of dead stock on their hands. We pointed out that while the government in order to save their working expenses, neglected to repair these cars, they were spending millions in buying new rolling stock on capital account. At present the hon. gentleman is asking $698,000 more for rolling stock, although he is rather boastfully saying now that the rolling stock is in a good condition. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is going to ask us for anything more. Last year I think we had about four supplementary votes before we got through. But surely, under such circumstances, the rolling stock should improve. Now, let me say this about the Intercolonial Railway. We have criticised its management. We want the Intercolonial to get a fair chance to show what is in it. We want the officers and the staff of the Intercolonial to have the same chance as the officers and the staff of every other railway in this country; and I believe that if the official staff of the Intercolonial had had that freedom from interference on the part of politicians that railway companies have, there would have been a very different result, in the earnings of the line. We are not despondent. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has any reason for despondency with regard to the Intercolonial Railway. We used to hear the hon. Minister of Finance and other ministers boast of the brilliant prospects of that railway under present auspices; but since about a year ago we have been hearing a very different tale from them. The hon. gentlemen who used to boast of this railway are now becoming despondent—why? Are they crying stinking fish? Are they trying to get rid of the railway? Is there some applicant for it in the market? How is it that the men who a few years ago were so boastful of this line, are now so despondent that the minister yesterday made a speech that was characterized on this side of the House as the most despondent ever uttered with regard to this railway? That is the position we take; we believe that this railway ought to have a fair show. In the last four years every railway in Canada has been almost over-burdened with traffic. The Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway have been earning enormous sums above their working expenses. The government railway alone has been a burden. We say: Give the staff of the Intercolonial the same freedom, the same opportunities that are enjoyed by the staffs of the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and under proper management freed from political interference and officialism the results would be very different from what they are and what they have been.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Before you pass from this item, Mr. Chairman, there are one or two things I desire to say in answer to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Barker) and to the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Ingram). They have been pleased to criticise the statement of the Minister of Railways yesterday as the most doleful ever presented to this House. The people throughout this country, but more particularly the workmen along the line of the Intercolonial who are a very important class of people in this country will not criticise that statement as the most doleful ever presented to this parliament. They will regard it as the happiest statement for them and therefore for the country that has ever been presented by a Minister of Railways. The Minister of Railways has been able to say that for the first time in the history of the country he has been able to do justice to the men employed on the Intercolonial. Time was—and those of us who live on the line of the Intercolonial remember it very well—when the workmen on the Intercolonial appealed to former Ministers of Railways and appealed in vain that justice might be done to them. There never was a time in the history of the Intercolonial Railway when the officials of the road were so free from interference from politicians and others as at the present time. I want to call to the mind of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) this fact that if he seeks to know what has been transpiring with respect to it he would do well to consult with the officials on the Intercolonial who were there previous to 1896; he would learn where the interference came from in those days. That was the day when shingles were being issued all over the Intercolonial Railway. The line was more noted for the purpose of carrying shingles in 1896 than for any other purpose.

Mr. LENNOX. It is hay now.

Mr. JOHNSTON. My hon. friend says it is hay. Yes, very true, and he will find that those responsible for the management of the Intercolonial Railway will be in a position to go before the people of this country and justify to the full their conduct in connection with the carrying of hay.

Mr. LENNOX. The have not done so.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. We will be prepared to go with the hon. member for East Simcoe to the people of this country and to justify our conduct in this connection. We will take issue with our friends opposite on this question as we have on every other question in connection with the Intercolonial Railway since 1896. I tell my hon. friends opposite that they do not know the conditions that prevail along the Intercolonial Railway to-day. I believe what is more that they do not know the conditions that obtained along the Intercolonial Railway previous to 1896. The men who were ashamed of the Intercolonial Railway then, when it was in the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite are to-day prepared to go before the people of this country and to say that they are proud of the Intercolonial Railway to-day. Was there any one in this country who was proud of the Intercolonial Railway during the days when it was administered by our hon. friends opposite? I want to know if there is one member on the opposite side who is prepared to stand in his place to-night and say that previous to 1896 the Intercolonial Railway under Conservative administration was creditable to the people of this country. Is there one among them to-day prepared to deny the fact that the Intercolonial Railway to-day is a credit to the people of this country? The Minister of Railways told the House yesterday that it was not the purpose of the Intercolonial Railway from the time it was started to make money for the people of Canada. He said truly, and I support the statement in its entirety, that the Intercolonial Railway ought to be regarded, has been regarded, and will continue to be regarded as a complement of the canal system of this country. Those of us who live along the line of the Intercolonial are not whining and complaining day after day about the moneys that are being spent by the people in maintaining the efficiency of the canal system of this country. We regard it as important to the people of Ontario that the canal system should be maintained in its efficiency, and we are not going before the people and complaining that the money is being wasted and squandered upon them. For five years I have sat in this House and listened to a former Minister of Railways complaining about the money that was being spent upon this road. Member after member sitting opposite told the people that it was idle to waste money on the Intercolonial Railway, that it was to be a sinkhole for the money of the people of this country and still they are not satisfied. Who was it that tried to dispose of the Intercolonial Railway? My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) a few moments ago expressed a fear that the present Minister of Railways and the present government were desirous of parting with it. Who are the only political party in this country that ever tried to dispose of the Intercolonial Railway? Let them read the record of their party previous to 1896, and they will find that they were prepared to hand over to the Canadian Pacific Railway this Intercolonial Railway. Who was it that did everything possible to cripple the services of the Intercolonial Railway? Who was it that entered into a contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway to render practically useless to the maritime provinces and the people of this country the Intercolonial Railway? Let them call to mind the agreement, entered into by the former Conservative administration of the Intercolonial with the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Liberal

party has been found fault with by hon. gentlemen because it was thought desirable in the interest of the people of this country, but more particularly in the interests of those served by the Intercolonial, to cancel that agreement. For my own part I have nothing but admiration for the management of the Intercolonial Railway since 1896. I am prepared to go before my own people and I am quite sure that every member on this side of the House is prepared to go before his constituents and defend the management of the Intercolonial Railway since 1896. I say that there have been deficits on the Intercolonial Railway; these deficits are not new, they existed in former times and I have no doubt that they will continue to exist. I do not know whether they will ever be avoided, but I do know that the people of this country are getting good value for them, are getting much better value to-day for the present deficits of the Intercolonial Railway than they did for those that existed before 1896. The people are given a good service to-day. It remained to the Intercolonial Railway since 1896, it remained to the present government to raise the standard of the railway travel in this country. They set the example and other roads have been obliged to raise the standard of their travel and the comfort of their passengers and therefore it is that all sections of this country, but more particularly those sections traversed by the Intercolonial Railway, are prepared to defend in all respects the management and administration of the Railway Department from 1896 to the present time.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. One remark was made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. Johnston), who has just taken his seat, which, I think, is not exactly correct. He stated that, so far as he knows, every railway official on the Intercolonial—which, I suppose, would include the Prince Edward Island Railway —was left free from political influence. I wish to tell this House that at the last election on the 3rd of November last, a large number of Conservative officials on the Prince Edward Island Railway were handed the book and the bribery oath were put to them. I ask whether that is political influence or not? I ask whether that is freedom or not? I think the statement made by the hon. gentleman is not borne out by the facts. He has made another statement—that the people of the maritime provinces are satisfied with the Intercolonial Railway as it is conducted to-day. But if you will remember the statement made by the minister yesterday, he told us that he was unable to carry the grain from the west to Halifax and St. John, because he had not sufficient rolling stock. At the same time, these gentlemen put upon the statute-book a law which provides that the money of the people of Canada shall be used in the construction of another road paralleling the Intercolonial and taking away the traffic that ought to go to that road. If the Intercolonial Railway today is deficient in rolling stock to carry the grain from the west to the ports which they boast so much about as the winter ports of this country, why is not the public money used to put this road in a proper state to carry this business instead of wasting it in constructing a road to be handed over to the Grand Trunk Pacific that they may carry the grain to the foreign port of Portland? I think that when these hon. gentlemen say that this road is in efficient condition, they do not speak by the book. They boast of the increase of wages. I have no fault to find with them for the increase of the wages if they have the money to do it. But they have not the revenue, because they have not the traffic, and they say they have not the traffic because they have not the means of carrying it. But when did they raise the salaries of the officials? Immediately before the election of 3rd of November last. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) went down to Moncton some time in October. Conferences were held at the office in Moncton. Delegations were there from every department in the Intercolonial Railway to meet the minister—that is reported in the public press, at any rate. Arrangements were made at that time for the increase of wages all round, with the exception of the staff in the accountant's department of the railway.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. How many increases in wages were there before that?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. Johnston) can tell. At any rate, these increases were made at the time when the government party required the votes of the officials of the railway.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The item stands.

Some resolutions reported.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BARKER. May I ask the leader of the House what work will be taken up tomorrow?

Mr. FIELDING. I think we shall resume in supply, continuing the consideration of the estimates of the Minister of Railways.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

INDEX

FIRST SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT, 1905.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass.; Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Consider ; Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments ; Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General ; Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved ; Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., North-west Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques. Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn ; Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

Adamson, Mr. A. J., *Humboldt.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5114 ; (election of members) in Com., 5776 (iii); (distribution of seats) 8740 (v).

Western Life Insurance Co.'s Incorp. B. 108, 1°*, 2184 (ii); in Com., 4684 (iii).

Alcorn, Mr. G. O., *Prince Edward, Ont.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4375; in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7960 (iv).

Bay of Quinte, Lighthouse *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).

Criminal Code (summary appeals) Amt. B. 45 (Mr. Porter) on Amt. (Mr. Bureau) *re* Race Courses, 5137 (iii).

Immigration Association in Prince Edward County (remarks) in Com. of Supply, 7706 (iv).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1205 (i).

SUPPLY :

Immigration (interpreters) 7706 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (life-saving awards) 2624 (ii).

Ames, Mr. H. B., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

'Acadia' Str., Disposition of Fittings, &c., (Ques.) 1849 (i).

Acetylene Gas Lights, Number, Annual Saving, &c. (Ques.) 1592 (i).

Adulteration of Food, Inspection *re* (remaks) in Com. of Sup., 1723 (i).

Advances by O.C., Total Amount, &c. (Ques.) 267 (i).

Ames, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*

Alberta Steam Service, Number of Navigable Miles, &c. (Ques.) 6904 (iv).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co., Claims of Damages, Amounts paid (Ques.) 2063 (ii).

——— (remarks) 7021 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Mothersill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9382 (v).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4504 (iii); in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8006 (v) ; on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7789, 7829, 7880, 7930, 7951 (iv).

Bissonnette, vs. Crown, Illegal Stamping of Letters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 194 (i).

Boots and Shoes, Imports and Exports, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7216 (iv).

Bout de l'Isle, Repentigny and Charlemagne Ferry Service (Ques.) 9696 (v).

British American Fish Corporation, Contract *re* N. Western Lakes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2897 (ii).

Buoy Contracts, Tenders, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2742 (ii).

Butter in Cold Storage, Shipped by Allan SS. Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 881 (i).

'Canada'-'Cape Breton' Collision, Resignation of Capt. Salmon, (M. for cor.) 384 (i).

———'Statement of Case', (M. for ret.*) 2067.

———(remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2625 (ii).

Caplin and Paspebiac Ry., Payments *re* Subsidy, (M. for ret.) 3203 (ii).

Ames, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
Carbide purchased for Lighthouses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2710, 2743 (ii).
——— Quantity and Price (Ques.) 914 (i).
Copyright Act *re* Photographs, Amt. Legislation, &c. (Ques.) 1849 (i).
Dental Institute: *See* 'Franking Privilege'.
Electoral Lists in N.W.T., Names of Qualified Electors, &c. (Ques.) 7422 (iv).
Fishing Bounties Distribution, Rep. *re* Frauds (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2911 (ii).
Fort William Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6730 (iv).
Franking Privilege, Abuse of, *re* Circulars from Dental Institute (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1807 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Coal Supply (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2605 (ii).
——— Supplies, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2620 (ii).
——— circular *re* supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6464 (iv).
See 'Marine.'
Grain Survey Board, Recommendation from Montreal Board of Trade (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7230 (iv).
——— Pets., Memorials, &c., *re* (M. for copies) 1763 (i).
——— Toronto and Montreal, Appnmts. *re*, Names, &c. (Ques.) 910 (i).
Hamilton Cove, Que., P.O., Mail Service and Revenue (Ques.) 7421 (iv).
Harbour Buoys, Contracts with Companies *re* Placing, &c. (M. for ret.*) 917 (i).
Hodgins, Jonathon, Resignation from Montreal Harbour Commission (Ques.) 151 (i).
Hospital Dues for Sick Mariners Fund (remarks) in Com of Sup., 2687 (ii).
Immigration Arrangements for a Refund, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9322 (v).
Immigration Property, Montreal, Leased by Govt. (Ques.) 913 (i).
'Lady Laurier' Govt. Str., Repairs *re* Accident (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2597 (ii).
Lemieux, Jos., Appnmt. *re* Lightship Service, Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 1762 (i).
Lighthouse Supply Depots (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2709 (ii).
Lowe, Mr., Refusal *re* Ship 'Neptune' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).
'Lurcher' Lightship, Accident to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2855 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2752 (ii).
Mail Distributing Stations, Montreal, Purchase of Site, &c (Ques.) 915 (i).
'Maisonneuve,' Expenditure, &c, Duties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2744 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1849 (i).

Ames, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Circulars *re* private Tenders, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1399 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 4753 (iii).
See 'Govt.,' &c.
Molson's Bank Amt. (B. 14) 1° m., 317; in Com., 1755 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Appnmt. of Members (Ques.) 150 (i).
Montreal, Free Port, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7317 (iv).
——— Raising of Sunken Elevator, &c. (Ques.) 151 (i).
——— Removal of Shoals, &c (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7319 (iv).
——— Sheds, Cor. between P. W. St. George and Mar. Dept., *re* (M.) for copies, 689 (i).
——— Steel Sheds, Approval of Plans, &c. (Ques.) 151 (i).
——— Steel Freight Sheds, Rep. of Mr. Geo. S. Green *re* Plan, &c. (M. for copies*) 3204 (ii).
——— Sheds, Claims of P. Lyall & Sons, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1397 (i).
——— (Ques.) 687 (i)
Montreal Inland Revenue Building, Addition and Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1120 (i).
Montreal Post Office, Charges *re* Registered Letters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 183 (i).
——— Illegal Stamping of Letters for Election Matters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 194 (i).
——— Pneumatic System, Installation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1135, 1136 (i).
——— St. Catherine St. Branch, Unsanitary Condition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 182 (i)
——— Stealing of Cheques, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 198 (i).
Naval Militia, Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2909 (ii).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contracts *re* Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9323 (v).
Ocean and River Service, Removing Obstruction, &c. (Ques.) 151 (i).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 2540 (ii).
Protection to Women, Children, Pet. *re* Wife Beaters and Criminal Code (Ques.) 591 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners' Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. Prefontaine) in Com., 1243 (i).
St. George, Mr. P. W., Emplymt by Govt., (Ques.) 152 (i).
St. John, Halifax and W. Indies Mail Subsidies, Res. from Montreal Corn Exchange (read) 7178 (iv).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, in Com. of Sup., 2482 (ii).

Ames, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*

——— Aids to Navigation, 2858; Res. of Montreal Board of Trade (read) 2859 (ii).

——— Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 2461 (ii).

St. Louis, Capt., Reinstatement, Certificate *re* (Ques.) 591 (i).

Salmon, Capt., Resignation, &c. (M. for cor.) 384 (i).

See 'Canada,' &c.

Salmon Hatcheries and Provincial Fishing Leases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2905 (ii).

Seamen's Act Amt. B: 147 (Mr. Prefontaine) in Com., 7425 (iv).

Sorel Shipyards, Dredge Building, &c. (remarks in Com. of Sup., 6448 (iv).

——— Purchase of Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2486 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Adulteration of Food (Act violations, &c.) 1723 (i).

Canals—Trent (dredge engine) 9381 (v).

Chinese Immigration (salaries) 981 (i).

Fisheries (hatcheries) 2905; (inspectors' salaries) 2890 (ii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6401 (iv), 9323 (v).

Inspection of Staples (grain inspection) 7230 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies) 2705; (aids to navigation) 2758, 2858; (buoy contracts) 2742; (engineers' salaries) 2761; lightships, maintenance) 2706; (Marconi stations) 2869; (pilotage) 2760; (salaries) 2703; (submarine signals) 2877 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G. B. and Canada) 881; (Quebec and Natashquan) 967 (i); (St. John and W. Indies) 7088, 7178 (iv).

Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 2687 (iv).

Miscellaneous (Pacific Cable grant) 7239 (iv).

Ocean and River Service ('Aberdeen' boilers) 6465; (Arctic expedition) 6472; (examination of masters and mates) 2623; (govt. steamers) 2596; (icebreakers) 6464; (steamers, maintenance) 6464; (wrecks investigations) 6466 (iv).

Penitentiaries—(contract supplies) 479; (general expenditure) 476 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Richibucto) 6814 (iv); N.W.T. (Strathcona Horse barraks) 1637; Que. (Montreal Inland Rev.) 1120; (Montreal P.O., improvements) 1127; Montreal P.O., pneumatic system) 1136 (i); (Quebec hospital) 9547 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Cow Bay) 7401; (Inverness Mines) 7405; (Janvrin's Island) 7406; (Larry's River) 7407; (Mabou bridge) 7408; (Mahone bay) 7408; (Meteghan) 7413; (Port Hood) 7414; (West Arichat) 7419 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Barachois de Malbaie) 7287; (Bic wharf) 7288; (Canton Fabre) 7288; (Chambord wharf) 7289; (Chicoutimi) 7377; (Descente des Femmes wharf) 7307; (Doucet's Landing) 6850, 7299; (East Templeton wharf) 7303; (Grand Machins) 7304; (Grande Piles dam) 7329; (Lake St. John dredging) 7306; (Little Pabos) 7307; (Mont Louis wharf) 7310; (Montmorency wharf) 7312; (New Carlisle wharf) 7312; (Nicolet pier) 7313; (Notre Dame du Portage wharf) 7314; (harbour works) 6727; (Repentigny wharf) 7314; (Rimouski pier) 7320 (iv); (St. Lawrence channel) 2461 (ii); (St. Lawrence channel, suction dredge) 6447 (iv); (St. Mary's current) 814 (i); (St. Maurice dredging) 7326 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 9385; (Indiantown branch) 9482; Miscellaneous (Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. investigation) 9382 (v).

Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 7216 (iv).

Trading Stamp Abolition, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 7684 (iv).

Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 726 (i).

Wrecking Plants in St. Lawrence Channel, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2479 (ii).

Yukon Ter. Reforms, on M. (Mr. Thompson) to M. for Sup., 7041 (iv).

Armstrong, Mr. J. E., *East Lambton.*

Adulteration of Jams, &c., Prosecutions *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 2437 (ii).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5457, 5486; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4767 (iii); in Com. (distribution of seats) 7729; (lands vested in Crown) 5986 (iv).

——— School Clause Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5867 (iii).

Bank Notes, Printing, &c. (renarks) in Com. of Sup., 6252 (iv).

Bell, Dr., and Director of Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9305 (v).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1073 (i).

Cold Storage, *re* Atlantic Steamers on M. for Sup., 8183 (v).

——— Thermograph Records, &c. (Ques.) 2774 (ii).

Experimental Station in Niagara District, Cor., &c., Inquiry for, 7677 (iv).

Fessenden Wireless Tel. of Canada Co.'s incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6381 (iv).

Galena Oil Co., President's Name, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).

Geological Reports, Distribution, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sep., 9621 (v).

Grand Bend Pier, Delay in Building, &c. (Ans.) 1344 (i).

Grimsby, Establishment of Farm, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6166 (iv).

House of Commons, High Temperature, Regulation of (remarks) 9303 (v).

I.C.R., Advertising Car, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2257 (ii).

Armstrong, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Freight Diversion and Traffic Arrangements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2233 (ii).

——— Purchases *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2182 (ii).

Jams, Preserves, &c., Adulteration of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).

Japan Exhibition, Trade Increase *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6273 (iv).

Kitchen, Mr., Contract for Murray Harbour Branch Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2138 (ii).

Mail Subsidies, &c., Total Vote (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9617 (v).

Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2138 (ii).

Niagara Fruit Growers' Association, Cor., &c., Inquiry for, 9395 (v).

Oils for Illuminating Purposes, Testing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7617 (iv).

Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contracts, Tender of Conmee & Bowman, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4478 (iii).

Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1322 (i).

Railway Commissioners B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1619 (i).

Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at London and Oxford Elections (M.) to adjn., 7331 (iv).

Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 103 (Mr. Tobin) on M. for 2°, 2297 (ii).

Rural Mail Delivery, Cost of Establishment, &c., on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Ret., 2082 (ii).

St. Joseph Pier, Lake Huron, Delay *re* Completion (Ques.) 2774 (ii).

Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 338 (i).

SUPPLY:

Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1701, 1710 (i).

Arts, Agriculture, &c (exhibitions) 6273; (experimental farms) 6166 (iv).

Canals—Lachine (enlargement) 6294; (Mill street paving) 6301 (iv).

Canals—St. Lawrence (shoals) 6289; St. Peters (dredging) 6303; Soulanges (construction) 6290 (iv).

Canals—Trent (Holland River) 9374 (v): (lowering floor of lock) 6302; (surveys) 6292 (iv).

Canals—Welland (electric plant) 1231 (i); (long level deepening) 6291 (iv); (Port Colborne elevator) 1322 (i).

Civil Govt. —Interior (mines branch) 6265 (iv).

Customs (collectors' salaries) 409 (i).

Dom. Lands (homestead inspectors) 9261 (v); (inspectors salaries, &c.) 6419; (maps, printing, &c.) 6426; (surveys, maps, &c) 6406 (iv).

Legislation—H. of C. (telephone evidence translation) 9621 (v).

Miscellaneous (tariff commission) 9614 (v).

Armstrong, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additions to H. of C.) 9544 (v); (elevator attendance) 1667; (H. of C. improvements) 1565; (lighting) 1667; (Royal Mint) 609; (steel shelving) 1564; (telephones) 1669 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Grand Bend) 7553 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 7613; (clerical assistance) 7620; (Ottawa river works) 7613 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges (N.W.T., Battle river) 7590; (Bryson) 7586; (colonization roads) 7594; Ottawa (repairs) 7585 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraphs—B.C. (Kamloops) 7610; Mar. Provs. (Bay St. Lawrence) 7608; N.W.T. (working expenses) 7633; Que. (Bersimis, &c.) 7609 (iv).

Quarantine (cattle) 2314 (ii).

Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, construction, &c.) 2287, 2298 (ii), 9498 (v); P.E.I. (agents' houses) 2180; (Murray Harbour and bridge) 2138 (ii).

Thermograph Records, Cold Storage on Steamers, &c (M. for ret.*) 2778 (ii).

See 'Cold Storage.'

Transportation Commission, Progress *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6447 (iv).

Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 717, 1774 (i).

Ventilation in House of Commons, &c (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).

Avery, Mr. M., *Frontenac.*

Ballot Box Frauds in Dom. Elections, on M. (Mr. Porter) to Com. of Sup., 9211 (v).

Barker, Mr. Saml., *East Hamilton.*

Apples, Packing for Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 739 (i).

Auditor General's Resignation and Audit Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6529 (iv).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 9659; 9671 (v).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5354; (Alberta boundaries) in Com., 5616, 5635 (iii); (Crown Lands) 8173; (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8052 (v); on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7774, 7953 (iv); (election of members) in Com., 5769; (H. of C. representation) in Com., 5751 (iii); (lands vested in Crown) in Com., 6006 (iv); (laws, courts, &c.) in Com., 5932; (Lt. Gov.'s powers) in Com., 5782 (iii); (school clause amt.) 7173 (iv).

——— on M. for 3°, Amt. (Rupert's Land) 8864 (v).

Autonomy (Saskatchewan) B. 70, sec. 12 (distribution of seats) in Com., 8750; (Rupert's Land) Amt. 8761 (v).

Ballot Box Frauds, on M. (Mr. Porter) to Com. of Sup., 9225 (v).

Bank Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8689 (v).

Barker, Mr. Saml.—*Con.*
Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Denial *re* Election Speaking, 557 (i).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4237; on M. for 3°, 4413 (iii).
Canada Eastern Ry. Co., Purchase, &c., on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Ret., 735 (i).
Canada Life Assurance Co., Ref. to in Com. on B. 108, 4684 (iii).
Canadians detained at U.S. Borders, Letter (read) 5920 (iii).
Circulars issued by Mr. Cote *re* Census Returns (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 1098 (i).
Coal for Govt. Rys., from N. S. Mines, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 2191 (ii).
Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4267 (iii).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) in Com., 4972 (iii).
Dredges, Working Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 805 (i).
Dundonald Park and Ottawa Improvement Commission (remarks) in Com. on B. 180, 8687 (v).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2106, 3212 (ii).
Fessenden Wireless Tel. Co. of Canada incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6381, 6609 (iv).
Fishing Leases granted to F. H. Markey, in Western Lakes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2903 (ii).
Gillies Brothers Limited B. 95 (Mr. A. A. Wright) in Com., 2763 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4123, 4205; on M. for 3°, 4228 (iii).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) on M. for 3°, 7853 (iv).
G.T. Pacific, &c., Agreements with National Transcontinental Ry. Act (Ques.) 2776 (ii).
——— Terminals, Plans deposited with Dept. on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret. 2822, 2825 (ii).
Great Northern Ry. of Canada B. 71 (Mr. J. T. Shell) in Com., 4259 (iii).
House of Commons, Supplies, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6615 (iv).
Inland Revenue Act (guarantee bonds) Amt B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8678 (v).
I.C.R. and C.A. Ry. Act (running rights) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 4194 (iii); in Com., 6152, 7584 (iv).
I.C.R. and G.T.R. Arbitration, &c. (remarks) 69 (i).
I.C.R., Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1956 (i).
——— Reply to Financial Statement (Mr. Emmerson) 7446, 7467 (iv.).
——— Rolling Stock, Estimate of Cost, &c., in Com. of Sup., 9506 (v).
Japanese Trade with Canada, Discrimination *re* Canadian Manufactures, Quotation from 'Industrial Canada' (read) 6654 (iv).

Barker, Mr. Saml.—*Con.*
Killam, Judge, Appnmt. as Chairman of Ry. Commission (remarks) on M. for Com. on Res., 521 (i).
Locomotives built and purchased for I.C.Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1966 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, Letter of Mr. Rogers sent to Prime Minister (remarks) 4023 (ii).
Murray & Cleveland, Claims for Extras *re* Galops Canal : in Com. of Sup., 1221 (i).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2135, 2165 (ii).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9478 (v).
Northwest Territories B. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8768 (v).
Ontario Boundaries Extension, Cor. with Ross Govt., Inquiry for, 3590, 4078 (ii).
Ontario Fire Ins. Co.'s incorp B. 105 (Mr. Boyce) in Com., 2772 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2716 (ii).
Ottawa City Act Amt. B. 180 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8687 (v).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 4969, 5738 (iii).
Pearson, Geo., Relief B. 153 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 7623 (iv).
Pitblado, Isaac, Relief (B. 185) 1°*, 7906 (iv).
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Bowman & Conmee's Tender, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4472, 4667 (iii).
Port Colborne Breakwater, Elevator, &c., Cor., Papers, &c. (M. for copies*) 2067 (ii).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1292 (i).
Provl. Govt. in N.W. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Works under Contract, Supervision Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7590 (iv).
Ry. Act (crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 3236 (ii).
——— (express companies) Amt B. 4 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for Adjnmt., 3247 (ii).
Railway Commissioners, Appnmt. of Chairman B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com., 521; in Com. on Res., 580 (i).
Railway Surveys in Joliette Co., Instructions, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2066 (ii).
Returning Officers, Forms and Instruction *re* Dom. Elections (M. for copies*) 697 (i).
——— Instruction *re* Form of Oaths, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7348 (iv).
Rivière Ouelle Spur Line (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1981 (i).
Royal Mint, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 618 (i).
Russian Priests canvassing for Conservatives (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9264 (v).
Seamen's Act B. 147 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7434 (iv).

Barker, Mr. Saml.—*Con.*
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1204 (i).
Sidings and Spur Lines, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 1970 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9346 (v).
Spirits in Bond, Age Limit, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8683 (v).
Submarine Signalling Bells: in Com. of Sup., 2874, 2885 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c.—Experimental Farms (bulletins) 6928 (iv); (Patent Record) 1473 (i).
Canals—Galops (enlargement) 1220 (i) ; Trent (Holland river) 9360 ; (surveys of dams) 9377 (v); Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1292; (surveys) 1234 (i).
Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 77, 90; Customs (salaries) 79; Privy Council (salaries) 72; Sec. of State (salaries) 76 (i).
Customs (expenses) 262 (i).
Fisheries (inspectors' salaries) 2885 (ii).
House of Commons (Sergeant-at-Arms, salaries) 6610 (iv).
Indians—Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6517, 6520 ; Man. and N.W.T. (live stock) 6540; N.B. (medical attendance) 6516; (seed grain) 6516 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7515 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoys) 2729 (ii); (lighthouse repairs) 6638 (iv); (submarine signals) 2874 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 981 (i).
Miscellaneous (secret service) 6958 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (schools of navigation) 2645 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Glace Bay) 1035; (Halifax, Dom. building) 1037; (Shelburne) 1044; (Sydney P.O.) 1045; Ottawa (Royal Mint) 607; Que. (Chicoutimi) 1106; (Grosse Isle) 1108 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers Generally (dredging) 805 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Baddeck) 7396; (Bridgewater) 7398; (Carlos Breakwater) 7398; (Cow Bay, Port Morien) 7401; (Inverness Mines) 7405; (Margaree) 7410 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Cobourg) 7549; (Collingwood) 7550; (Hamilton harbour) 7556; (Lake Temiscaming) 7559; (Little Current) 7560; (Midland) 7561; (Otonabee River) 7564; (repairs, &c.) 7555; (Sarnia) 7564; (Spanish river) 7565 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Ste. Famille wharf) 7390; (St. Fidele) 7391 ; (St. François de Sales) 7391 ; (St. Fulgence) 7392 ; (St. Louis Feeders) 7385 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Dom. colonization roads) 7601 ; (traffic bridges) 7592 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings, &c.) 1970 (i); (bridge strengthening) 9386 (v); (Campbellton) 1968 ; (capital expenditure) 1956 (i); (double tracking) 9390; (engine houses) 9389 (v); (general vote) 7446, 7467 (iv); (Memramcook accommodation) 1977 (i); (Moncton accommodation) 9391 (v); (Newcastle improvements) 1967 (i); (Pictou accommodation) 9390 (v) ; (rolling stock) 2037 (ii), 9501 (v); (St. Fabien subway) 1981 (i); (St. John accommodation) 9389 (v); (St. Moise station) 1976; (semaphores) 1986; (steel rails, fastenings, &c.) 1988 (i), 2038 (ii).
Railways—P.E.I. (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2041, 2135 (ii).
Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Zimmerman) in Com., 4259 (iii).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. D. Ross) on M. for 2°, 4701 (iii); in Com., 8315, 8637 (v).
Western Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4686 (iii).
Woodi'l, Seymour, Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ques.) 2191 (ii).

Barr, Mr. J., *Dufferin.*
Apples, Packing for Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 677 (i).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3921 (ii); (laws, courts, &c.) in Com., 5933 (iii); (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8518; on M. for 3° on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8837 (v).
Cement : in Com. on Ways and Means, 8992 (v).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 1001; in Com., 644 (i).
Chesley Postmastership Vacancy, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 9081 (v).
Citizens' Bank of Canada (B. 133) 1°*, 4271 (iii); in Com., 5973 (iv).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9425 (v).
Dredges, Hiring, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6842 (iv).
Franking Privilege, Use of Stamp *re* Documents, &c. (remarks) 5134 (iii), 5963, 6834, 6961 (iv).
House of Commons, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1568 (i).
Immigrants, Number arriving in 1904, &c. (Ques.) 1148 (i).
Immigration of Skilled Labour and Toronto Labour Council, on M. (Mr. Foster) 7510 (iv).
Inland Revenue Act (guarantee bonds) Amt. B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8681 (v).
Jams, &c., Adultaration of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1712 (i).
Lump-jaw in Cattle (remarks) on Conc., 6917 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9470 (v).
Officials dismissed by Mr. Whitney (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iv).

Barr, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3135 (ii).
Parole System for Convicts (remarks) in Com of Sup., 471 (i).
Post Office Regulations *re* Distribution of Packages sent to Postmasters, Cor., &c. (read) 6834 (iv).
See 'Franking', &c.
——— Packages, Inquiry for, 6961 (iv).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'
Royal Mint, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 618 (i).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 335, 1167 (i).
Shelburne Postmaster, Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re* (M. for copies) 595 (i).
Shelburne P.O. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1043 (i).
Spirits in Bond, Age, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8681 (v).
SUPPLY:
Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1700 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Can. exhibits at Imperial Institute) 1838 (i); (experimental farms) 6166; (bulletins) 6928 (iv); (Year Book) 1475 (i).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 9058; (patent branch) 9057 (v); Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 6266 (iv).
Dom. Lands (maps, printing, &c.) 6425 (iv).
Excise (methylated spirits) 1691; (travelling expenses) 1689 (i).
Geological Survey (salaries) 9249 (v).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6388 (iv).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (Treaty No. 9) 9336 (v).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (keepers' salaries) 2697 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Canals Celebration, Sault Ste. Marie) 9621; (International Congress, Reception at Quebec) 9622 (v).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, maintenance) 2618; (schools of navigation) 2640 (ii); (winter mail service) 6467 (iv).
Penitentiaries (parole system) 471 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (St. John quarantine) 1053 (i); N.W.T. (Edmonton) 9550 (v); N.S. (Shelburne) 1043 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additions, &c.) 9544 (v); (H. of C. improvements) 1568; (Printing Bureau, addition) 1575 (i); (Rideau Hall, grounds) 9551 (v); (Royal Mint) 618 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Apple River wharf) 1731.
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bracebridge) 7547; (Grand River dredging) 6873; (Collingwood) 7549; (Little Current) 7560; (Midland) 7561; (Ottawa locks) 7561; (Owen Sound) 7561 (iv), 9600 (v); (Penetanguishene) 7563 (iv); (Saugeen) 9602 (v); (Wiarton) 7569 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (McPherson's cove) 1735 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (compensation to Jos. Paul) 6463; (Doucet's Landing) 6849; (Maskinongé river) 6842.
Quarantine (Grosse Isle steamer) 1838; (William's Head) 1841 (i).

Barr, Mr. J.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Steamboat Inspection (salaries) 2695.
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 1696; (standards) 1695 (i).
Telephone System, Investigation, &c., on M. (Sir Wm. Mulock) for Sel. Com., 2684.
Temiscamingue, Establishment of Experimental Farm (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).
Thessalon Postmaster, Mr. J. B. Dobey, Irregularities, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6203 (iv).
Trading Stamps: *See* 'Criminal.'

Beauparlant, Mr. A. M., *St. Hyacinthe.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4395 (iii).

Beland, Mr. H. S., *Beauce.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3906 (ii).
Maple Product, Adulteration of, Prevention by Govt. (Ques.) 1340 (i).

Belcourt, Hon. N. A., *Ottawa.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3498 (ii); in Com. (school clause amt.) 7160 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8461; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8298; (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) dual language, 8570 (v).
See 'Manitoba.'
Cabinet Ministers-ex, Annuity B. 203 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 9739 (v).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) on Sen. Amts., 7625 (iv).
Dundonald, Earl of, Cor. O. C's., &c., *re* Dismissal (M. for copies*) 3205 (ii).
House of Commons, Duties of Clerks *re* (remarks) 9077 (v).
Imperial Guarantee and Accident Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 98) 1°*, 2043; in Com., 2770 (ii).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6670 (iv).
L'Union St. Joseph du Canada incorp. (B. 151) Pet. presented, 2490, 2491 (ii); 1°*, 5783 (iii).
McGillicuddy, Mr. D., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6602 (iv.)
Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation (remarks) 4015 (ii).
Militia Infantry Corps, Reduction of, &c. (Ques.) 7019 (iv).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2057 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1890 (i); in Com., 2533, 2537, 2958, 3199; on Amt. (Mr. Stewart) to M. for 3°, 3395 (ii).

Belcourt, Hon. N. A.—*Con.*
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s (B. 92) 1°*, 2005 (ii) ; in Com., 4965, 4968 (iii).
Owen, Thomas David, Patent Relief B. 177 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 8652 (v).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Ry. Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 570 (i).
'Renegade Liberals,' &c., Ref. to in speech on Autonomy Bill, 3527 (ii).
Secretary of State, Deptl. Employes, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 8655 (v).
SUPPLY :
House of Commons (sessional clerks) 6596 (iv).
Treadgold Concessions, Instructions to Commissioners (remarks) 7101 (iv).
Yukon Reforms *re* Condition of Govt. (remarks) on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 7085 (iv).

Bennett, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5262 (iii) ; (lands vested in Crown) in Com., 6033 (iv).
Autonomy Bill, Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2576 (ii).
Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Conspiracy, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. on B. 36, 541 ; Cor. (read) 543 ; Tel. (read) 546 (i).
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers (remarks) on Orders of the Day, 3586 (ii).
Canadian Cattle, British Embargo (remarks) 457 (i).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 650 (i).
Coal Contracts *re* Penitentiaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 478 (i).
Coldwater and Lowering Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ques.) 1848(i), 2594 (ii).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Payments by Govt. *re* Bounty (Ques.) 6653 (iv).
Collingwood Public Dock, Tenders *re* Conroy Bros. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6572 (iv).
Conmee & Bowman, Dredging Contract *re* Port Arthur and Ft. William, Advertisements for Tenders, &c. (M.) to adjn., 4458 (iii).
See 'Ft. William,' 'Dredges,' &c., 'Port 'Arthur,' &c.
Dredges built by Govt. at Toronto (remarks) 2456 (ii.
Dredging Plant, &c., imported into Canada, Valuation, &c. (Ques.) 5425 (iii).
Dredges imported and Entries at Customs (remarks) *re* Answer to Question, 5595 (iii).
Dukis Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber, &c. (Ques.) 3202 (ii).
Exchequer Court Judgeship, Appnmt. of (remarks) 5209 (iii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*
Fort William and Port Arthur Dredging, Number of Tenders, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6729 (iv).
See 'Conmee,' &c.
Gas Plant at Parry Sound, Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2725 (iv).
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale, &c., to Mr. F. W. Grant (remarks) 6479 (iv).
——— on Explanation (Mr. Grant) 6737 (iv).
Grain carried and exported through Govt. Elevators (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1917 (i).
Grand Trunk Railway Co.s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3885 (ii).
Hope Island Timber Cutting, Inquiry for Papers, 2759 (ii).
I.C.R., Traffic Arrangements with other Rys. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1917 (i).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6658, 6666 (iv).
Killam, Judge, Appnmt. of as Chairman of Ry. Commission (remarks) on M. for Com. on Res., 541 (i).
Kingston Penitentiary Supplies, Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 477 (i).
Levis, Purchase of Land for I.C.R. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6668 (iv).
McCraney, Mr., Charges *re* Frauds *re* Census (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 650 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 3968 (ii).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6808 (iv).
Midland Govt. Dock, Tenants, Rent, &c. (Ques.) 5428 (iii).
——— Protest *re* Govtl. Action (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9557 (v).
Midland Harbour Range Lights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2734 (ii).
——— on Statement of Dep. Min. (remarks) 2853 (ii).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5591 (iii).
Parliament Grounds Paving Contract, on M. (Mr. Hughes) to adjn., 5792 (iii).
Parry Sound, Buoy Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2858 (ii).
——— Gas Plant, Purchase of Property (remarks) 2725 (ii).
Penetanguishene Dredging, Owner's Name, &c. (Ques.) 2063 (ii).
Plunkett, Geo., Contract *re* Coal for Penitentiaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 479 (i).
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Conmee & Bowman's Tender (M.) to adjn., 4645, 4676 (iii.)
——— Advertisement for Tender, &c. (M.) to adjn., 4458 (iii).
——— Tenders *re* (remarks) 5963 (iv).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Postal Service, Patronage *re* Boots for Mail Carriers (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6229 (iv).

Pound Net Licenses issued (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2892 (ii).

Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'

Ry. Commissioners (appnmt. of chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 541 (i).

Sbaretti : *See* 'Manitoba,' &c.

'Sequin,' Str., Purchase by Govt. (Ques.) 3834 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Trent (Holland river) 9361; (surveys) 9356 (v).

Dom. Lands (Banff Park Waterworks) 9306 (v).

Fisheries (inspectors' salaries) 2892 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoys) 2730; (gas lights) 2725 (ii).

Pentitentiaries (Kingston) 477 (i).

Post Office (mail service) 9611 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (St. Boniface) 9549 ; N.W.T. (Edmonton) 9550 ; (Saskatoon) 9550 (v).

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Neepawa) 9549; (Orillia) 9549; (Owen Sound) 9547; Ottawa (post office fittings) 9551 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.S. Battery Point) 9552 ; (Phinney's Cove) 9557 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Crowe's Landing) 9600; (Honora wharf) 9597 ; (Manitoulin wharf) 9597 ; (Midland harbour) 9601; (Rama wharf) 9602; (Rosseau wharf) 9600 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Anse à l'Ilot) 9591 ; (Beauce wharf) 9591; (Grande Rivière de Beaupré) 9592; (Lake Megantic) 9591; (Riviere aux Renards) 9592; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 2456 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 1912 (i); (Indiantown branch) 9482 (v).

Thessalon Postmaster, Irregularities, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6227 (iv).

Victoria Harbour Mail Contract (Ques.) 2191 (ii).

Watson, Customs Collector at Collingwood, Superannuation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 408 (i).

Waverly Postmaster, Duties and Residence, &c. (Ques.) 5427 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5807 (iii).

Wire Fencing : *See* 'N.W.T.'

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*

Acetylene Gas Invention of Mr. Painchaud, *re* Safety (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6308 (iv).

Adulteration Act Amt. (B. 197) 1°*, 9179 (v).

Anthracite Coal and Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. Gallihier) to present Pet., 4550 (iii).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 892 (i).

Atlas, Samples furnished by Interior Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9308 (v).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

Audit Act Amt., Govtl. Intention (remarks) 6112 (iv).

Auditor General's Rep., on Inquiry for (remarks) 97 (i).

Autonomy Bill, 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5443, 5480 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3462 (ii); (Alberta boundaries) in Com., 5601 (iii); (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) dual language 8547, 8568 (v); (school clause amt.) 7134 (iv); 8387 (v); (Senate representation) 5675 (iii); on M. for 3° (Amt.) Schools, 8831; Neg. (Y. 7; N. 138) 8832 (v).

Autonomy Bill Circular, signed by T. Brown, Sec. of Public Instruction, Printing, &c. (remarks) 3009 (ii).

See 'Sbaretti,' 'Saskatchewan.'

Banking Act Amendment (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 607 (i).

——— (remarks) 6112 (iv).

Bank Notes, Supervision *re* Printing and Circulation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6254 (iv).

Beauharnois Canal Water Power, Negotiations *re* procuring for Electric Lighting, &c. (Ques.) 1504 (i).

——— utilization of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6307 (iv).

——— Waterways, Opening of Feeders: in Com. of Sup., 7380 (iv).

Bicquet Lighthouse Keeper, Name, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3202 (ii).

Bic Wharf, Purchase of Land from P. Ross, &c. (Ques.) 1850 (i).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 179 (Mr. Turriff) on M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 8653 (v).

Cabinet Ministers-ex, Annuities B. 203 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9792 (v).

Cacouna Wharf, Expenditure *re* Work, &c. (Ques.) 7096 (iv).

Canadian Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Com., 9007 (v).

Catholic Mutual Benefit Association B. 93 (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com., 2770 (ii).

Caughnawaga Indians, Medical Attendance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 225 (i).

Chateauguay River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6847 (iv).

Château Richer, Public Works, Dates of Payment, &c. (Ques.) 3202 (ii).

——— Montmorency Wharf, Expenditure by Govt. (remarks) 1015 (i)

Collingwood Govt. Dock, Tenders *re* Conroy Bros. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6576 (iv).

Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9429 (v).

Curran Bridge and Sorel Bridge Scandals, Ref. to on Nixon Charges, 8142 (v).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
Debates, French Edition, Delay in Translation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 239 (i).
Debates, Official, 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 5034 (iii).
——— on M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com., 9809 (v).
Dismissals from Public Offices, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).
Divorce Bills, Vote *re*, &c. (personal explanation) 6377, 6405, 6571 (iv).
Doutre, Mr. Alex., Dismissal and Reinstatement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 142 (i), 6247 (iv).
Edmonton Electoral District, Galician Vote, &c. (remarks) 4201 (iii).
Electoral Atlas, Distribution to Members (remarks in Com. of Sup., 6897 (iv).
——— New Edition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) on M. for 1°, 987 (i).
Extradition Cases by U.S., Before Commissioners, Montreal (Ques.) 3937 (ii).
Fessenden Wireless Tel. of Canada Co.'s incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6380, 6607 (iv).
First Minister's Salary, B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3°, 9790 (v).
Foreign Coin Circulation, Prevention *re* (remarks) 8776 (v).
Fort William and Port Arthur Dredging, Number of Tenders, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6730 (iv).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 52 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 2113 (ii), 9199 (v).
Gaynor-Greene Extradition, Charges against Mr. Lafontaine, &c. (Ques.) 3937 (ii).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9399 (v).
G.T.P. Commission, Appnmt. of Hon. S. N. Parent (remarks) 699 (i).
G.T.P. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7626 (iv).
Harbours and Boards of Commissioners, Names, &c., (Ques.) 1063 (i).
Harbour Commissions, Control of by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6725 (iv).
Harper, Geo. Dance, Relief B. 154 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) on M. for 3°, 6377 (iv).
House of Commons, Accommodation, Doorkeepers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6600 (iv).
——— Rooms for Members, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 238 (i).
Imports and Exports, Duties paid, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) for Ret. 3204 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 7421 (iv).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
Judges of Provincial Courts Act (salaries) Amt. B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9794 (v).
Lachine Canals, Nuisances of Whistles, &c. (remarks) 9284 (v).
Letter Carriers, Bonuses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 215 (i).
——— Uniforms, Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 207 (i).
Lewis, Edward Norman, Relief B. 142 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 5137 (iii).
Library of Parliament, Enlargement of Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6944 (iv).
Lighthouse Keeper at Bicquet, Name, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3202 (ii).
McGillicuddy, Mr. D., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6602 (iv).
McGill University, School of Transportation, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9381 (v).
Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr Sbaretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 4052 (ii).
Marconi Stations in Operation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6625 (iv).
Martin, Eli, Emplymt. in Customs Dept. (Ques.) 7097 (iv).
Military School for Montreal, Selection of Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7009 (iv).
Militia Act (permanent force) Amt. B. 170 (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for 2°, 7267 (iv).
Militia Officers, and Independence of Parlt. Act, Suggested Amt. (remarks) 5137 (iii).
Militia Staffs of Officers, Reduction in Number, &c. (Ques.) 5315 (iii).
'Montcalm,' Str., Experiments *re* Icebreaking (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).
Montreal Customs, Dep. Collector, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 256 (i).
Montreal Dom. Exhibition, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 192 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 9288 (v).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 779 (i).
Montreal Inland Revenue Buildings Addition, Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1123 (i).
Montreal Post Office, Illegal Stamping of Letters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 196 (i).
——— Improvements, New Station (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 222 (i).
——— Rep. of Supt. of Health (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 203 (i).
Nixon, Mr., Dom. Lands Agent, Charges against, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8142 (v).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9322 (v).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5584 (iii).
N. W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 8 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 460 (i).
Northwest Territories B. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8765 (v).
Ottawa Buildings, Concentration of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3180 (ii).
Pacific Bank of Canada B. 175 (Mr. Galliher) on M. for 2°, 7625 (iv).
Parent, Hon. S. N., Appnmt. to G.T.P. Commission (remarks) 699 (i).
Parole System for Convicts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 467 (i).
Patent Medicines, Inspection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1725 (i).
Pearson, Geo., Relief B. 153 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 7623 (iv).
Plains of Abraham, Number of Acres purchased by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
Postmasters as Political Partisans (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6247 (iv).
Printing Bureau, Enlargement of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6897, 6948 (iv).
'Protestant School', Ref. to Mr. Fielding's Speech, 3482 (ii).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Accounts Com., Meetings, &c. (remarks) 7100 (iv).
Public Works and Marine Depts., Line of Demarcation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6841 (iv).
Public Works under Contracts, Supervision, Drawback (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7588 (iv).
Quebec Drill Hall, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1145 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 1243 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Transfer to Marine Dept., 771 (i).
Railways Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6145 (iv).
Railway Passes, Certificate of Identification for Members (M.) 7249 (iv).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7346 (iv).
Richibucto Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6731 (iv).
Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 169 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6967 (iv).
Ste. Famille Wharfage Dues, Abolition of (Ques.) 1150 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1149 (i).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
St. Francois and Quebec SS. Subsidy, Request *re* (Ques.) 1504 (i).
St. James Division Branch Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 218 (i).
St. Lawrence River Channel, Charges *re* 'J. I. Tarte' Dredge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2463 (ii).
St. Timothée Wharf, Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7305 (iv).
Saskatchewan B. 70, in Com. on Res., 8701 (v).
Sbaretti's, M'gr., Explanation *re* Man. Boundaries, Letter of Mr. Fitzpatrick to Bishop of Quebec (read) 4053 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Indemnity B. 201 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9791 (v).
Sorel Dredge Building, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 794 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9345 (v).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dom. exhibitions, B.C.) 9608 (v).
Adulteration of Food (patent medicines) 1725 (i).
Canals—Beauharnois (repairs) 6307 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (culvert St. Therese Island) 6301 (iv).
Canals—Cornwall (lock repairs) 9381 (v).
Canals—Lachine (Côte St Paul bridge) 6294 (iv) ; (electric appliances) 9354 (v); (enlargement) 6295 ; (Hanault, O. L., payments) 6299 ; (lock gates suspension) 6301; (Mill St. paving) 6301 ; (power house flume) 6299 ; (repairs) 6306 (iv) ; (St. Gabriel basin) 9378 (v) ; (wall underpinning) 6298 ; (widening tailrace) 6299 (iv).
Canals—St. Ours (landing wharf) 6302 (iv).
Canals—Trent (staff on dams) 9383 (v).
Charges of Management (Receiver General's Office) 6249 (iv), 9053 (v).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (archivist) 9054 (v); (salaries) 92 ; (Aud. General's Dept. (salaries) 77, 91 ; Finance (salaries) 119 ; (High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 120; Indian Affairs (salaries) 116; Justice (fees, witnesses and jurors) 135 (i) ; Post Office (contingencies) 6247 (iv) ; (salaries) 95 ; Public Works (salaries) 94 (i) ; Sec. of State (Civil Service Examiners) 6249 (iv); (purchase of books) 75 (i).
Customs—(contingent expenses, &c.) 256 ; Yukon (living allowances) 411 (i).
Dom. Lands (surveys, maps, &c.) 6406 (iv).
Dominion Police (salaries) 138 (i).
Excise (contingencies) 6724 (iv).
Fisheries ('Petrel,' protection service) 6630 (iv).
Geological Survey (salaries) 9249 (v).
House of Commons (contingencies) 250 ; (debates) 239 (i) ; (leather trunks) 6606 (iv); (salaries) 238 (i) ; (sessional clerks) 6597; Library (books) 6944 (iv).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6385 (iv).
Indians (land management fund) 236 ; Ont. (blankets, clothing) 225; (medical attendance) 225; Quebec (Oka band) 235; (St. Regis lockup) 237 (i).
Justice—Yukon (court fees, &c.) 137; (judges' allowances) 126 ; (law books, &c.) 136 ; maintenance of prisoners) 135 (i).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7511 (iv).
Legislation—Franchise Act (voters' lists) 6897, 6954 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (revolving lights) 2704 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Mexico) 895; (Can. and S. Africa) 974; (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 945; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 948 (i).
Marine Hospitals (St. John, N.B.) 6628 (iv); (sick seamen) 2686 (ii).
Militia (Advisory Board) 436 (i); (permanent force) 9110 (v); (Royal Military college) 7000 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Pacific cable grant) 7276 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (hydrographic surveys) 6625 (iv).
Penitentiaries (parole system) 467 (i).
Pensions (Fenian Raid) 6956; (Militiamen, 1885) 6957 (iv).
Post Office (Compassionate allowance *re* Patrick Gallery) 6628; (inspector W. A. Cairns' salary) 6629; (mail service) 6629 (iv); (ry. mail clerks) 139 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (improvements) 6735; N.B. (Richibucto) 6731 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (London drill hall) 6732 (iv).
Public Buildings, Ottawa (additions to H. of C.) 9544 (v); (Archives) 603 (i); (elevators) 9551 (v); (museum) 765; (Royal Mint) 606 (i).
Public Works — Buildings — Que. (Grosse Isle) 1109 (i), 6734 (iv); (Levis) 1112; (Longueuil) 1114; (Magog) 1114; (Montreal barracks) 1118; (Montreal Inland Rev.) 1119; (Montreal military buildings) 1126; (Montreal P. O. improvements) 1127; (Montreal P. O. pneumatic system) 1135; (St. John's) 1143; (Valleyfield) 1144 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Fort Lawrence) 6838; (L'Ardoise breakwater) 6839; (Port Hawkesbury) 6837 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur) 787; Que. (Anse aux Beaufils) 7285; (Anse aux Gris Fonds) 7285; (Anse St. Jean) 7286; (Baie des Peres, Lake Temiscamingue) 7287; (Barachois de Malbaie) 7287; (Bic wharf) 7288; (Canton Fabre) 7288; (Chambord wharf) 7289; (Chateauguay dredging) 6847, 7322; (Chateau Richer) 7290; (Descente des Femmes wharf) 7307; (Desjardins wharf) 7298; (Doucet's Landing) 6849, 7298; (eastern channel) 7330; (East Templeton) 7301; (Fraserville harbour) 7323; (Gatineau Point) 7303; (Grand Piles dam) 7327 (iv); (Que. harbour improvements) 770 (i), 6724 (iv); (Isle St. Therese) 7376; (Lake St. John dredging) 7306; (Laprairie ice piers) 7306; (Lavaltrie wharf) 7306; (Little Rapids dam) 6839 (iv); (Louise embankment) 770 (i); (Magdalen Islands) 7308; (Maskinonge river) 6842; (Mille Vaches) 7310; (Mistook wharf) 7310; (Mont Louis wharf) 7310; (Montmagny wharf) 7311; (Montmorency Falls) 7311; (Montmorency wharf) 6852; (Nicolet pier) 7313; (Notre Dame du Portage wharf) 7314; (Ottawa river) 7376; (Peel Head bay) 7314; (Riviere du Lievre) 7325; (Riviere du Loup) 7325; (Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere) 7390; (Ste Famille wharf) 7390; (St. Fidele) 7391; (St. François, Orleans) 7391; (St. Francis de Sales) 7392; (St. Jean, Orleans) 7393 (iv); (St. Lawrence channel) 2463 (ii); (St. Louis river) 7379; (St. Louis river feeders) 7381; (St. Maurice dredging) 6851, 7326; (Saguenay dredging) 7377; (Sorel ice piers) 6841; (Terrebonne) 7394; (Yamaska river) 7394 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Transportation, &c. (Georgian Bay surveys) 7637 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (balances, &c.) 7629; (clerical assistance) 7626; (Deep Waterways Commission) 6894; (engineers, &c.) 6895; (technical books) 7627; (transportation commission) 7627 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges—N.W.T. (Battle river) 7588; (Shellmouth) 7592 (iv).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (Gatineau River) 7630 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Que. (J. C. Taché, special service) 6897; Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 6896 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, construction, &c.) 2287 (ii); I.C.R. (working expenses) 9384; Miscellaneous (school of transportation) 9381 (v).
Senate (contingencies) 6620 (iv).
Yukon Ter. Govt. (additional allowance to Maj. Wood) 9250; (local council grant) 9250 (v).

Trading Stamps: *See* 'Criminal Code'.

Uniforms for Letter Carriers. Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

Uniforms for Militia, Rules *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 438 (i).

Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 719 (i).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8639 (v).

Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 8696, 9544 (v).

Yukon Customs Officials, Living Allowances (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).

Yukon, Reforms *re* Condition of Govering, &c. (remarks) on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 7066 (iv).

Bickerdike, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*

Aids to Navigation, *re* St. Lawrence Channel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2891 (ii).

American Currency circulated in Canada, Prevention *re* (Ques.) 3010 (ii).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4360 (iii).

Bills from the Senate (M.) to place on Orders, 9278 (v).

Canadian Agency (B. 77) 1°*, 1671 (i); in Com., 9077; M. to ref. back to Banking and Commerce Com., 9078 (v).

Embargo on Canadian Cattle in G.B., on M. (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) to conc. in 6th Rep. of Committee, 9003 (v).

Bickerdike, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Montreal Harbour Commission, Permanent Sheds, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for copies, 162 (i).

St. Lawrence Channel, Aids to Navigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2891 (ii).

South Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 149) M. to place on Order Paper, 9278 (v).

Black, Mr. J. B., *Hants.*

Adulteration of Food, Centralization of Samples (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1717 (i).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5109 (iii);

——— Edmonton Election (remarks) in Com., 5893 (iii).

——— Ref. to Speech *re* 'Doukhobors and Englishmen' (remarks) in Com. on B., 5901 (iii).

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 106) 1°*, 2184 (ii); in Com., 4971; 3° m., 5113 (iii); on Sen. Amts., 7625 (iv).

G.B. and Her Colonies, Inter-Imperial Parlt., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2390 (ii).

Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6657 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1717 (i).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1361 (i).

Blain, Mr. R., *Peel.*

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., on Res., 737 (i), 2416; in Com., 2848 (ii).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3284 (ii); (lands vested in Crown) in Com., 5997; (subsidy to provs.) in Com., 6096 (iv).

——— School Clauses, Explanation *re* Amts. (remarks) 5820 (iii).

Binder Twine Industry at Kingston Pen. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 485 (i).

Canada Eastern and I.C.R., Accounts *re* Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1928 (i).

Canadian Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Com., 9007 (v).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 997; in Com. on B., 634, 1069 (i).

Census Enumerators, Appnmt of (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 1073 (i).

Circulars issued by Political Associations *re* Census, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 1097 (i).

Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8221 (v).

Cornwall Canal Employees during Election Campaign (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1229 (i).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Corry Block, Rental paid by Govt. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 6821 (iv).

Dredges, Working Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 804 (i).

Dundonald Park and Ottawa Improvement Commission (remarks) in Com. on B. 180, 8686 (v).

Geological Survey Museum, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 761 (i).

Georgian Bay Islands, Sale to F. W. Grant (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6505 (iv).

Glace Bay, N.S., Purchase of Site for Building (Ques.) 9697 (v).

Glanders, Spread of among Horses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6690 (iv).

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4218 (iii).

Halifax and Esquimalt Garrisons, Defence of by Canada (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).

Immigration, Contract with North Atlantic Trading Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv).

Immigration Literature, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7710 (iv).

Indians, Medical Inspection, Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6553 (iv).

I.C.R., Freight Rates and Traffic Arrangements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2237 (ii).

——— Locomotives, Purchase of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1964 (i).

Lumber for Govt. Use, Prices, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1514 (i).

'Lurcher,' Lightship, Accident *re*, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2852 (ii).

Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6770 (iv).

Marconi Wireless Tel. System, on Govt. Boats (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2615 (ii).

Marine Insurance, Reduction of Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2865 (ii).

Murray Harbour Branch Ry. and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2143 (ii).

North Hastings Census Enumerator, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1077 (i).

Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2051 (ii).

Oshawa Harbour Revenue (Ques.) 1504 (i).

Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).

Ottawa City Act Amt. B. 180 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8686 (v).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3196 (ii).

Passenger Stations and Freight Sheds, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 1977 (i).

Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Conmee and Bowman's Tender, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4662 (iii).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Time for Tenders (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6877 (iv).

Port Burwell Dredging Contract, Purchase of Dredge, &c. (Ques.) 8656 (v).

Port Colborne Elevator: in Com. of Sup., 1326 (i).

Port Credit Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6871, 7555 (iv).

Port Hood, N.S., Breakwater, Estimated Cost, Approval, &c. (Ques.) 5132 (iii).

Poultry, Experimental, on Farms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6183 (iv).

Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'

Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 303 (i).

Railway Commission Maintenance, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1524, 1537 (i).

——— Report (remarks) 6139 (iv).

——— Salaries paid, Private Secs., &c. (Ques.) 687 (i).

Royal Mint, Ottawa : in Com. of Sup., 608 (i).

Salmon, Capt., Rep. *re* Accident to 'Lurcher' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2878 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1169 (i) ; on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to M. for 3°, 1884 (i).

Standard Gauge Ry., Cost of Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2181 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Can. exhibits, Imperial Institute) 1838 (i) ; (experimental farms) 6183 ; (experimental farms bulletins) 6927 ; (live stock records) 6686 (iv) ; (quinquennial census, N.W.T.) 9609 (v).

Canals—Lachine (electric installation) 1240 (i).

Canals—Miscellaneous (arbitrations, &c.) 1508 ; (litigation) 1523 ; (repairs) &c.) 1546 (i).

Canals—Welland (bridge building) 1234 ; (electric plant) 1231 ; (Port Colborne elevator) 1326 ; (stone protection) 1498 ; (surveys) 1520 (i).

Dom. Lands (homestead inspectors) 6407 (iv).

Fisheries (fishery commission) 9173 (v) ; (inspectors' salaries) 2878 (ii).

Geological Survey (assay apparatus) 8671 (v).

Immigration (agents, G.B., &c., salaries) 6392, 7693 ; (contingencies) 7710 ; (interpreters) 7705 (iv).

Indians—B.C. (industrial schools) 6556 ; (medical attendance) 6555 ; (travelling expenses) 6556 (iv).

Indians—Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6537 (iv).

Indians—N.B. (medical attendance) 6517 ; (salaries) 6516 (iv).

Indians—N.S. (general vote) 6515 (iv).

Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7511 (iv).

Legislation (voters' lists) 6899, 6955 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 2865 (ii).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (wrecking plant) 958 (i).

Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 2686 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 6513 (iv); (permanent force) 9115 (v); (transports, &c) 6513 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 2609 (ii); (ice breakers, repairs) 9304 (v); (life-saving stations) 2635 (ii).

Penitentiaries (Kingston) 477; (parole system) 469 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vancouver) 1642 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—General (clerk of works) 1648 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 1633 (i); (Winnipeg customs) 9549 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 1018; (Sydney Mines) 1045 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont.—(Cobourg armoury) 1554; (Guelph armoury) 1557; (Owen Sound) 9548 (v); (St. Mary's) 1578; (Sandwich) 1579 ; (Toronto P.O., pneumatic tube system) 1591 (i).

Public Works — Buildings — Ottawa (improvements) 9549 (v); (museum) 755 ; (post office reconstruction) 1573 (i); (rents) 6821 (iv); (Royal Mint) 608; (telephones) 1669 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Lachute) 1111 ; (Levis) 1112 ; (Magog) 1114 (i).

Public Works—Dredging—General (vessel repairs) 7576; (P.E.I. plant) 7576 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Anderson, &c. lakes) 7573 ; (Columbia river) 7574 ; (Fraser channel) 7574 ; (Golden) 7574; (Langley) 7575; (Revelstoke) 7574; (Thompson river) 7575; (Victoria) 7576 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Dipper harbour) 7498; (Mud cove) 7500 ; (Petit Rocher) 7500 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Frude's Point) 9582; (Glace Bay) 9578 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bayfield pier) 7546; (Blanche river) 7547; (Cobourg 7549; (Collingwood) 6880, 7550; (Depot Harbour) 7552; (Grand river dredging) 6873 (iv); (Honora wharf) 9597 (v); (Lake Temiscaming) 7559; (Meaford) 7560; (Newcastle pier) 7561 (iv) ; (Oshawa harbour) 9600 (v); (Owen Sound harbour) 6886; (Point Edward dredging) 6869 (iv); (Port Arthur) 799 (i); (Rama wharf) 9602 (v); (repairs, &c.) 7555; (Sarnia) 7564 (iv); (Saugeen) 9602; (Stokes Bay) 9598 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Chateau Richer) 7295; (Doucet's Landing) 6849; (East Templeton) 7303 (iv) ; (Grosse Isle) 1109 (i); (Lake St. Peter piers) 6460 ; (Little Rapids dam) 6840 ; (Magdalen Islands) 7309; (Maskinonge river dredging) 6846; (Montmorency wharf) 6852; (New Carlisle wharf) 7312; (St. Lawrence channel, suction dredge) 6452 ; (St. Maurice river dredging) 6852 (iv).

Public Works — Telegraph Lines — B.C. (C.P.R. account) 9604; N.W.T. (Qu'Appelle-Edmonton) 9604; Que. (Descente des Femmes) 9604 (v); Yukon (Ashcroft and Dawson) 6896 (iv).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Quarantine (cattle) 6690; conc., 6917 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (construction) 9498 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (book-keeping, &c.) 1928; (locomotives) 1964 (i); (locomotive machinery) 6429 (iv); (Memramock accommodation) 1977; (St. Cyrille, diversion of line) 1970; (steel rails) 1996 (i), 2038 (ii); (ties, &c.) 6430 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (extra clerks) 1521 (i).
Railways—P.E.I. (Cardigan branch) 2175; (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2130 (ii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance, &c.) 1537 (i).
Steamboat Inspection (salaries) 2695 (ii).
Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 9039 (v).
Yukon Govt. (salaries, &c.) 7718 (iv).

Water Meters Inspection B. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8676 (v).

Wireless Telegraphy Regulation B. 186 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 9032 (v).

Wrecking Plant, 'Lord Strathcona,' in Com. of Sup., 958 (i).

Year-Book Statistics, &c (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 997 (i).

Bland, Mr. L. T., *North Bruce.*

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 6179 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Kincardine) 7558; (Saugeen) 7565; (Wiarton) 7569 (iv).

Bole, Mr. D. W., *Winnipeg.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5497 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4784 (iii).

Canadian Pacific Ry. Co's (B. 56) 1°* 985 (i).

Criminal Code Amt. (B. 23) 1° m., 450 (i).

Dominion Annuity Co.'s incorp. (B. 82) 1°*, 1745 (i); in Com., 2767; 3° m., 2768 (ii).

Half-breed Scrip, Charges, &c. (personal explanation) 7812 (iv).

Lebonk and Thunder Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 61) 1°*, 1241 (i).

Manitoba School Fund, Amount paid, Amount claimed (Ques.) 379 (i).

Northern Bank (B. 104) 1°*, 2184 (ii).

Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2047 (ii).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick, K.C.M.G. (Minister of Militia and Defence) Kings, N.S.

Ammunition, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).

Armouries, Construction of Generally (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 423, 1650 (i).

Cadets, Equipping and Practice, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9119 (v).

Camps of Instructions, Indemnity *re* Casualties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9148 (v).

Cavalry Corps, Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9126 (v).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick—*Con.*

Director of Operations *re* Militia Council (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 418 (i).

Dress Regulations for Militia (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 438 (i).

Halifax and Esquimalt Defences, Control by Can. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1403 (i).

——— Possession by Dom. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9114 (v).

Halifax and Esquimalt Naval Stations, Continuance of (remarks) 9678 (v).

Halifax Fortifications, Retention of Imperial Troops (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6510 (iv).

Highland Cadet Corps, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) 7814 (iv).

Inspector General of Militia (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 437 (i).

Judge Advocate General, Appmt. of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 425 (i).

Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6660 (iv).

——— Charges of Mr. S. Hughes (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9710 (v).

Lindsay Drill Hall, Erection of (Ans.) 271 (i).

London Drill Hall, Sale of old Site (Ans.) 8384 (v).

London Militiamen at Niagara (remarks) in Connection with London Election, 7251 (iv).

——— Telegrams (read) 7331 (iv).

Medical Officers and Independence of Parlt. Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 418 (i).

Medical Officers *re* Militia Districts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 417 (i).

Militia Council, Appnmts. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 415, 416 (i).

——— Constitution, Duties, &c. (regulations read) 420 (i).

——— Memoranda, &c., Papers laid on Table, 9073 (v).

——— Memorandum *re* General Policy, Quotations (read) in Com. of Sup., 9116 (v).

Military Hospital, St. Johns, Que., Contract *re* Repairs (Ans.) 5687 (iii).

Military School, Selection of Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7010 (iv).

Military Sites, Armouries, &c., Control of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 428 (i).

Military Training Camp, Central, Site, &c. (Ans.) 268 (i).

——— Camp at South Simcoe, Establishment of (remarks) 9713 (v).

Militia Act (permanent force) Amt. B. 170 (prop. res.) 6905; in Com. on Res., 6984; 2° m., 7263 (iv); on M. for 2°, 9179, 9195 (v).

Militia Armouries, &c., Supervision of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 423, 1650 (i).

Militia, Canadian Garrisons, Defence of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9107 (v).

Militia and Defence, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 4549 (iii).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick—*Con.*
Militia Estimates, Delay in bringing down, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) 9099 (v).
——— General Statement : in Com. of Sup., 9105 (v).
Militia Force, Reduction of (explanation) on M. for Sup., 6992 (iv).
——— Reduction of, (Ans.) 7019 (iv).
Militia Officers gazetted *re* Examinations (Ans.) 8886 (v).
Militia Orders *re* Civil Servants (remarks) 1261 (i).
Militia Staffs of Officers, Reduction in Number, &c. (Ans.) 5315 (iii).
Miltimore, J. M., Permission to attend Cavalry School, Toronto (Ans.) 6384 (iv).
Minnedosa Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9171 (v).
Naval Militia for Canada, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 1346 (i).
Ninety-Fifth Battalion, Reduction, &c. (Ans.) 909 (i).
Ottawa Drill Hall, Increased Accommodation, &c. (Ans.) 271 (i).
Permanent Force, Recruiting Points, &c. (Ans.) 5977 (iv).
See 'Militia Act (B. 170).'
Portland Cement, Prices paid, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 435 (i).
Rifle Range in Cape Breton (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9170 (v).
Ross Rifle Factory, Erection of Tank on Plains of Abraham (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 431 (i).
Royal Military College Act (salaries) Amt. (B. 169), prop. res., 6904 ; in Com. on Res., 6966 ; 1°*, 6984 ; in Com., 7262 (iv).
Royal Military College Graduates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9118 (v).
Sherbrooke Armouries, Provision for Militia (Ans) 266 (i).
S. A. Veterans and King's Medals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9160 (v).
SUPPLY :
Civil Govt.—Militia (contingencies) 9068 ; (salaries) 9067 (v).
Militia (annual drill) 441 (i), 6512 (iv) ; (armoury, Montreal) 9161 (v) ; (arsenal) 445 (i), 6513, 7012 (iv), 9170 ; (Esquimalt) 9170; (general statement) 9105 ; (Louisbourg Fort) 9170 (v) ; (pay and allowance) 415 (i), 6510 (iv) ; (permanent force) 9113 (v); (rifle, &c., grants) 444 (i) ; (Royal Military College) 7000 (v), 9170 (v) ; (stores) 6513 (iv) ; (surveys) 439 (i) ; (transport, &c.) 6513 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—General (armouries) 1650 (i).
Sussex Rifle Range, Inspector *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7011 (iv).
Toronto Drill Shed, in Com. of Sup., 1658 (i).
Woodstock Rifle Range, Purchase of Land (Ans.) 5132 (iii).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick—*Con.*
Worthington, Col., Militia Allowance and Independence of Partl. Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9148 (v).

Borden, Mr. R. L., *Carleton, O.*
'Agnes Donahue,' Schr., Seizure by Uruguayan Govt. (remarks) 1507 (i), 6106 (iv).
Alberta, Prov. of : *See* 'Autonomy B. 69.'
Allan SS. Co. Cold Storage System, Stmnts. of Mr. E. D. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 877 (i).
Amherst Pier, N.S., Contract *re* Construction (Ques.) 4371 (iii).
Amherst Ry. Accommodation, Application *re* Wharf Connection (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9520 (v).
Anglo-American Convention respecting Property (remarks) *re* Cor.. 1068 (i).
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 738 (i), 2440 (ii).
Auditor General and Audit Act, on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 9666 (v).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Additional Copies, Letter from Mr. McDougall to Sec. of State (read) 4271 (iii).
——— Inquiry for, 1151 (i).
Autonomy for Alberta, B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 1459 (i) ; on M. for 2°, 2926, 2963 (ii) ; (amt.) 2979 (ii) ; Neg. (Y. 59 ; N. 140) 5400 (iii), 8092 (v).
——— on M. for Com., 5423 (iii).
——— in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5435, 5485, 5498 (iii).
——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5601 ; (arbitration *re* assets) 5946; (B.N.A. Act, 1867 to 1886) 5672; (B.N.A. Act) 5719 (iii) ; Amt., 8526; (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) dual language, 8557, 8627 (v) ; (C.P.R. lands) 6062 (iv); (distribution of seats) Amt., 8004, 8011 (v); (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7917 (iv); (election of members) in Com., 5810; (H. of C. representation) in Com., 5752; (Hudson Bay Co. rights) 5955 (iii), 8169 (v); (lands vested in Crown) in Com., 5946 (iii), 5986 (iv), 8171, 8260 (v); (laws, courts, &c.) in Com., 5813, 5931 (iii), 6101 (iv), 8170, 8240 (v); (legislative assembly) 5815; readjustment of representation) in Com., 5753 (iii); (school clause amt.) 7103 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8389, 8420; on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8494 ; on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8285, (amt.) 8292; (seat of govt.) 8248 (v); (Senate representation) in Com., 5675 (iii).
——— on Schedules (Athabasca) 8163; (Cardston) 8149; (Edmonton city) 8161; (Gleichen) 8153; (Lacombe) 8156; (Leduc) 8157; (Lethbridge) 8150; (Macleod) 8150; (Medicine Hat) 8148; (Peace River) 8163; (Pincher

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Autonomy for Alberta, B. 69—*Con.*
Creek) 8153; (Ponoka) 8156; (Red Deer) 8155; (St. Albert) 8163; (Saskatchewan) 8161; (Strathcona) 8157; (Sturgeon) 8162 (Wetaskiwin) 8157 (v).
——— on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Scott) C.P.R. lands, 8793 (v).
——— on M. for 3°, 8796; Amt. (schools) 8804, Neg. (Y. 41; N. 109) 8816 (v).
Autonomy for Saskatchewan B. 70 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5424 (iii); (amt.) 8698; Neg. (Y. 37; N. 90) 8699; in Com. on Res., 8701 (v).
——— in Com. (distribution of seats) 8704, 8739; (laws, courts, &c.) 8759; (schools) Amt., 8759, 8884; (Senate representation) in Com., 8703 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Scott) to M. for 3°, 8874 (v).
——— in Com. *re* Schedules (Moosejaw) 8758 (v).
Autonomy B. 69, Alberta Boundaries, Population *re* Saskatchewan (remarks) 5919 (iii).
——— Approval by Cabinet, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2263 (ii).
——— Mr. Bulyea's Interview *re* Subsidies to Rys, &c. (remarks) 4202 (iii).
——— Census of Town and Rural Population, &c., Inquiry for Estimates, 8092 (v).
——— Constitutionality of, Changes *re* (remarks) 2192 (ii).
——— Debate *re* Absence, &c (personal explanation) 2043 (ii).
——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 6736, 6836 (iv).
——— Edmonton Election and Toronto Election, Tests *re* Feeling of Country (remarks) 5886 (iii).
——— Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Min., on M. for Sup., 2493 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Rets. (remarks) 2594 (ii).
——— Meridian Divisional Line (remarks) 8635 (v).
——— Official Report of Division (remarks) 5430 (iii).
——— Papers *re*, Inquiry for, 3008 (ii).
——— Responsibility, &c. (remarks) 2321 (ii).
——— Pets. circulated in Quebec, &c., Denial *re* Charge, 2570 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) *re* Mr. Belcourt's Charges, 3521 (ii).
——— Saskatchewan Boundaries, Addition to (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5621 (iii).
——— conference *re* boundaries (remarks) 8268 (v).
——— Schedules *re* (remarks) 4375, 5423, 5815 (iii).
——— Schedules, Preparation of, &c. (remarks) 4750 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Autonomy Bills, Schedules *re* Saskatchewan (remarks) 5474 (iii).
——— School Clauses, Change, Explanation *re* (remarks) 5673 (iii).
——— School Clause, Explanation *re* Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5818 (iii).
——— printing, &c. (remarks) 2761 (ii).
——— School Clause, on Explanation (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5985 (iv).
——— School Clauses Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5840; Quotations from Regina 'Leader, 5851 (iii).
See 'Manitoba,' 'Orangemen,' 'N.W.T.'
Ballot Box Frauds in Dom. Elections, on M. (Mr. Porter) to Com. of Sup., 9219 (v).
Banking Act Amendment, Legislation *re* (remarks) 2441 (ii).
Bell, Dr., Appnmt. as Director of Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9303 (v).
Bills from the Senate, on M. (Mr. A. Johnston) to place on Order Paper, 8096 (v).
Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 179 (Mr. Turriff) on M. to ref. back to Committee, 8652 (v).
Brunet, Mr., Ry. Commissioner, Resignation of (remarks) 5036 (iii).
Budget, The, Inquiry for, 2685 (ii), 4920 (iii).
Cabinet, ex-Ministers, Annuity B. 203 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 9735 (v).
Cabinet Changes from 1904 (remarks) 1336 (i).
Cabinet Vacancies, and Absence of Ministers (remarks) on Orders of the Day, 3555 (ii).
——— Interior Dept., Information *re* (remarks) 3362 (ii).
——— (remarks) *re*, 4085. 4201 (iii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase, &c., on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Ret., 736 (i).
Canada Life Assurance Co., Ref. to in Com. on B. 108, 4690 (iii).
Canadian Fast Mail Service, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to adjn., 9779 (v).
C.P.R. Tax Exemptions, Interpretations *re* (Ans.) 731 (i).
See 'Autonomy,' &c.
Cement, in Com. of Ways and Means, 8987 (v).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 1013; in Com., 625, 1080, 1469 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) *re* Resolutions 631 (i).
Census in Man. and N.W.T., Taking of (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 1080 (i).
Clarke, Mr. E. F., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 2042, 2109 (ii).
Cold Storage, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8202 (v).
——— Statements of Mr. E. D. Smith *re* (remarks) 874 (i).
Collingwood Govt. Dock, Tenders *re* Conroy Bros. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6580 (iv).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Colonial Conference, Par. in Montreal 'Star' *re* Tariff Discussions (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7098 (iv).

Colonial Stock Act and Provincial Trust Investments, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 9698 (v).

——— Inquiry for, 9540 (v).

Commerical Agencies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9037 (v).

Committees, Sel., Com., Addition of Name (remarks) 624 (i).

——— Appnmt. of Mr. Bristol (remarks) 5210 (iii).

Companies Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 8528 (v).

Consumption : *See* 'Tuberculosis.'

Conventions between United Kingdom and U.S. *re* Personal Property (remarks) *re* Cor., 1068 (i).

Cornwall Canal Employees during Election Campaign (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1228 (i).

Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4271 (iii).

Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 1°, 9075; in Com., 9411; on M. for 3°, 9524 (v).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Passenger Rates, Ref. to Ry. Commission (remarks) 6836 (iv).

Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 4550 (iii).

——— Rep. of Com. and Internal Economy (remarks) 9802 (v).

Demers, L. J., M.P., Decease of (remarks) 5140 (iii).

Discrimination in Freight Rates *re* Allan SS., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 888 (i).

Dobey : *See* 'Thessalon.'

Dominion Annuity Co.'s incorp. B. 82 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 2768 (ii).

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) in Com., 4971 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 189) 1° m., 8775 (v).

——— (issue of writ) Amt. (B. 194) 1° m., 9073 (v).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. Bills, Consideration during Recess (remarks) 9812 (v).

Dom. Lands Act, Yukon Regulations, on M. (Mr. Oliver) to approve, 9787 (v).

Dredges employed at Port Arthur, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 790 (i).

Easter Adjournment (remarks) 4375 (iii).

——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4750 (iii).

Edmonton Election, Date of Contest, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5892 (iii).

Election of Members to Vacant Constituencies (B. 194) 1° m., 9073 (v).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Estimates, Delay in bringing down and efficient Criticism. on Amt. (Mr. Foster) 9094 (v).

Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 1400 (i), 3205 (ii).

Facer Steel Car Co.'s Patent Relief B. 27 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 1339 (i).

Fessenden Wireless Tel. of Can. incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6607 (iv).

First Minister's Salary (B. 201) in Com. on Res., 9726 (v).

Fiscal Year, Change of Date to March 31 (remarks) in Discussion of Estimates, 9095 (v).

Fishery Inspectors, N.S., Delay in appointing (remarks) 9687 (v).

Fisheries Protection Service, Neglect of Overseers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6632 (iv).

Fog Horn Nuisanee at Toronto Island (remarks) 9287 (v).

Fort Lawrence, N.S., Pier, Name of Contractors, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 5034 (iii).

Franchise Act (1898) Amt. B. 52 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 2113 (ii), 9198 (v).

Franking Privilege, Use of Stamp, &c. (remarks) 5135 (iii).

Geological Survey Director, Delay in appointing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9303 (v).

Georgian Bay Islands, Sale to Mr. F. W. Grant (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6485 (iv).

Gillies Brothers, Limited B. 95 (Mr. A. A. Wright) in Com., 2764 (ii).

Glanders among Horses, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6707 (iv).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3361 (ii).

Govt. Steamers, Coal Supply (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2609 (ii).

Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9400 (v).

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3649, 3880 (ii), 4126, 4202 ; on M. for 3° (remarks) 4228 (iii).

G. T. Ry. Arbitration B. 199 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9529 (v).

G.T.P. Ry. B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7623, 7625 (iv).

G.T.P. Ry., Plans deposited with Dept. of Rys., on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 918 (i).

——— Survey of Route, Moncton to Winnipeg, Information *re* (remarks) 6134 (iv).

Guarantee Bonds : *See* 'Inland Revenue,' &c.

Half-breed Scrip Investigation, Appnmt. of Counsel (remarks) 8529 (v).

Half-breed Scrip to Non-residents (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6504 (iv).

——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 6566 (iv).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Halifax Garrisons, Explanation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9128 (v).
Halifax Fortifications, Retention of Imperial Troops (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6510 (iv).
Halifax and Esquimalt, Naval Stations, Continuance of (remarks) 9677 (v).
——— Control by Canada (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1404 (i).
Halifax Lightship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2708 (ii).
Halifax, New Public Building, Contract *re*, in Com. of Sup., 1037 (i).
Herring and Fishing Industry, Rep. of Commission, Inquiry for, 4552 (iii).
Immigration, Fraudulent Representations B. 120 (Mr. Logan) in Com., 9700 (v).
——— (remarks) *re* Bill, 8177 (v).
See 'North Atlantic,' &c.
Imperial Guarantee and Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2771 (ii).
Indian Harbour Wharf, Pet. *re*, Inquiry for Copy, 8178 (v).
Inland Revenue Act (guarantee bonds) Amt. B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8677 (v).
Insurance Cos., Legislation *re*, &c. (remarks) 9690 (v).
I.C.R. and C.A. Ry. Act (running rights) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 4187 (iii) ; in Com., 6139, 7584 (iv).
I.C.R., Appointments, *re* Train Service, of unworthy Persons (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9520 (v).
——— Freight Diversion and Traffic Arrangements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2219 (ii).
——— Freight Rates, Increases, &c. (remarks) on Explanation of Min of Rys., 6119 (iv).
——— Snow Blockade, Delay in Service, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2028 (ii).
——— Train Service, Stalled by Snowstorms, Tel. (read) 695 (i).
Interior, Appnmt. of Mr. Oliver as Minister (remarks) 4201 (iii).
Internal Economy Committee (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6612 (iv).
——— Rep. *re* Proceedings (remarks) 9076 (v).
Japan Trade Relations with Canada, on Stmnt. (Mr. Fisher) 7914 (iv).
——— Treaty, Inquiry for 8385 (v).
'J. I. Tarte' Dredge, Defective Boilers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2466 (ii).
Johnston, T. G., Late, M.P., Decease of (remarks) 8694 (v).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) Act Amt. B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9742, 9750 ; in Com., 9794 ; on Amt., 9797 (v).
Judicial Vacancies, Length of, Appmnts, &c. (remarks) 7423 (iv), 8002 (v).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Kentville Rifle Range, Purchase of Property (remarks) 6661, 7584 (iv).
——— Rep. *re* Evidence (remarks) 8698 (v).
'Lady Laurier,' Govt. Steamer, Investigation *re* Accident (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2600 (ii).
Land Titles Act (1894) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 9082 (v).
Lewis, Edward Norman, M.P., Relief B. 142 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, and in Com., 5136 (iii).
London Militiamen and London Election (remarks) 7253, 7331 (v).
See 'McKenzie,' &c.
'Lurcher,' Lightship, Accident to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2756 (ii).
McDonald, Mr. J. L., Indian School Teacher, N.S., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 6514 (iv).
McKenzie, Mr. D. D., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill, on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. Johnston) 8477 (v).
Mackenzie and Dauphin, Man., Ret. Officers, Special Officers (remarks) 1336 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Demands *re* Separate School Question, by Mgr. Sbaretti, 3848 (ii).
——— Former Pets. *re* (remarks) 4084 (iii).
——— Mr. Jackson's, Speech *re* Settlement (remarks) 4843 (iii).
——— Mgr. Sbaretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 3938 (ii).
——— Mgr. Sbaretti's Explanation, 'Race and Religious Cry', Charges by Mr. Paterson (reply) 4037 (ii).
——— Reply to O.C. of March 21st, 1905, from Man. Govt. (remarks) 3744 (ii).
See 'Autonomy,' &c.
Manitoba Election Returns, Voters' Lists returned to Clerk of Crown (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1405 (i).
——— Duties of Returning Officers (remarks) 1506 (i), 4678 (iii).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6797 (iv).
Melfort Mail Service, Charges *re* Delays, &c., Cor., &c. (read) 9789 (v).
Meteorological Observatory, Removal to Ottawa (remarks) 9800, 9810 (v).
Midland Harbour Range Lights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2738 (ii).
Militia Medical Officers, Disqualification as Members of H. of C., Cor. asked for, 8997 (v).
Militiamen at London, Elections, Voting, &c. (remarks) 7253, 7331 (iv).
Ministerial Changes, Mr. Aylesworth's Position, &c. (remarks) 1336 (i).
See 'Cabinet'.

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Montevideo, Imprisonment of British Seamen (remarks) 2689 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Claims of P. Lyall & Sons (remarks) *re* Question, 696 (i).
Moosejaw and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 20 (Mr. Scott) in Com., 2715, 2762 (ii).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9082 (v).
Murray Harbour and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2153 (ii).
Musquodoboit Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6224 (iv).
Nixon, Robt., Charges against (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9331 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8109 (v).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9323 (v).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9448 (v).
——— Tel. *re* Contract, &c. (remarks) 8182 (v).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2052, 2324 (ii).
Northwest Territories Representation Act Amt. (B. 156) in Com. (amt.) 8769; Amt. (agents) 8770; Amt. *re* Govt. employees, 8771 (v).
Northwest Territories B. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 8764; in Com., 8765; on M. for 3°, 9408 (iv).
N.W.T. Govt. Officials, Interference in Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9721 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2718 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 9817 (v).
Orangemen, Attack *re* 'Yellow Dog,' Quotations from Quebec Papers (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 8354 (v).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 2545, 3172, 3191; (amts.) 3199, 3201 (iii).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 4965 (iii).
Owen, Thomas David, Patent Relief B. 177 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 8652 (v).
Oxford, N., Issue of Writ, &c. (remarks) 6135 (iv).
Papal Ablegate: *See* 'Manitoba Boundaries.'
Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5798 (iii).
Pilotage Commission, Sydney Harbour, Benefit Fund for Pilots, &c. (remarks) 9036 (v).
Poonamalie Dam, Pet. *re* Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9381 (v).
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Conmee and Bowman's Tender, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4476, 4670 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4673 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Port Arthur and Ft. William Fog Alarms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6645 (iv).
Port Arthur and Fort William Telephone System, and Board of Ry. Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Cor., 1394 (i).
Prorogation, Date of, &c. (remarks) 9790, 9811 (v).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Works under Contract, Supervision Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7589 (iv).
Public Works Minister, Resignation of, &c. (remarks) *re* Rumour, 5035 (iii).
——— Appnmt. of Minister (remarks) 5961 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, *re* G.T.P. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2295 (ii).
Railways and Canals Dept., Dep. Minister, Retirement of, &c. (remarks) 9678 (v).
Railway Belt Lands, B.C., Settlement of, Cor. *re* (read) 9295 (v).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5011 (iii).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7333 (iv).
Returning Officers, for Mackenzie and Dauphin, Man., Special Reps., Inquiry for, 1336 (i).
Rets. and Repts., &c., Inquiry for, 1242 (i), 2263 (ii).
Roads and Road Allowances *re* Alberta and Saskatchewan B. 195 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 9525; on Sen. Amts., 9819 (v).
St. Lawrence River Ship Channel, in Com. of Sup., 2466 (ii).
Saskatchewan, Prov. of: *See* 'Autonomy B. 70.'
Sbarretti, Mgr.: *See* 'Manitoba Boundaries.'
'Scotia,' Str., I.C.R., Certificates of Engineers, &c. (remarks) 8385 (v).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 2116 (ii).
Seamen's Act (shipping masters) Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7425 (iv), 9031 (v).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1162, 1187 (i).
Settlers' Effects, Duty *re*, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8997 (v).
Seymour, D. G., Complaints *re* obtaining Homestead Patent (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9033 (v).
——— Complaints *re* Location of Homestead Entry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9294 (v).
Ships' Safety B. 21 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 731 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9341, 9587; on Senate Amts., 9815 (v).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Statutes Revision, Completion of (remarks) 745 (i).

——— Indexing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8673 (v).

Stewart, Mr. J. S., Charges against by Mr. Roche, M.P. (letter read) 9613 (v).

Supply B. 206 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9801 (v).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Chambly (macadamizing road) 9378 (v).

Canals—Galops (channel completion) 1230 (i).

Canals—Lachine (Atwater Avenue bridge) 1240 (i).

Canals—Trent (Holland river) 9367 (v).

Canals—Welland (bridge building) 1234; (Port Colborne, deepening) 1232; (Port Colborne, elevator) 1327; (Port Colborne, entrance) 1231; (surveys) 1236 (i).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salary increases) 9070; Public Works (salaries) 9071; Railways and Canals (private sec.) 9065; Sec. of State (salaries) 9071; Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 9034 (v).

Customs (remission of duties *re* army and navy goods) 6724, 6813 (iv).

Dom. Lands (Banff Park waterworks) 9306 ; Mines Branch (smelting ores) 9303; Miscellaneous (maps, &c.) 9308 (v).

Excise (contingencies) 6724 (iv).

Fisheries (bait freezers, Mar. Provs.) 9620 (v ; (bounty distribution) 6636 (iv); (dogfish experiments) 9173; (fish curing) 9173; (fishery commission) 9172 (v); (inspectors' disbursements) 6632 (iv).

Geological Surveys, (surveys, &c.) 8669 (v).

Govt. of N.W.T. (general vote) 9622 (v).

Immigration (seed grain supply) 9307 (v).

Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (provisions) 9338 (v); N.S. (general vote) 6514 (iv).

Justice, Administration of (B. C. judges) 9683 ; (N.W.T. judges) 9683 ; (Three Rivers judgeship) 9682 (v) ; Miscellaneous (litigation matters) 7247 (iv).

Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7544 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 2759 (ii); ('Arctic' patrol boat) 9177 (v); (engineers' salaries) 2760 (ii); (ice boats) 9177 (v); (lighthouse repairs) 6641 (iv) 9036 ; (light-keepers' salaries) 9176 (v) (lightships maintenance) 2708 (ii); (NW.M. Police patrol boat) 9178 (v); (pilotage) 2760; (signal service) 2760 (ii); (wrecking plant. Mar. Provs.) 9177 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and G.B.) 967; (Can. and Mexico) 897 (i), 9681 (v) ; (G.B. and Canada) 865 ; (Manchester Line) 932; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 928 ; (St. John and Halifax) 923 ; (St. John and Minas) 926 (i); (St. John, &c., and W. Indies) 7192 (iv), 8691 (v) ; (Victoria and San Francisco) 906 ; (wrecking plant) 960 (i).

Marine (hospitals) 9172 (naval militia) 9178 (v) (shipwrecked seamen) 2688 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 6512 (iv); (depots) 9114 (v); pay and allowance) 6510 (iv);; (permanent force) 9127, 9155 (v).

Miscellaneous (Bank of Commerce, Yukon, compensation) 9615 (v) ; (consolidation of statutes) 7247 (iv), 8673 (v) ; (printing &c.) 6723 (iv); (Public Accounts evidence) 9616; (Sabbath Day legislation) 9684; (tariff commission) 9614 (v).

Northwest Mounted Police (pay of force) 8658 ; (Yukon) 8665 (v).

Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 2600; (hydrographic surveys) 2679 (ii), 6623 (iv); (ice-breakers, repairs) 9035 (v); (meteorological service) 2679; (schools of navigation 2640 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 849, 1021; (Halifax detention building) 1037 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additions, &c., (H. of C.) 9546 (v).

Public Works—Dredges (new plant) 9171 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Salmon river) 7575 ; (Thompson river) 7575; (Victoria) 7576 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours anad Rivers—N.S. (Apple river) 7395; (Baddeck) 7396; (Barachois) 7396; (Breton Cove) 7397; (Clark's Harbour) 7398; (Cow Bay, Port Morien) 7399; (Culloden) 7401; (Fort Lawrence) 6838 (iv); (Glace Bay) 9578 (v); (Inverness Mines) 7403; (Judique) 7407; (Larry's River) 7407; (Mahone Bay) 7408; (Margaree) 7411; (Meteghan) 7413; (New Campbellton) 7413; (Port Hawkesbury) 6838 ; (Scott's Bay) 7416 ; (Victoria Beach) 7419 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 7549 (iv) ; (Port Arthur) 784 ; (Port Colborne) 815 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Lake St. Peter piers) 6462 (iv) ; (St. Lawrence channel) 2448, 2466 (ii) ; (St. Lawrence channel, suction dredge) 6437 (iv) ; (Sorel deep water wharf) 9593 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Transportation, &c. (Georgian Bay surveys) 7637 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (arbitrations, &c.) 7611 ; (cement testing) 7613 ; (Ottawa river survey) 7612 ; (surveys) 7611 ; (transportation commission) 7628 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Dom. (traffic bridges) 7592 ; N.W.T. (Battle river) 7587 ; (colonization roads) 7595 ; Ottawa (repairs) 7585 ; Que. (Bryson) 7586 (iv).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (Gatineau river) 7630 ; (working expenses) 7632 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraphs—B.C. (Kamloops) 7610 ; (Vancouver, Salt Springs) 7610 ; Mar. Provs. (Bay St. Lawrence) 7606 ; N.W.T. (Edmonton and Qu'Appelle) 7633 ; (working expenses) 7633 ; P.E.I. (working expenses) 7632 ; Que. (Bersimis, &c.) 7609 (v).

Public Works—Transportation Commission (expenses) 8692 (v).

Quarantine (organized districts, salaries) 2303 (ii).

Railways—G.T.P. (salaries, &c.) 2293 ; (surveys, construction, &c.) 2282 (ii), 7496 (iv); (terminals, &c.) 9500 (v).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 9387 (v) ; (double tracking) 2027 (ii), 9391 (v) ; (expenditures) 2219 (ii) ; (general vote) 7476 (iv); (Halifax deep water dredging) 2026 ; (Halifax terminals) 2032 (ii) ; (rolling stock) 9520 (v) ; (St. Lambert, &c., double tracking) 2183 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—P.E.I. (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2153 (ii), 8692 (v).

Senate (contingencies) 6621 (iv).

Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 9037 (v).

Supreme Court, N.S., Vacant Judgeship, Delay *re* Appnmt. (remarks) 5036, 5209 (iii), 6837 (iv).

Sutherland, Hon. James, Decease of (remarks) 5317 (iii).

Telegraph Lines in Can., Total Mileage (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7609 (iv).

Telephone Lines, Pet. *re* Control, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1244 (i).

Thessalon Postmaster Dismissal, Investigation, &c. (remarks) on M. to adjn., 6652 (iv).

——— Mr. J. B. Dobey, Irregularities, &c., on M. for Sup., 6209, 6221 (iv).

——— on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Cor., 3203 (ii).

Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3653, 4683; on M. for 3°, 4965 (iii).

Trachoma Hospital, Halifax, Disposal of to Govt. (remarks) 2303 (ii).

Trading Stamps : *See* 'Criminal Code,' &c.

Transcontinental Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman (remarks) 7916 (iv).

——— Personnel and Duties, &c. (remarks) 9679 (v).

——— Progress, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6438 (iv).

——— Reps. *re* (remarks) 9687 (v).

——— Rep. *re* C.A. Ry. (remarks) in Com. on B. 45, 4225 (iii).

See 'G.T.P.', &c.

Treadgold Concessions Inquiry, Instructions to Commissioners (remarks) 7101 (iv).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1379 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Perley) to conc., 9522 (v).

Union Labels B. No. 10 (Mr. R. Smith) in Com., 702, 918 (i).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8650 ; on M. for 3°, 8824 (v).

Veterans of 1886 and 1870, Grant of Lands (remarks) 6048 (iv).

Voters' List *re* Edmonton Election, Preparation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).

Water Meters Inspection B. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8674 ; in Com., 9410 ; on Sen. Amts,. 9816 (v).

Western Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4689 (iii).

Wire Fencing, Contract *re* Erection of, N.W.T. Boundary Line, on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5580 (iii).

——— on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5692 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Papers, 5808, 5961 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Wireless Telegraph Regulations B. 186 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 9032 (v).

Worthington, Col., Militia Allowance and Independence of Parlt. Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., Cor., &c (read) 9149 (v).

Wrecking Plant 'Lord Strathcona,' in Com. of Sup., 960 (i).

Yukon Commissioner, Vacancy and Appnmt. (remarks) 5036 (iii).

Yukon Election, Cor. (read) *re* Ret. Officer, 1254 (i).

——— Delay in Opening Ballot Boxes (remarks) 987 (i).

——— Ret. of Member (remarks) *re* Telegrams, 1066 (i).

——— Returning Officer, Information *re* (remarks) 1152 (i).

Yukon Territory Orders-in-Council, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 9725 (v).

Yukon Reforms *re* Condition of Country (remarks) on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 7035, 7081 (iv).

Bourassa, Mr. H., *Labelle.*

Autonomy for Alberta, Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3252 (ii) ; (B. N. A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) dual language, 8581 (v).

——— in Com. (schools) on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7141 (iv), 8299 ; (Amt.) 8341 ; on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8426, 8464 ; on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8522 (v).

——— on M. for 3°, Amt. (schools) 8835 ; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to sec. 16 (schools) 8813 ; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 8845 ; Amt. to Amt. dual language, 8845 (v).

Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) Debate in Com. on School Clause (personal explanation) 7175 (iv).

——— on M. for 3° (personal explanation) *re* Not Voting, 8865 (v).

Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) in Com., sec. 16 (schools) Amt., 8759 (v).

Man. Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Memorandum *re* Separate Schools, 3863 (ii).

——— on M. to adjn., 3986, 4066 (ii).

Telephone Lines, Pet. *re* Municipal Control (remarks) 1250 (i).

Boyce, Mr. A. C., *West Algoma.*

Aliens employed on Govt. Works at Sault Ste. Marie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1412 (i).

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 4433 (iii).

Autonomy Bill, Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2581 (ii).

Bank Notes, Supervision *re* Printing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6255 (iv).

Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Conspiracy, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. on B. 36, 537 (i).

Boyce, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Boyd, Geo. A., Emplymt. by Govt. at Sault Ste. Marie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6881 (iv).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1074, 1099 (i).
Dobie, W. J. B., Dismissal from Thessalon Post Office (M. for cor.) 3202 (ii), *See* 'Thessalon.'
Fishing Regulations in Ont., Conflict with Dom. (remarks) 4751 (iii).
Fitz-Simons, Jane Marie, Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6379 (iv).
Ft. William Station, Plans *re* deposited with Ry. Dept. (remarks) 2009 (ii).
Georgian Bay, Lake Huron, &c., Fisheries, Request *re* Investigation of (Ques.) 5479 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry., Plans of Terminals, Copies Deposited in Ry. Dept. (M. for ret.) 917 (i), 2816, 2836 (ii).
——— Plans *re* Termini, &c. (Ques.) 1150 (i).
——— Surveys, Reps. in Ry. Dept., &c. (remarks) 2009 (ii).
——— Terminus at Port Arthur, Approval of Location (remarks) 6138 (iv).
Hay Imports from U.S., Quantity, Duties collected, &c. (Ques.) 1064 (i).
Kentvale Postmaster, Sureties, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 5977 (iv).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6658 (iv).
Killam, Judge. Appnmt. as Chairman of Ry. Commission (remarks) on M. for Com. on Res., 537 (i).
Lake Superior and Sault Ste. Marie Cos., Purchase of Steel Rails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1995 (i).
Leach, R. E. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1151 (i).
McDermot, Clara Bidwell, Relief B. 152 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 6279, 6357 (iv).
Meadow Creek Ranching Co., Patent *re* Lands (Ques.) 6476 (iv).
Municipal Telephone System, Present Status of Port Arthur and Fort William Application (Ques.) 595 (i).
Ontario Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 105) 1°*, 2184 ; in Com., 2772 (ii).
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Conmee & Bowman's Tender, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4462, 4465 (iii).
——— Time for Tenders (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6875 (iv).
Port Arthur and Fort William, Application *re* Telephones (Ques.) 595 (i).
——— Cor. *re* Application to Board of Ry. Commissioners (M. for copy) 1386, 1391 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 2203, 2685 (ii).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'

Boyce, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Railway Commissioners, Appnmt. of Chairman. B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 537 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Bonded Warehouse *re* Soft Coal, Establishment of (Ques.) 5688 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Contractors, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1407 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Dry Dock, Construction, Total Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 5426 (iii).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1189, 1791 ; on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) to M. for 3°, 1873 (i).
SUPPLY :
Canals—St. Peters (dredging) 6303 (iv); Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 1335, 1406 (i); Welland (claims *re* injuries) 6306 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Acton Vale) 1106 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Blind River dredging) 6870; (Grand River dredging) 6873; (Sault Ste. Marie harbour) 6881 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (steel rails, &c.) 1995 (i).
Telephone Lines, Pet. *re* Municipal Control (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1253 (i).
Telephone and Telegraph Lines, Govt. Construction, &c., Ques. wthdrn., 6105 (iv).
Thessalon Postmaster, Appnmt. and Sureties (Ques.) 6105 (iv).
——— (M. for cor.) 3202 (ii).
——— on M. for Sup., 6192 (iv).
——— (remarks) on M. to adjn., 6649 (iv).
——— Salary Warrants, Inquiry for 6239 (iv).
Voters' Lists, Algoma East and West, &c., Revision, &c. (Ques.) 594 (i).
Voters' Lists for Unorganized Ters., Cor. *re*, Instructions, &c. (M. for copies*) 1397 (i).

Boyer, Mr. G., *Vaudreuil.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5169 (iii).
Castonguay, A. B., Cause and Report *re* Dismissal (Ques.) 6653 (iv).

Brabazon, Mr. G. H., *Pontiac.*
Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, Engineers, Reps., &c. (Ques.) 192 (i).

Bristol, Mr. E., *Centre Toronto.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden to M. for 2°, 5140 (iii).

Broder, Mr. A., *Dundas.*
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 2430 (ii).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4846; in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5537 (iii).
Ice Jam in St. Lawrence River, Govt. Action *re* (remarks) 699 (i).
Lefebvre, A. P., Postmaster at Markstay, Investigation *re* Dismissal (Ques.) 7096 (iv).
St. Lawrence Ice Blockade, Damages *re* (remarks) 280 (i).

Broder, Mr. A.—*Con.*

'Scout,' Str., Explosion of Acetylene Gas, Investigation *re* (remarks) 4842 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, plans, &c) 9490 (v).

Williamsburg and Cornwall Canal Water Power Leases, Dates, Rentals, Claims, &c. (Ques.) 4809 (iii).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P. (Minister of Inland Revenue), *Rouville.*

Adulteration of Jams, &c., Prosecutions *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1711 (i).

Alexandra Bridge, Ottawa, Lighting, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7586 (iv).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5211 (iii) ; in Com., sec. 2 (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) (dual language) 8558, 8599 (v) ; in Com. (school clause amt.) 7131 (iv) ; on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8333 ; on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8393; on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Léonard) 8857 (v).

Beauharnois Canal, Waterways, Opening Waterways, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 7380 (iv).

Bills from the Senate, on M. (Mr. A. Johnston) to place on Order Paper, 8096 (v).

Bout de l'Isle, Repentigny and Charlemagne Ferry Service (Ans.) 9696 (v).

Canadian Agency B. 77 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for Com., 9049; in Com., 9077 (v).

Caplin and Paspebiac Ry., Payments *re* Subsidy, on M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 3203 (ii).

Cast Iron, Furnished Marine Dept. at Sorel (Ans.) 2328 (ii).

Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4265 ; on M. for 3°, 5139 (iii).

Cullers, Abolition of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7580 (iv).

Debates, Official, and Internal Economy Com., Reps. *re* (remarks) 9802 (v).

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) in Com., 4975 (iii).

Election Officers : *See* 'Returning.'

Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3207 (ii).

Fairford River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7570 (iv).

Fertilizers, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1726 (i).

Fishermen for Cod Fisheries, P.E.I., Immigration from Ireland and Scotland (Ans.) 586 (i).

Fish Hatcheries, N.B., Number of Fish, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 590 (i).

Gas and Electric Light Inspection, Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1692 (i).

—— Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1760 (i).

Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9398 (v).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4202 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7621 (iv).

Greece's Point Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7302 (iv).

Halibut Fisheries, B.C., American Encroachments (Ans.) 585 (i).

Imports and Exports. Duties paid, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) for Ret., 3204 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. (B. 176) 1° m., 7421 (iv); in Com., 8676; on Sen. Amts., 9411 (v).

Inland Revenue Dept., Rep. (presented) 51 (i), 4085 (iii).

Internal Economy Board, Rep. of Proceedings (remarks) 9076 (v).

International Bridge and Terminal Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 87 (Mr. Grant) on Sen. Amts., 9695 (v).

Lobster Canneries, Licenses, Applications, &c., N.B., District No. 1 (Ans.) 584 (i).

Lobsters, Legal Length in Bay of Fundy, Changes *re* (Ans.) 584 (i).

McDermot, Clara Bidwell, Relief B. 152 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 6352 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries, Mgr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 3985 (ii).

Maple Products, Adulteration of (Ans.) 1341 (i).

Metric System, Adoption of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1694 (i).

Moncton Harbour Master, Appnmt. of Mr. D. Robertson (Ans.) 2329 (ii).

Montreal Harbour, &c., Dues and Charges, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7316 (iv).

Montreal P.O., St. Catherine St. Branch, Unsanitary Condition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 202 (i).

Naturalization and Aliens Act Amt. (B. 184) 1°*, 7906 (iv).

Patent Medicines, Inspection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1725 (i).

Port Arthur Dredging Contract, on Ques. of Order *re* Relevancy of Debate, on Ms. to adjn. (remarks) 4673 (iii).

Port Credit Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iv).

Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'

Public Works under Contract, Supervision Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7588 (iv).

Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. (B. 37) 1° m., 582 (i).

Ry. Debts : *See* 'Exchequer.'

Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7355 (iv).

Richelieu Bridge Dispute, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6960 (iv).

St. Louis, Certificate *re* Reinstatement (Ans.) 591 (i).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

St. Timothée Wharf, Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).

Seamen's Act Amt. (B. 38) 1° m., 582 (i).

Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. of Sup., 368 (i).

South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9586; on M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 9072; on Sen. Amts., 9816 (v).

Spirits in Bond (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8679 (v).

SUPPLY:

Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1699 (i).

Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (salaries) 89 (i), 9069 (v).

Excise (additional remuneration) 1688; (allowance to customs officers) 1689 (i); (contingencies) 6724 (iv); (Frechette, L. A., translation) 1690; (inspectors' salaries) 1679; (methylated spirits, purchase) 1690; preventive service) 1688; (provisional allowances, B.C., &c.) 1690; (travelling expenses) 1689 (i).

Legislation (voters' lists) 6954 (iv).

Miscellaneous (clerical assistance) 7626 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (generally) 7284; (St. John drill hall) 7503 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Anderson Lake) 7573; (Arrow Head) 7574; (Chilliwack) 7573; (Columbia river) 7573; (Fraser channel) 7574; (Golden) 7574; (Langley) 7575; (Revelstoke) 7573; (Salmon river) 7575; (Thompson river) 7575; (Victoria) 7576; (Williams Head) 7576 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Gimli wharf) 7573; (Lake Dauphin) 7569; (Lake St. Francis) 7572; (Narrows Lake) 7572; (Selkirk) 7573; (White Mud) 7573; (Winnipegosis) 7573 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Cape Tormentine) 7497; (Chance harbour) 7497; (Clifton breakwater) 7497; (Dipper harbour 7498; (Durham wharf) 7498 (Great Salmon breakwater) 7498; (Miscou harbour) 7498; (Mud Cove) 7500; (Petit Rocher) 7500; (Pointe du Chene) 7500; (Quaco harbour) 7501; (Richibucto pier) 7501; (St. John harbour) 7503; (St. John tributaries) 7501; (tidal waters) 7503 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.W.T. (repairs, &c.) 7573 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Apple river) 7396; (Baddeck) 7396; (Barachois) 7396; (Bass river) 7397; (Bay St. Lawrence) 7397; (Bear Cove) 7397; (Beckerton) 7397; (Breton Cove) 7397; (Bridgewater dredging) 7398; (Broad Cove) 7398; (Canning wharf) 7402; (Carlos breakwater) 7398; (Chezzetcook) 7402; (Clark's harbour) 7398; (Country harbour) 7398; (Cow Bay, Port Morien) 7399; (Culloden breakwater) 7401; (Cunningham Point) 7402; (Devil's Island) 7402; (Digby Pier) 7402; (Eel river) 7407; (Freeport) 7402; (Gabarus) 7402; (Georgeville) 7402; (Harrigan cove) 7403; (Indian Harbour) 7403; (Inverness Mines harbour) 7403; (Janvrin's Island) 7406; (Judique) 7407; (L'Ardoise) 7407; (Larry's river) 7407; (Litchfield) 7407; (Little Brook) 7407;

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—*Con.*

(Lunenburg) 7408; (Mabou bridge) 7408; (Main-a-Dieu) 7409; (Mahone bay) 7408; (Malignant Cove) 7409; (Margaree Harbour) 7409; (Margaretville) 7412; (Meteghan cove) 7413; (Mill cove) 7413; (New Campbellton) 7413; (Newport) 7413; (Noel wharf) 7413; (Ogden's Pond) 7414; (Pembroke breakwater) 7414; (Pleasant bay) 7414; (Plympton) 7414; (Port Greville) 7414; (Port Hood) 7414; (Port La Tour) 7415; (Scott's Bay) 7415; (Shelburne) 7418; (Skinner's cove) 7418; (Summerville) 7418; (Three Fathom harbour) 7418; (Victoria beach) 7418; (Wallace harbour) 7419; (West Arichat) 7419; (White Head) 7419; (Wolfville wharf) 7419; (Yarmouth) 7419 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Amherstburg) 7546; (Bayfield pier) 7546; (Beaverton harbour) 7546; (Belle River) 7546; (Blanche river) 7547; (Bracebridge) 7547; (Bronte) 7548; (Cobourg) 7548; Collingwood) 7549; (Depot Harbour) 7552; (Goderich) 7553; (Grand Bend) 7553; (Haileybury wharf) 7556; (Hamilton harbour) 7556; (Kincardine) 7558; (Lake Temiskaming wharfs) 7559; (Little Current) 7560; (Matchedash bay) 7560; (Meaford) 7560; (Midland) 7560; (Newcastle pier) 7561; (Oliphant wharf) 7561; (Otonabee River) 7564; (Ottawa locks) 7561; (Owen Sound) 7561; (Parry Sound) 7562; (Pembroke wharf) 7562; (Penetanguishene) 7563; (Petewawa) 7562; (Point Edward) 7563; (Port Bruce) 7563; (Port Burwell) 7563; (Port Dover) 7564; (Port Hope) 7564; (Port Stanley) 7564; (repairs, &c.) 7555; (Rondeau harbour) 7564; (Sarnia dredging) 7564; (Saugeen) 7565; (Spanish river) 7565; (Thessalon) 7565; (Thornbury) 7565; (Toronto, breakwater) 7567; (Toronto harbour) 7566; (Wiarton) 7569 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse à Beaufils) 7285; (Anse aux Gris Fonds) 7285; (Anse St. Jean) 7283; (Barachois de Malbaie) 7287; (Batiscan channel) 7322; (Belœil guide piers) 7287; (Bic wharf) 7288; (Canton Fabre) 7288; (Chambord wharf) 7289; (Champlain wharf) 7290; (Chateauguay, dredging) 7322; (Chateau Richer) 7290; (Descente des Femmes wharf) 7307; (Desjardins wharf) 7298; (Doucet's Landing) 7298; (eastern channel) 7330; (East Templeton) 7300; (Escoumain wharf) 7303; (Fraserville harbour) 7323; (Gatineau Point) 7303; (Grand Mechins) 7303; (Grande Piles dam) 7326; (Grosse Isle pier) 7305; (Isle St. Therese) 7376; (Lake St. John dredging) 7306; (Lake Temiscamingue) 7287; (Laprairie ice piers) 7306; (Lavaltrie wharf) 7306; (L'Ile d'Alma) 7307; (Little Pabos) 7307; (Lower St. Lawrence) 7308; (Magdalen Islands) 7308; (Maskinongé dredging) 7325; (Mille Vaches) 7310; (Mistook wharf) 7310; (Mont Louis wharf) 7310; (Montmagny wharf) 7311; (Montmorency Falls) 7311; (New Carlisle wharf) 7312; (Nicolet pier) 7313; (Notre Dame du Portage wharf) 7314; (Ottawa River) 7375; (Peel Head bay) 7314; (piers, bridges, &c.) 7305; (Portneuf wharf) 7314; (Repentigny wharf)

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—*Con.*
7314; (Rimouski pier) 7320; (Rivière Ouelle) 7375; (Rivière du Lièvre) 7325; (Rivière du Loup) 7325; (Rivière Verte) 7390; (Sacré-Cœur) 7390; (Saguenay river) 7377; (St. Alexis pier) 7390; (St. André de Kamouraska) 7390; (Ste. Anne de la Pocatière) 7390; (St. Charles Borromée) 7390; (Ste. Famille wharf) 7390; (Ste. Fidèle) 7391; (St. Francis de Sales) 7391; (St. François, Orléans) 7391; (St. Fulgence) 7392; (St. Gédéon Islands) 7392; (St. Jean, Orléans) 7393; (St. Louis, feeders) 7380; (St. Louis, improvements) 7379; (St. Maurice dredging) 7326; (St. Simeon) 7393; (Terrebonne) 7394; (Yamaska river) 7394 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay surveys) 7637 (iv).
Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (new plant) 7578; (working expenses) 7579; Generally (new plant) 7578; (vessel repairs) 7576; Man. (snag boat) 7577; (working expenses) 7579; Ont. and Que. (new plant) 7577; (working expenses) 7579; P.E.I. (new plant) 7577 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (arbitrations, &c.,) 7611; (architects, &c.) 7618; (art gallery) 7618; (balances, &c.) 7628; (cement testing) 7613; (clerical salaries) 7620; (Ottawa river surveys) 7612; (surveys, &c.) 7611; (technical books) 7627; (telegraph staff) 7620; (transportation commission) 7627 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Dom. (traffic bridges) 7592; N.W.T. (Battle river) 7587; (colonization roads) 7594; (Shellmouth) 7591; Ottawa (bridge repairs) 7585; Que. (Bryson bridge) 7585 (iv).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (Gatineau river) 7630; (St. Maurice) 7579; (Upper Ottawa Co.) 7629; (working expenses) 7632 (iv).
Public Works — Telegraphs — B.C. (Kamloops) 7610; (Vancouver and Salt Springs) 7610; (working expenses) 7635 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Dom. (generally) 7636 (iv).
Public Works — Telegraphs — Mar. Provs. (Bay St. Lawrence) 7606 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—N.W.T. (Qu'Appelle and Edmonton) 7633; (working expenses) 7633 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Ont. (Pelee Islands) 7609 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—P.E.I. (Anglo-American Co.) 7632; (working expenses) 7632 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Que. (Bersimis, &c.) 7609 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 7635 (iv).
Senate (contingencies) 6621 (iv).
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 1696; (inspectors' salaries) 1692; (metric system) 1698; (standards) 1695 (i).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3658 (ii).
Tobacco and Cigars imported from U.S., Duties paid, &c. (Ans.) 5687 (iii).
Tobacco Industry, Inspection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1681 (i).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Toronto Harbour, Eastern Entrance, Fog Signals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7566 (iv).
Water Meters Inspection (B. 188) prop. Res., 8385; in Com. on Res., 8674; 1°*, 8676; in Com., 9409; on Sen. Amts., 9816 (v)
Wharf Building, &c., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7316 (iv).
Wharfs in Tidal Waters, Contributions by Provincial Govts., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).

Brown, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s (B. 150) 1°*, 5783 (iii).
South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 149) 1°*, 5783 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Chateauguay dredging) 7322 (iv).

Bruneau, Mr. A. A., *Richelieu.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4552 (iii).
Cast Iron, Quantity furnished to Marine Dept. at Sorel (Ques.) 2328 (ii).
G. B. and Her Colonies Inter-Imperial Parlt., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2376 (ii).

Bureau, Mr. J., *Three Rivers & St. Maurice.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4861 (iii).
Criminal Code (summary appeals) Amt. B 45 (Mr. Porter) in Com. (amt.) *re* Race Courses, 5137 (iii).
La Compagnie Electrique de Trois Rivieres, &c (B. 57) 1°*, 986 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 3986 (ii)
Orangemen, Attack *re* Quotations from Quebec Papers (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 8351 (v).
St. Maurice Valley Ry. Co. (B. 173); Pet. presented, 6826, 7017 (iv), 1°*, 7175 (iv).
Separate Schools, Circulars issued by Jacques Cartier Club (remarks) on prop., Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2408 (ii).
SUPPLY:
House of Commons—Library (books) 6947 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (eastern channel) 7330; (Grande Piles dam) 7327; (St Maurice dredging) 7326 (iv).

Burrows, Mr. T. A., *Dauphin.*
Fairford River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7570 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Douphin) 7570; Roads and Bridges—N.W.T. (colonization roads) 7603 (iv).

Caldwell, Mr. T. B., *North Lanark.*

Budget, on The, 8965 (v).

Facer Car Wheel Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 27) 1°*, 493; in Com., 1285 (i).

Fitz-Simmons, Jane Marie Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6379 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 4016 (ii).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3172 (ii).

Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 716 (i).

Calvert, Mr. W. S., *West Middlesex.*

Canadian Canals Corporation incorp., (B. 72) 1°*, 1592; 2° m., 1757 (i).

Canada Middlesex Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B 55) 1°*, 908 (i).

Fitz-Simmons, ane Marie Relief (B. 130) 1°*, 4081 (iii) ; in Com., 6377 ; 3° m., 6378 (iv).

Great Northern Ry. of Canada (B. 71) 1°*, 1504 (i).

Hersey, A. T., Relief B. 167 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) in Com., 7624 (iv).

Hudson's Bay and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 109) 1°*, 2184 (ii).

Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Co.'s (B. 84) 1°*, 1788 (i).

London and St. Clair Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 32) 1°*, 493 (i).

McCormack & Sharples, Messrs., Patent Relief B. (M.) to receive Pet., 6558 (iv).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s (B. 39) 1°*, 625 (i).

Pearson, Geo., Relief (B. 153) 1°*, 5919 (iii) ; in Com., 7623 (iv).

Prior, James Arthur Relief (B. 127) 1°*, 3091 (ii).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s (B. 48) 1° m., 817 (i).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s (B. 110) 1°*, 2184 (ii)

Campbell, Mr. A., *Centre York.*

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2843 (ii).

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5307 (iii).

——— in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7853; (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8444 (v).

Autonomy Bill 69, School Clause Amts., Explantation *re* (remarks) 5819 (iii).

Breakwaters, Wharfs, &c., N.S., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9556 (v).

Budget, on The, 8938 (v).

Canadian Yukon Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 165) 1°, 6232 (iv).

Damen, Wm., Patent Relief (B. 129) 1°*, 3834 (ii) ; (M.) to ref. back to Com., 6379 (iv).

Campbell, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Estimates, Delay in bringing down, Obstruction, &c (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9273 (v).

Fitz-Simmons, Jane Marie Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6378 (iy).

Freight Rates, Advancement of, Rebate, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1545 (i).

Gold Medal Furniture Mfg. Co. Patent Relief (B. 102) 1°*, 2184; in Com., 3399 (ii).

Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9405 (v).

Ideal Manufacturing Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 166) 1°, 6232 (iv).

I.C.R., Freight Rates and Traffic Arrangements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2243 (ii).

——— Freight Rates, Increases, &c. on Explanation of Min. of Rys., 6128 (iv).

McDermot, Clara Bidwell Relief (B. 152) 1°*, 5919 (iii) ; in Com., 6275, 6347 (iv) ; 3° m., 6376, agreed to (Y. 38; N. 13) 6377 (iv).

Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6805 (iv).

Molson's Bank B. 33 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 755 (i).

Murray Harbour Branch Ry. and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup. 2158 (iii).

Officials dismissed by Mr. Whitney *re* Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6865 (iv).

Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s (B. 86) 1°*, 1933 (i) ; in Com., 2715, 2717, 2763, 3134 (ii).

Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'

Railway Commission, Advancement of Freight Rates, Rebates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1545 (i).

Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Com., 4984 (iii).

Red Deer Valley and Coal Co.'s (B. 76) 1°*, 1671; 2° m., 1757 (i); in Com., 2325 (ii).

Sterling Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 182) 1°*, 7810 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Trent (Holland River) 9363 (v).

Justice, Administration of (Three Rivers Judgeship) 9683 (v).

Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7538 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoys) 2733 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Phinney's Cove) 9556 (v) ; Ont. (Sault Ste. Marie wharf) 6885 (iv).

Railways—P.E.I. (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2158 (ii).

Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. (B. 99) 1°*, 2108 ; in Com., 3651 (ii), 4680 ; 3° m., 4964 (iii).

Trelawney, A. H. H. S., Relief (B. 198) 1°*, 9278 (v).

Water Meters Inspection B. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 9410 (v).

Carvell, Mr. F. B., *Carleton, N.B.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta boundaries) in Com., 5657 (iii).
Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4263 (iii).
Halifax Fishery Awards, Payment to Provs., Ref. *re* (Ques.) 2065 (ii).
McDermot, Clara Bidwell Relief B. 152 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 6365 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies, Readjustment *re*, Memoranda, &c. (M. for copies) 2100 (ii).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1190 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Woodstock armoury) 1059 (i).

Cash, Mr. E. L., *Mackenzie.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4833 (iii) ; in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7889 (iv).

Chisholm, Mr. T., *East Huron.*
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 744 (i).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2° (remarks) 5090 (iii).
Civil Servants' Guarantees *re* P.O. Dept. (Ques.) 1758 (i).
Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8225 (v).
I.C.R. Capital Account, Total Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2064 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3195 (ii).
Post Office Assessment System, Collections *re* (Ques.) 3671 (ii).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 347 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Montmorency wharf) 6867 (iv).

Christie, Mr. P., *South Ontario.*
McDermot, Clara Bidwell Relief B. 152 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 6282 (iv).
Port Perry Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2190 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 6181 ; (live stock records) 6687 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 7616 (iv).
Whitby Wharf Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2190 (ii).

Clare, Mr. G. A., *South Waterloo.*
Binder Twine Industry at Kingston (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 486 (i).
Cement, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8994 (v).

Clare, Mr. G. A.—*Con.*
Cordage at Kingston Penitentiary, Sale of 58 Tons, &c. (Ques.) 6827 (iv).
——— Plant established at Kingston (Ques.) 2329 (ii).
I.C.R., Supplies of Oils, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).
Labour Union Labels, B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com. on Res., 274 ; in Com., 722 (i).
SUPPLY :
Customs (contingencies) 261 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Wellington St. pavement) 1572 (i).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, construction, &c.) 2290 (ii).

Clarke, Mr. A. H., *South Essex.*
Criminal Code (summary appeals) Amt. B. 45 (Mr. Porter) on Amt. (Mr. Bureau) *re* Race Courses, 5138 (iii).
Exchequer Court, Admiralty Jurisdiction, Number of Actions, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1770 (i).
N.W.T. Boundary Fence, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5695 (iii).
Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 306 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery, Cost of Establishing, &c., on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Ret., 2095 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Excise (inspectors' salaries) 1687 (i).
Tobacco Industry, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i).
Woodstock and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 80) 1°*, 1671 (i).

Clarke, Mr. E. F., *Centre Toronto.*
Sovereign Fire Ins. Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 26) 1°*, 493; in Com., 1755 (i).

Clements, Mr. H. S., *West Kent.*
Agricultural Exports and Imports to U.S., &c. (Ques.) 909 (i).
——— Duties paid, &c. (M. for ret.) 3203 (ii).
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. of Res., 2418 (ii).
Beet Sugar Industry, Encouragement of (M. for copies of cor.*) 3204 (ii).
Budget, on The, 8957 (v).
Chatham Armoury, Contract, Price *re* Erection (Ques.) 587 (i).
Coatsworth Customs Collector, Revenue and Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 261 (i).
Franking Privilege, Extension of Time after Prorogation (remarks) 9395 (v).
Hog Plague in Essex and Kent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6711 (iv).
Ice Jam on Thames River (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1013 (i).
Imports and Exports, Duties paid, &c (M. for ret.) 3203 (ii).

Clements, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Erection of Wire Fencing (Ques.) 5478 (iii).
——— Fencing Contract, Cor. *re* (read) M. to adjn., 5577 (iii).
——— on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5696 (iii).
Rural Mail Delivery, Cost of, &c., on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Ret., 2095 (ii).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 337, 1181; on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) to M. for 3°, 1881 (i).

SUPPLY :
Customs (expenses) 261 (i).
Excise (inspectors' salaries) 1683 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Chatham armoury) 1551 (i).
Quarantine (cattle) 6711 (iv).
Thames River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6872 (iv).
——— Ice Jam (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1013 (i).
——— Lake St. Clair, &c., Surveys, Completion and Cost (Ques.) 590 (i).
Tobacco and Cigars, imported from U.S., Duty paid, &c. (Ques.) 5687 (iii).
Tobacco Industry, Inspection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1683 (i).
Veterinary Inspectors *re* Hog Plague, Salaries, &c. (Ques) 1933 (i).
Veterinary Surgeons, Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6707 (iv).
Wire Fencing *re* Boundary Line, N.W.T., Erection of, Contract *re* (M.) to adjn., 5578
See 'N.W.T.'

Cochrane, Mr. E., *East Northumberland, Ont.*
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 739 (i).
Ballot Box Frauds in Dom. Elections, on M. (Mr. Porter) to Com. of Sup., 9225 (v).
Binder Twine Industry at Kingston (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 483 (i).
Campaign Literature and Franking Privilege (remarks) 1813 (i).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 643 (i).
Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 190 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9764 (v).
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale to Mr. F. W. Grant (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6487 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry., Surveys, Rep. in Ry. Dept., &c. (remarks) 2017 (ii).
I.C.R. Traffic Arrangements, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2217 (ii).
Murray Canal Inspector, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).
Murray Harbour Branch Ry. and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2163 (ii).
Oats, Rolled, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9764 (v).

Cochrane, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Peterborough Immigrant Homes, Inspection, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7696 (v).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1332 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re* on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5015 (iii).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7432 (iv).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 335, 363 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts—Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6935; Experimental Farms (bulletins) 6926 (iv).
Canals—Miscellaneous (inspectors) 1511 (i).
Canals—Trent (surveys, &c.) 1482 (i); (surveys) 9355 (v).
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1332; (surveys) 1235 (i).
Dom. Lands (homestead inspectors) 9258 (v).
Immigration (agents, G.B., &c., salaries) 7694; (interpreters) 7704 (iv).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (live stock) 6540 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—General (armouries) 1655; N.S. (Antigonish) 1017; (Canso) 1026 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Printing Bureau) 1575 (i); (Rideau Hall maintenance) 9551 (v); Que. (Montreal Inland Rev.) 1120 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse aux Gris Fonds) 7285; (Chateau Richer) 7292; (Lake St. Peter piers) 6459 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, plans, &c.) 9496 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (expenditures) 2218; Halifax terminals) 2034 (ii); (ties, &c.) 6431 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2163 (ii).
Trent Canal Surveys (remarks) in Com of Sup., 1472 (i).

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F., *Brantford.*
Adulteration of Food, Jams, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1718 (i).
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 2423 (ii).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4580; in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5550 (iii); in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7974 (iv).
Autonomy B. 69, School Clauses Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5848 (iii).
Brantford Parade Ground (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1553 (i).
Brantford Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Supply, 219, 860 (i).
Budget, on The., 8936 (v).
Campaign Literature franked by Ministers of Crown (remarks) 1817 (i).
Cement, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8985 (v).
Grass Seeds, Quantity exported (Ques.) 913 (i).
G. B. and Her Colonies, Inter-Imperial Parlt., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2358 (ii).

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
House of Commons, Improvements in Corridors, &c. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 1566 (i).
Indian Schools Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 230 (i).
I.C.R., Freight Rates, Increases, &c., on Explanation of Min. of Rys., 6131 (iv).
Letter Carriers, Brantford, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 217 (i).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6802 (iv).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5590 (iii).
——— on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5716 (iii).
Permanent Force, Recruiting Points, &c. (Ques.) 5977 (iv).
P.E.I. Winter Mail Service, Delays, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2656 (ii).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'
Railway Commission (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1613 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5021 (iii).
Rolled Oats, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8984 (v).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 329, 1155, 1208, 1793 ; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 1868 (i).
SUPPLY :
Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1718 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 6179 (iv).
Indians—Ont., &c. (schools) 230 (i).
Ocean and River Service (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2656 (ii).
Post Office (mail service) 219 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—General (armouries) 1657; N.S. (Antigonish) 860; Ont. (Chatham armoury) 1553; Ottawa (H. of C. improvements) 1566 (i).
White Lead, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8983 (v).
Wire Fencing : *See* 'N.W.T.'

Conmee, Mr. J., *Thunder Bay and Rainy River.*
Autonomy B. 69, in Com., sec. 16 (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8356; on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8516 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s (B. 86) on Sen. Amts., 9817 (v).

Costigan, Hon. John, *Victoria, N.B.*
Campaign Literature, franked by Ministers of Crown (remarks) 1822 (i).
G.T.P. Surveys through Madawaska, N.B., Route, &c. (Ques.) 5688 (iii).
Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s incorp. (B. 101) 1°*, 2108 (ii).
Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co., Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 9697 (v).

Crawford, Mr. J., *Portage la Prairie.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4607; in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5562 (iii).
Cement, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8991 (v).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9407 (v).
Lake Manitoba, Closing *re* Fishing, Cor., Pets, &c. (M. for copies) 9698 (v).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6760 (iv).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3172 (ii).

Crocket, Mr. O. S., *York, N.B.*
Alexander Gibson Ry. Co., Purchase, &c. (M. for ret.) 734 (i).
Armoury at Woodstock, Ownership of Land by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 4920 (iii).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4532 (iii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase, &c., Cor., Number of Officials, &c (M. for ret.) 734 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 4811 (iii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Roadbed Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1978 (i).
'Canadian Citizenship' Political Speech by Min. of Rys. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2214 (ii).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9435 (v).
Drill Hall, Fredericton, Contract *re* (Ques.) 729 (i).
Fertilizers, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1726 (i).
Fredericton Military Buildings, Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 728 (i).
Fredericton Post Office, Equipment, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 170 (i).
Fredericton Station Agent, Mr. O. White (M. for cor.) 193 (i).
——— Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 107 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 698 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 1349 (i).
Harvey, N.B., Customs Collector, Appnmt. of (Ques.) 9696 (v).
I.C.R., Freight Rates, *re* Fredericton Increases (remarks) 6591 (iv).
——— on Explanation of Min. of Rys., 6123 (iv).
——— remarks *re*, 6588 (iv).
——— Traffic Arrangements, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2223 (ii).
Military Buildings, Fredericton, Construction (Ques.) 728 (i).
Pound Net Licenses, Little Current, Cor. between A. E. Dyment, M.P., and Min of Mar. and Fisheries *re* (M. for copies*) 1399 (i).

Crocket, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*

Provl. Govt. in N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'

SUPPLY :

Adulteration of Food (fertilizers) 1726 (i).
Militia (cavalry corps) 9125 (v).
Post Office (provisional allowances) 170 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Campbellton wharf) 1744 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (Memramcook accommodation) 1977; (Moncton accommodation) 1948 (i); (revenue collections) 2223 (ii).

White, Odbur, Dismissal as Station Agent, I.C.R. (Ques.) 107 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2205; Cor., &c. (read) 2206 (ii).

Woodstock Rifle Range, Purchase of Land (Ques.) 5132 (iii).

Daniel, Mr. John W., *St. John City.*

Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Denial *re* Election Speaking, 557 (i).

Bridges, Dr., Resignation as Medical Officer of No. 8 District (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 417 (i).

Budget, on The, 8978 (v).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 634 (i).

Dipper Harbour Breakwater, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 912 (i).

Dredging in Mar. Provs., Number of Vessels, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6890 (iv).

Fisheries Industry, Commission *re* Investigation, Recommendations, &c., on M. (Mr. Ganong) 6344 (iv).

Fitz-Simmons, Jane Marie Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com. 6378 (iv).

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4220 (iii).

Halifax Garrison, Defence by Canadian Troops (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9131 (v).

Imports from United Kingdom, Amounts, &c. (Ques.) 267 (i).

Imports under Preferential Tariff, Amount, Value, &c. (Ques.) 152 (i).

I.C.R., Coal purchased, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 910 (i).

——— Freight Arrangements and Traffic Diversion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2226; Letter from C. W. Stewart (read) 2227 (ii).

——— Superannuation Scheme (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2241 (ii).

——— Time Table, Changes and Delays, &c., on M. for Sup., 6827, 6829 (iv).

'Lady Laurier,' Number of Crew at Halifax (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2616 (ii).

Letter Carriers, Contract *re* Boots, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).

Live Stock Record Association, incorp. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5926 (iii).

Magdalen Island SS. Subventions, Res. of Mar. Board of Trade (read) 907 (i).

Daniel, Mr. John W.—*Con.*

Mail Subsidy paid to Star Line *re* St. John River (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 181 (i).

Militia Act (permanent force) Amt. B. 170 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6986 (iv).

——— on Explanation (Sir Frederick Borden) 6999 (iv).

Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5964 (iv).

Preferential Tariff, Imports, Value, &c. (Ques.) 152 (i).

Provident Savings Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5975 (iv).

Quarantine Officers, Examination of Ships, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2304 (ii).

Royal Military College Amt. B. 169 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6967 (iv).

St. John and Digby Mail Subventions, Res. from Mar. Board of Trade (read) 905 (i).

St. John and St. Martins, N.B., Mail Contract (Ques.) 2776 (ii).

St. John Drill Hall, in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i).

St. John, Halifax and London SS. Subvention, Memorial from St. John Board of Trade (read) 903 (i).

St. John, Halifax and W. Indies Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7183 (iv).

St. Lawrence Navigation, Aids to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 891 (i).

Settlers' Effects, Duty *re* in Com. on Ways and Means, 8997 (v).

Submarine Signal Bells on 'Lurcher' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2873 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (creameries) 6940, 7015; (experimental farms) 6168 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (enlargement) 6294 (iv).
Culling Timber (salaries) 7236 (iv).
Customs (revenue cruisers) 409 (i).
Dominion Police (salaries) 138 (i).
Immigration (medical inspection) 9241 (v).
Inspection of Staples (grain inspection) 7227 (iv).
Justice—Yukon (court fees) 137 (i).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7513 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (submarine signals) 2873 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (France and Can.) 7095 (iv); (G.B. and Canada) 864; (St. John and Digby) 904; (St. John and Halifax) 925 (i); (St. John, Halifax and London) 903 (i), 7087; (St. John and W. Indies) 7176 (iv).
Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 2686 (ii).
Militia (Dom. arsenal) 7012 (iv); (pay and allowance) 417 (i); (Royal Military college) 7004 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Academy of Arts) 7238; (tuberculosis grant) 7248 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 2615; (obstructions, removal) 2647; (schools of navigation) 2643 (ii).
Post Office (letter carriers' boots, &c.) 211; (provisional allowances) 168 (i).

Daniel, Mr. John W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (St. John drill hall) 1049 (i); (St. John drill hall) 7504 (iv); (St. John immigration shed) 1050; (St. John Quarantine) 1052 (i); Richibucto) 6814 (iv); N.S. (Antigonish) 855 (i); Ottawa (heating, &c.) 6816 (iv).

Public Works—Dredging—Dom. (repairs to vessels) 6890; Mar. Provs. (new plant) 6891 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. Chance harbour) 7497; (Quaco harbour) 7501; (Salmon river) 7499; N.S. (Shelburne) 7418 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Deep Waterways Commission) 6894 (iv).

Quarantine (cattle) 2310; (organized districts, salaries) 2302 (ii).

Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, construction, &c.) 2299 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (advertising) 2236; (revenue collections) 2225 (ii).

Transportation Commission, Interim Rep. *re* St. John Harbour, Inquiry for, 2595 (ii).

——— Preliminary Rep. (remarks) 731 (i).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1358 (i).

Wines, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8984 (v).

'W. S. Fielding' Dredge, Completion and Placing, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6891 (iv).

Demers, Mr. L. P., *St John's and Iberville.*

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir W. Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R.L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3450 (ii); on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8839 (v).

Canada Car Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 16) 1°*, 317 (i).

Catholic Mutual Benefit Association B. 93 (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com., 2769 (ii).

Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9436 (v).

Effront, Jean, Patent Relief (B. 33) 1°*, 493 (i).

Fish imported into New York, Prohibition of, Legislation *re* on M. for Com. of Sup., 6188 (iv).

Gold Medal Furniture Co.'s Patent Relief B. 102 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3399 (ii).

Goodwin Car Co. Patent Relief (B. 17) 1°*, 317 (i).

Hersey, Arthur, Relief B. 167 (M.) to employ Stenographer, 8527 (v).

Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3135 (ii).

Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 300 (i).

Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7353 (iv).

Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 724 (i).

Derbyshire, Mr. D., *Brockville.*

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 2425 (ii).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5197 (iii).

Autonomy Bill, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn., 2203 (ii).

Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 94) 1°*, 2005 (ii).

Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup. 8229 (v).

I.C.R., Freight Rates (remarks) *re* Mr. Taylor's Statement, 6590 (iv).

Postmasters acting as Ret. Officers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6245 (iv).

Rural Mail Delivery, Cost of, &c., on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Ret., 2096 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 6175 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Post Office (contingencies) 6245 (iv).

Immigration (printing, &c.) 7711 (iv).

Desjardins, Mr. S., *Terrebonne.*

Dairy Products, Classification for Export, &c. (Ques.) 7810 (iv).

Doncaster Indian Reserves, Abolition of (Ques.) 7812 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Terrebonne) 7394 (iv).

Tison, R. Aimé, Emplymnt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6475 (iv).

Dyment, Mr. A. E., *East Algoma.*

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 116) 1°*, 2185 (ii).

Algoma Copper Range Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 60) 1°*, 1241 (i).

Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9741 (v).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 114) 1°*, 2185 (ii).

Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Rys. Co.'s (B. 113) 1°*, 2185 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Honora wharf) 9597; (Manitoulin wharf) 9598; (Stokes Bay) 9598 (v).

Elson, Mr. P., *East Middldsex.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5100 (iii).

London Drill Hall, Sale of, &c. (Ques.) 8384 (v).

Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) to M. for 3°, 1875 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (London P. O.) 1563 (i).

Quarantine (cattle) 6690 (iv).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R. (Minister of Railways and Canals), *Westmoreland.*

Agents' Dwelling Houses, I.C.R., Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).

Aliens employed at Sault Ste. Marie on Govt. Works, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1415 (i).

Alien Labour and Ry. Employees: *See* 'Père Marquette.'

Amherst, Wharf Connection *re* I. C. Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9521 (v).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry., Amounts paid for Damages (Ans.) 2063 (ii).

——— Rep. of Mr. Mothersill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9383 (v).

Atwater Bridge, Lachine Canal, Name of Contractor, Price, &c. (Ans.) 7261, 7422 (iv).

Balsam Lake Waterways, Agreement *re* (remarks) in Com., of Sup., 1524 (i).

Beauharnois Canal Water Power, Negotiations *re* for Electric Lighting (Ans.) 1504 (i).

Burritt's Rapids Locks, Dismissals, &c. (Ans.) 8384 (v).

Canada Atlantic Ry., Purchases, on Inquiry for Papers, 2685 (ii).
See 'Ry. Act. B. 132.'

Canada Eastern Ry., Improvement of Roadbed (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1978 (i).

——— Purchase, &c., on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Ret. 734 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 4811 (iii).

——— Total Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1922 (i).

Canada Southern Bridge Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. German) in Com., 1286 (i).

'Canadian Citizenship', Political Speech *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2214 (ii).

Canadian Fast Mail Service (announcement) 9279 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to adjn., 9782 (v).

Canal Inspectors, Qualifications, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1509 (i).

Cardinal Canal, Claims from Contractors: in Com. of Sup., 1220 (i).

——— Swing Bridge and Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1418 (i).

Carillon Canal Fishway, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 2064 (ii).

Charlottetown Ry. Station, Site, &c. (Ans.) 60 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 4810 (iii).

Coal for Govt. Rys., Purchase from N.S. Mines, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 2191 (ii).

Cornwall Basin Dredging Contract, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 588 (i).

Cornwall Canal, Dredging, Contract *re*, Advertising, &c. (Ans.) 686 (i).

——— Employees during Election Campaign: (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1223 (i).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

Cornwall Canal, Extra Employees, during Oct. and Nov. (Ans.) 107 (i).
See 'Williamsburg.'

Cote St. Paul Water Power, Lease to J. Frothingham (Ans.) 3360 (ii).

Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4269 (iii).

Culrute Canal, Litigation *re* Flooding (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1522 (i).

Drummond Co. Ry., Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1940 (i).

Elevator at Port Colborne, in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1288 (i).

Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 1401 (i).

Fessenden Wireless Tel. Co. of Canada incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6380 (iv).

Fisheries Industry, Commission *re* Investigation, Recommendation, &c., on M. (Mr. Ganong) 6345 (iv).

Fort Lawrence Pier, N.S., Name of Contractors, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 5034 (iii).

Ft. William Telephone System, on Inquiry for Ret., 2685 (ii).

Fish Transportation from Boston to Montreal via G. T. Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1930 (i).

Fredericton Station Agent, Mr. O. White, Dismissal, on Inquiry for Ret., 698 (i).

——— Dismissal, &c., (Ans.) 107 (i).

Freight Rates on I.C.R.: *See* 'I.C.R.', 'Ry. Rates.'

Galena Oil Co., Purchases from (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).

Gamebridge Masonry Inspector, Imperfect Ret. (remarks) 5600 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Papers (remarks) 8004 (v).

Govt. Railways, Rails laid and disposed of, &c., Number of Tons, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2066 (ii).

Grain exported through Govt. Elevators (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1917 (i).

G.T.P. Ry., Awarding of Contracts, Specifications, &c., Answers (read) to Mr. Foster's questions, 9782 (v).

——— Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2182 (ii).

——— Interim Rep. (presnted) 6310 (iv).

——— Location of Line from Winnipeg (remarks) 9815 (v).

——— Plans *re* Termini, &c. (Ans.) 1151 (i).

——— Plans deposited with Dept. of Rys., on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 917 (i), 2820 (ii).

——— Proposed Route West of Winnipeg, Plans, &c. (Ans.) 730 (i).

——— Surveys, B.C., Information *re* (Ans.) 3009 (ii).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
G. T. P. Ry., Surveys through Madawaska, Route, &c. (Ans.) 5688 (iii).
——— Surveys, Number and Names of Employees (Ans.) 686 (i).
——— Surveys, Quebec and Moncton route, Information *re* (remarks) 228 (i).
——— Surveys, Reps. in Ry. Dept., &c. (remarks) 2009 (ii).
——— Terminus at Port Arthur, Approval of Location (remarks) 6138 (iv).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3879 (ii), 4126, 4218 (iii),
Grenville Canal, Appnmt. of Supt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1509 (i).
——— Lumber for Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1514 (i).
Hay, Free Transportation over I.C.R. (Ans.) 59, 109 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 165 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 919 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1929 (i).
Ice Jam in St. Lawrence river, Govtl, Action *re* (remarks) 700 (i).
I.C.R. and C.A. Ry., Running Rights (B. 132) 1° m., 4186 (iii); in Com., 6139, 7583 (iv).
I.C.R. and G.T.R., Arbitration *re* Traffic Arrangements (remarks) in Com of Sup., 1929 (i).
——— (remarks) 68 (i).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry. Claims for Damages, Amounts paid (Ans.) 383 (i).
I.C.R., Advertising Car, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2257 (ii).
——— Annual Statement, on M. for Sup., 1886, 1891 (i).
——— Appointments to Train Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9521 (v).
——— Capital Account, Total Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2065 (ii).
——— Chapman, F. B., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1343 (i).
——— Coal carried free to Ottawa in 1902-3 (Ans.) 2192 (ii).
——— Coal, Free Transportation in 1902-3, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 2065 (ii).
——— Coal purchased, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 910 (i).
——— Employees, Messrs. Weldon, &c. Political Partisan (Ans.) 1146 (i).
——— Employees, Pensions, Govt. Legislation *re* (remarks) 9289 (v).
——— Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1950 (i).
——— Financial Statement in Com. of Sup., 7445 (iv).
——— Fish Traffic: *See* 'Fish.'
——— Freight Arrangements and Traffic Diversion, on Cor. of C. W. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2228 (ii).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
I. C. R., Freight Rates, Increase of, &c (Statement) in Reply to Mr. Taylor, M.P., 6112; Cor., &c. (read) 6115 (iv).
——— (remarks) *re* Mr. Taylor's Statement. 6587 (iv).
——— Fuel Inspector, Duties, &c. (Ans.) 451 (i).
——— Locomotives, Purchase of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1964 (i).
——— Parlour Cars, Net Profits, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).
——— Passes issued, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2258 (ii).
——— Passes for Councillors at Quebec (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1925 (i).
——— Private Cars, Number, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2259 (ii).
——— Purchases by Tender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2181 (ii).
——— Receipts and Expenditures, Total Amount (Ans.) 688 (i).
——— Rolling Stock, Estimate of Cost, &c. (read) in Com. of Sup., 9501 (v).
——— Snow Blockade, Delay in Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).
——— Superannuation Scheme (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2241 (ii).
——— Supplies, Purchase of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2246 (ii).
——— Time Table, Changes and Delays, on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 6828, 6830 (iv).
——— Time Tables, Printing in English and French (Ans.) 6827 (iv).
——— Traffic Arrangements with other Rys. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1915 (i); 2215 (ii).
——— Train Service, *re* Snowstorms (explanation) 726 (i).
——— Trains stalled by Snowstorms, *re* Telegrams, &c., 696 (i).
See 'P.E.I.'
James Bay Ry. Co., Maps *re* Location (Ans.) 2191 (ii).
Kitchen, Mr., Contract *re* Murray Harbour Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2138 (ii).
Lachine Canal Water Power at Côte St. Paul, Use by Manufacturers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1518 (i).
——— Water Privilege, Lease to Wm. Parkyn, &c. (Ans.) 5133 (iii).
——— Whistles, Nuisance of (remarks) 9284 (v).
Lévis, Purchase of Land for I.C.R. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6670 (iv).
McAlpine, Mr. E. H., Expenditure *re* Litigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1522 (i).
McGill University School of Ry. Transportation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9381 (v).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Madoc and Eldorado Ry. Bonus (Ans.) 7261 (iv).
Morell River Ry. Bridge, P.E.I., Complaints *re* (Ans.) 5035 (iii).
Municipal Telephone System, Application before Ry. Commission *re* Port Arthur, &c. (Ans.) 595 (i).
Murray & Cleveland, Claims for Extras *re* Galops Canal: in Com. of Sup., 1220 (i).
Murray Harbour Branch Ry., Amount due Contractors (Ans.) 2064 (ii).
——— Completion, &c. (Ans.) 189 (i).
——— Delegation *re* (Ans.) 265 (i).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2127 (ii), 9482 (v).
New Brunswick Southern Ry., Negotiations *re* Purchase (Ans.) 584 (i).
New London Branch Ry., P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2179 (ii).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5696 (iii).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5738 (iii), 5964 (iv).
Père Marquette Ry. Employees, on Inquiry for Papers, 7916 (iv).
Port Arthur and Fort William Telephone System and Board of Ry. Commissioners' on M. (Mr. Boyce) for copies of Cor., 1393 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 2203 (i).
Poonamalie Dam, Pet. *re* Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9380 (v).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1288 (i).
P.E.I Ry., Claims for Damages *re* Murray Harbour Branch (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9489 (v).
——— Land Expropriations, Papers laid on Table, 8528 (v).
P.E.I. and Mainland, Steam Communication, Delays in Mails, &c. (remarks) 2204 (ii).
P.E.I. and Murray Harbour Branch, Expenditure up to Jan., 1905 (Ans.) 106 (i).
P.E.I. Ry., Stanley Bridge Branch, Surveys, &c. (Ans.) 267 (i).
P.E.I. and Steam Communication, Delay in Mails, &c. (remarks) 1754 (i).
P.E.I. Ry. Survey, West Cape Branch (Ans.) 590 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Delay to Travellers, &c., Refund of Expenses (Ans.) 4807 (iii).
Quebec Bridge and G.T.P. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2295 (ii).
Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossing) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 291 (i).
Railways and Canals Act Amt. (B. 53) 1°*, 817; 2° m., and in Com., 1673 (i).
Ry. Act (I.C.R. and C.A.R.) Amt. (B. 132) 1° m., 4186 (iii); in Com., 6139, 7583 (iv).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Railways and Canals, Dep. Minister, Retirement of, &c. (remarks) 9678 (v).
——— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 908 (i).
Railway Commission Board, Maintenance, in Com. of Sup., 1525 (i).
——— Salaries, Private Secs., &c. (Ans.) 688 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Cars (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1538 (i).
——— Number and Names of Employees (Ans.) 684 (i).
——— Official Cars, Legal Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 593 (i).
——— Rep., Non-Production (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6235 (iv).
——— Rep. of Board, Preparation of, &c. (remarks) 2007 (ii).
——— Rep. (presented) 6346 (iv).
——— Rep. on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6136 (iv).
——— Staff Salaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1539 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5005, 5013 (iii).
Ry. Report, Delay, &c. (remarks) 602 (i).
Railway Subsidies in Joliette Co., Salaries, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2066 (ii).
Ry. Surveys, *re* Joliette County, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 1346 (i).
Returns, Delay *re*, on Inquiry for, 1594 (i).
Richelieu Bridge at Sorel, Papers laid on Table, 8268 (v).
Rideau Canal Extension (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1524 (i).
Riviere Ouelle Spur Line (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1981 (i).
Ryan, Heber W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4458 (iii).
St. Peter's Breakwater, P.E.I., Tenders *re* (Ans.) 5035 (iii).
Sackville Ry. Station, Tenders *re* Erection, &c. (Ans.) 5133 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie Canals, Contractors, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1406 (i).
——— Dredging Contract, U.S. and Canadian Contractors (Ans.) 589 (i).
'Scotia' Str., Certified Engineers, &c. (remarks) 8386 (v).
Sidings and Spur Lines, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 1970 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9341 (v).
Standard Gauge Ry., Cost of Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2181 (ii).
Stanley Bridge, P.E.I., Survey, Total Cost, Claims for Damages, &c. (Ans.) 587 (i).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Beauharnois (repairs) 6307 (iv).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—Carillon and Grenville (guide piers) 6305 (iv).

Canals—Chambly (bank strengthening) 9378 (v); (culvert St. Therese Island) 6301 (iv); (macadamazing roads) 9378 (v.)

Canals—Cornwall (concreting apparatus) 6298 (iv); (enlargement) 1219; (lock repairs) 1494 (i), 9381 (v).

Canals—Farran's Point (gas plant) 6308 (iv).

Canals—Galops (channel completion) 1230; (enlargement) 1220; (leakage) 1492 (i); (shoals) 9354 (v).

Canals—Grenville (guide piers) 1500 (i).

Canals—Lachine (Atwater Avenue bridge) 1240 (i); (electric appliances) 9354 (v), 1240 (i); (enlargement) 6294 (iv); (gasoline boat) 1421 (i); (Hanault, L. O., Payments to) 6299; (lockgates suspension) 6300 (iv); (machinery for shops) 1240 (i); (Mill St. paving) 6301; (power house flume) 6300; (repairs) 6306 (iv); (St. Gabriel basin) 9378 (v); (Wall Basin No. 2) 1421 (i); (wall underpinning) 6298 (iv); (wharf below dock) 1421 (i).

Canals—Miscellaneous (additional remuneration) 1547; (arbitrations, &c.) 1508; (inspections and surveys) 1509 (i); (remuneration to lockmasters) 9384 (v); (surveys) 1520; (tolls, repairs, &c.) 1546 (i).

Canals—Murray (repairs) 1495 (i).

Canals—Rapide Plat (enlargement, upper entrance) 6289 (iv).

Canals—Rideau (extension) 1333 (i).

Canals—St. Lawrence (shoals) 6289 (iv).

Canals—St. Ours (booms and piers) 1499 (i); (landing wharf) 6302 (iv).

Canals—St. Peters (dredging) 6303; (repairs) 6208 (iv).

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 1334, 1402 (i).

Canals—Soulanges (construction) 6290 (iv).

Canals—Trent (construction) 1420; (construction and surveys) 1479 (i); (dredge engine) 9381 (v); (Geo. Matthews Co., damages) 6303 (iv); (Holland river) 9359 (v); (improvements) 1499 (i); (lowering floor of lock) 6302 (iv); (McLaren's creek bridge) 9379 (v); (Peterborough dam) 6303 (iv); (staff on dams) 9383 (v); (surveys) 6291 (iv), 9354 (v); (surveys of dams) 9376 (v).

Canals—Welland (bridge building) 1234 (i); (electric lighting power) 9377 (v); (electric plant) 1231 (i); (long level deepening) 6290; (lowering head of lock No. 1) 6309; (obstruction, &c.) 1231; (Port Colborne, deepening) 1232; (Port Colborne, elevator) 1266, 1288; (Port Colborne, entrance) 1230; (Port Colborne, level) 1263; (stone protection) 1496; (surveys) 1234, 1520; (Vanderburg, Stephen, claims *re* injuries) 6305 (iv).

Canals—Williamburg (steam plant) 1494 (i).

Civil Govt.—Railways (law clerk) 9066; (private sec.) 9062 (v); (salaries) 93 (i); (salary increases) 9062 (v).

Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7511 (iv).

Railways—G.T.P. (construction) 9498 (v); (salaries, &c.) 2293; (surveys, construction, &c.) 2277; (surveys, &c.) 2298 (ii), 6427, 7496 (iv); (surveys, plans, &c.) 9490; (terminals, &c.) 9498 (v).

Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings) 6431 (iv); (additional sidings and spurs) 1970; (advertising) 2236 (ii); (Amherst accommodation) 1983; (Antigonish accommodation) 1967 (i); (bridge strengthening) 1912 (i), 9384 (v); (Campbellton) 1968 (i); (Cape Road crossing) 6432 (iv); (double tracking) 1933 (i), 2027 (ii), 9390 (v); (Drummondville improvements) 1960 (i); (engine houses) 9389 (v); (financial statement) 7445 (iv); (grades and curves) 1987 (i); (Halifax accommodation) 9391 (v); (Halifax dredging) 2026; (Halifax terminals) 2032; (ii); (increased facilities) 9482; (Indiantown branch) 9482; (locomotive machinery) 6428 (iv); (Memramcook accommodation) 1977; (Mitchell diversion) 1940; (Moncton accommodation) 1946 (i), 9391 (v); (Newcastle improvements) 1967; (original construction) 1912 (i); (Pictou accommodation) 9390 (v); (revenue collections) 2204; (rolling stock) 2037 (ii), 6428 (iv); (rolling stock, statement read) 9501 (v); (St. Cyrille diversion of line) 1969; (St. Fabien subway) 1980 (i); (Ste. Flavie accommodation) 9390; (St. John accommodation) 9389 (v); (St. Lambert double tracking) 2183 (ii); (St. Moise station) 1976; (semaphores) 1986 (i); (station accommodation) 6429 (iv); (steel rails, fastenings, &c.) 1988 (i), 2038 (ii); (Sydney accommodation) 1912; (Sydney Mines extension) 1987 (i); (ties, &c.) 6429 (iv); (Truro accommodation) 9391 (v); (water service) 2170 (ii); (working expenses) 9384 (v).

Railways—Miscellaneous (Atlantic and Lake Superior investigation) 9383 (v); (engineers, &c.) 1521; (extra clerks) 1521 (i); (gratuities) 2183 (ii); (litigation) 1522 (i); (school of transportation) 9381 (v); (statistics) 1521 (i).

Railways — P.E.I. (air brakes) 2178 (ii); (Bloomfield agent's house) 6432 (iv); (Cardigan branch) 2171 (ii); 9482 (v); (Charlottetown, accommodation) 2025 (ii); (Charlottetown, track extension) 6433 (iv); (Freetown agent's house) 2180; (Georgetown station) 2179; (Hillsborough bridge) 2038; (Kensington station) 2178; (M.C.B.) couplers) 2178; (Morell bridge swing span) 2177; (Murray branch) 2038; (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2127 (ii), 8692 (v); (Summerside improvements) 2176; (Vernon River branch) 2177 (ii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance) 1525 (i).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co., Claims *re* Surveys, &c., 9494 (v).

Transportation Commission, Rep. of Mr. Bertram (read) 1288 (i).

——— Rep. *re* C. A. Ry., Ref. to in Com. on B. 45, 4225 (iii).

——— *re* Waterways (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1288 (i).

Trent Valley Canal, Damages *re* Flooding, Claims of Mr. James Clark, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 1396 (i).

——— Surveys *re* Rice Lake, &c. (Ans.) 153 (i).

Truro Dining Room, I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2256 (ii).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8315, 8639 (v).
Welland Canal, Deepening, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 589 (i).
——— Extra Employees, for Oct., Nov. (Ans.) 453 (i).
——— Water Power Leases, &c. on M. (Mr. German) for Ret., 2099 (ii).
White, Mr. Odbur, Dismissal, on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Cor., 193 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2209 (ii).
See 'Fredericton,' &c.
Williamsburg and Cornwall Canal Water Power Leases, Dates of Rental, Claims, &c. (Ans.) 4809 (iii).
Wire Fencing Contract: *See* 'N.W.T.'
Woodill, S., Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 2192 (ii).

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Debates, Official (M.) to conc. in 7th Rep., 9801 (v).

Fielding, Hon. W. S., (Minister of Finance), *Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.*
Adjournment, 24th May, (M.) 6384 (iv).
'Agnes Donahoe,' Schr., Seizure by Uruguayan Govt. (remarks) 6110 (iv).
American Currency circulated in Can., Prevention *re* (Ans.) 3010 (ii).
Anglo-American Tel. Co., Agreement *re* Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7606 (iv).
Ascension Day Adjournment (remarks) 6825 (iv).
Audit Act Amt. (remarks) 6112 (iv).
——— Progress *re* (Ans.) 2190 (iv).
Auditor General and Audit Act, on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 9640 (v).
——— (remarks) 9541 (v).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Inadequate Supply, &c. (remarks 4272 (iii).
——— Inquiry for, 2262 (ii).
Auditor General's Resignation, &c., and Amts. to Audit Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6523 (iv).
Audit Office and Treasury Board, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 1935 (i).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5435, 5479 (iii), on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 2979; amendment to Clause 16 (presented) 2840 (ii).
——— in Com. (compensation *re* lands) 5817; (B.N.A. Act) 5730; (Hudson Bay Co. rights) 5950; (laws, courts, &c.) 6102; (subsidy to provs.) 6091 (iv).
——— Attack on Orangeism (remarks) in Com., 5878 (iii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
——— Changes *re* Financial Clauses remarks) 2046 (ii).
——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 6736 (iv).
——— Official Report of Division (remarks) 5431 (iii).
——— Production of Cor., &c (remarks) 2593 (ii).
——— School Clause Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5830 (iii).
——— 'Yellow Dog,' *re* Quotation from Halifax 'Chronicle' (remarks) in Com., 5879, 5901 (iii).
See 'Lt. Govs.', &c., 'Saskatchewan.' 'N. W.T. B. 160.'
Bank Act Amt. (B. 181) 1° m., 7642 (iv); in Com., 8688 (v).
Banking Act Amts. (remarks) 6112 (iv).
Bank Notes, Circulation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6251 (iv).
Bank Notes lost in Circulation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6261 (iv).
Bills from the Senate, Amendments *re* Clerical Errors, &c. (remarks) 8383 (v),
——— on M. (Mr. A. Johnston) to place on Order Paper, 8096 (v).
Boyd, Mr. Geo. A., Emplymt. at Sault Ste. Marie Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6881 (iv).
Bracebridge Dry Dock, Supt. *re* Construction (Ans.) 6654 (iv).
Budget, The (financial statement) 8888 (v).
——— Resolutions *re* Ways and Means (M.) 8914 (v).
——— (remarks) 2006 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for, 2762 (ii), 4920 (iii), 7100 (iv).
——— Statement *re*, 8763 (v).
Cabinet Ministers Ex-, Annuity Bill (No. 203) M. for Com. on Res., 9702; in Com. on Res., 9733; 1°*, 9739; in Com., 9792; (amt.) 9796 (v).
Cacouna Wharf, Expenditure *re* Works (Ans.) 7096 (iv).
C.A.R. and I.C.R.: *See* 'I.C.R.'
Canada Life Assurance Co., Ref. to in Com. on B. 108, 4691 (iii).
Canadian Fast Mail Service, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to adjn., 9778 (v).
Catholic Mutual Benefit Association B. 93 (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com., 2769 (ii).
Cement, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9765 (v).
Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 49 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 2765 (ii).
Chateauguay River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6847 (iv).
Citizens' Bank of Canada, B. 133 (Mr. Barr) in Com., 5973 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Collingwood Govt. Dry Dock, Payments by Govt. *re* Bounty (Ans.) 6653 (iv).
——— Tenders *re* Conroy Bros. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6572 (iv).
——— Retention of Mr. Conroy's Cheque (remarks) 6654 (iv).
Commercial Agencies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9038 (v).
Cordage Plant at Kingston, Establishment of, &c. (Ans.) 2329 (ii).
Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4260 (iii).
Customs Act Amt. (B. 190) 1° m., 8997; in Com., 9761 (v).
Dams across Rivers, Govt. Policy in Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6839 (iv).
Debates Official, on M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com., 9809 (v).
Dominion Annuity Co.'s incorp. B. 82 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 2767 (ii).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) in Com., 4974 (iii).
Dom. Notes, Printing in English and French (Ans.) 6826 (iv).
Dredging, Cost of hiring Dredges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6842 (iv).
Dredging in Mar. Provs., Number of Vessels, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6890 (iv).
Dumping Clause, Amts. to (remarks) in Com. on B. 190, 9767 (v).
Dundonald Park, and Ottawa Improvement Commission (remarks) in Com. on B. 180, 8686 (v).
Electoral Atlas, Distribution to Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6897 (iv).
——— New Edition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).
Estimates (1905) Suppl. (presented) 6165 (iv).
———1906 (presented) 8718 (v).
——— Further Supplementary, 1906 (presented) 9392 (v).
——— Criticism of (remarks) 9052 (v).
——— Delay in bringing down and efficient Critism. on Amt. (Mr. Foster) 9090 (v). *See* 'Interior.'
Farmers' Bank of Canada B. 124 (Mr. T. Martin) in Com., 4700 (iii); on Sen. Amts. 6609 (iv).
Fessenden Wireless Tel. Co. of Canada : incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6381, 6608 (iv).
First Minister, Salary Increase (B. 201) M. for Com. on Res., 9700; in Com. on Res., 9725; 1° of B., 9726; in Com., 9790 (v); on M. for 3°, 9791 (v).
Fitz-Simmons, Jane Marie Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6378 (iv).
Fort William and Port Arthur Dredging, Number of Tenders (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6729 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Georgian Bay Islands Sale (remarks) on Explanation (Mr. Grant) 6737 (iv).
Gold of the Yukon purchased by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6264 (iv).
G.T.Ry., Arbitration B. 199 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 1°, 9280 (v).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3650 (ii), 4208 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7626, 7677 ; on M. for 3°, 7863 (iv).
G.T. Pacific Ry., Agreements with National Transcontinental Ry. (Ans.) 2776 (ii).
——— Plans *re* Terminals, Deposited with Govt., on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 2839 (ii).
——— Surveys, Rep. in Ry. Dept., &c. (remarks) 2016 (ii).
Great Northern Ry. of Canada B. 71 (Mr. J. T. Schell) in Com., 4258 (iii).
Guarantee Bonds : *See* 'Inland Revenue.'
Harbours and Rivers, N.S., Charges against Govt. Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9559 (v).
Hersey, A. H., Relief B. 167 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) in Com., 7682 (iv).
Hudson Bay Expedition, Payments *re* Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6729 (iv).
Immigration Contract : *See* 'North Atlantic.'
Imperial Guarantee and Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2771 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act (guarantee bonds) Amt. B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8681 (v).
Insurance Cos., Legislation *re*, &c. (remarks in Com. on B. 200, 9689 (v).
I.C.R. and C.A. Ry. Act (running rights) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 4192 (iii).
I.C.R. Employees Pensions (remarks) 9029 (v).
——— (Ans.) 2492 (ii).
Interior Estimates, Obstruction *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9265 (v).
Japanese Trade with Canada, Discrimination *re* Canadian Goods (remarks) 6655 (iv).
——— Trade Relations with Dom. (remarks) 7816 (iv).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9742 ; (amt.) 9797 (v).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6667 (iv).
——— (remarks) 9706 (v).
Labourers employed by Govt., Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6858 (iv).
Lt. Governors, Alberta and Saskatchewan (B. 193) in Com. on Res., 1°, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 9033 (v).
Loans by Govt., Temporary or Permanent, Total Amount, Rate of Interest, (Ans.) 4921 (iii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
London Bye-Election, Resignation of h. m. for S. York (remarks) 6384 (iv).
McGillicuddy, Mr. D., Letter to Sir Wm. Mulock, Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 6602 (iv).
McKenzie, D. D., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill, on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. Johnston) 8478 (v).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6797 (iv).
Melfort Mail Service, Charges *re* Delays (remarks) 9789 (v).
Mint, Royal Canadian, Estimated Cost, Capacity, &c. (Ans.) 2185, 2326 (ii).
Mutual Reserve Ins. Co., Payment of Claims, &c. (Ans.) 2333 (ii).
Nixon, Robt., on M. (Mr. Foster) to cancel Vote in Com. of Sup., 9329, 9769 (v).
Northwest Territories B. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8765 (v).
N.W.T. Boundary Line Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5696 (iii).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, Termination of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9452 (v).
——— (remarks) 8182 (v).
Oats, Rolled, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 8984, 9763 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2718 (ii).
Ontario Fire Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. Boyce) in Com., 2772 (ii).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 4965 (iii), 5963 (iv).
Ottawa City Act (1899) Amt. (B. 180) 1°*, 7642 (iv) ; in Com., 8686 (v).
Ottawa Public Buildings, Rentals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6818 (iv).
Port Arthur Dredging, Time for Tenders (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6875 (iv).
Port Credit Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6871 (iv).
Prime Minister, Salary Increase : *See* 'First.'
P.E.I. and Mainland Winter Service, Claims for Damages (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6644 (iv).
——— Obligations of Dom. Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2664 (ii).
Privy Councillors Annuity : *See* 'Cabinet Minister.'
'Protestant Govt.', Formation of, &c., ref. to in Speech on Autonomy Bill, 3006 (ii).
'Protestant Schools,' Ref. to in Autonomy Bill, 3484 (ii).
Provident Savings Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5974 (iv).
Provincial Govt. in N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Accounts, Meetings, &c. (remarks) 7100 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Quebec Citadel Walls, Repairs to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6726 (iv).
Richibucto Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 6730 (iv).
Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 103 (Mr. Tobin) in Com., 3669 (ii).
Rolled Oats, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8984, 9763 (v).
Royal Trust Co., Ref. to in Com., on Bill 99, 3651 (ii).
St. John, Halifax and W. Indies Mail Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7181 (iv).
Saskatchewan, Prov. of, B. 70, in Com. on Res., 8700 (iv).
Senate and House of Commons Indemnity B. 202 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9730 (v).
Senate and House of Commons, Conferences *re* Amts. to Bills (M.) 9280 (v).
Setters' Effects, Duty *re* in Com. on Ways and Means, 8997 (v).
South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9348, 9587 (v).
Sovereign Fire Insurance Co. of Canada B. 26 (Mr. E. F. Clarke) in Com., 1756 (i).
Spirits in Bond (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8681 (v).
Supply Bill (No. 206) M. for Com., 9798 ; 1° m., 2° m., and in Com., 9801 (v).
SUPPLY :
Charges of Management (contingencies) 8691 (v) ; (Receiver General's Office) 6249 (iv), 9052 (v).
Civil Govt., Auditor General (salaries) 6721 (iv); Finance Dept. (salaries) 9060 (v); Finance (private secretary) 6268 (iv); Gov. Gen.'s Office (clerical assistance) 6248 (iv), 9053 (v); Interior (mines branch) 6265; Miscellaneous (charwomen) 6268; Public Works (salaries) 6724 (iv), 9071 (v); Sec. of State (Civil Service examiners) 6249; (salaries) 6248 (iv), 9071; Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 9034 (v).
Govt. of N.W.T. (general vote) 9622 (v).
Inspection of Staples (contingencies) 6901 (iv).
Justice, Administration of (miscellaneous) 6721 (iv).
Legislation—Franchise Act (voters' lists) 6722, 6897 ; (H. of Commons) 6298 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and G.B.) 9622 ; (Canada and Mexico) 9622, 9680 ; (Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie) 9616; (Port Essington, B.C., &c.) 9616; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 9617 (v); (St. John, Halifax, &c.) 6901; (St. John and W. Indies) 7177 (iv), 8691 (v).
Miscellaneous (Academy of Arts) 7238 (iv); (Bank of Commerce, compensation, Yukon) 9615 (v); ('Canada Gazette') 6723; (Can. Mining Institute grant) 7247 (iv); (canals celebration, Sault Ste. Marie) 9621; (Champlain's monument) 9340 (v); (Dom. and Provincial accounts) 7241; (legal expenses *re* Martineau case) 6723; (legal services *re* Sunday Observance) 6722; (Pacific Cable grant) 7239 (iv); (Printing Bureau machinery) 9614 (v);

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Miscellaneous—*Con.*

(printing, &c.) 6723, 6901 (iv); (Public Accounts evidence) 9616 (v); (relief of distressed Canadians) 7247; (tariff commission) 9614 (v).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breaking steamers) 9620 (v).

Penitentiaries (Archibald, W. T., Parole Officer) 6722 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (improvements) 6735 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (engineers, firemen, &c.) 6823; (fuel) 6822; (furniture) 6817; (rents) 6818 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings, N.B. (Richibucto) 6730, 6813 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Lloydminster immigrant shed) 6734 (i).

Public Works—Buildings — Ont. (London drill hall, electric wiring) 6732 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (elevator, salaries) 6816; (grounds) 6817; (heating, &c.) 6816; (lighting) 6816; (Major's Hill Park) 6817; (repairs, &c.) 6815; (Rideau Hall) 6823; (telephones) 6814; (treasury vaults) 6825 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle repairs) 6734 (iv).

Public Works—Dredging—Dom. (repairs to vessels) 6890; Mar. Provs. (new plant) 6891; P.E.I. (new dredge) 6891 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Fort Lawrence) 6838 (iv); (Frude's Point) 9583 (v); (general vote) 7238 (iv); (Glace Bay) 9577 (v); (L'Ardoise breakwater) 6838 (iv); (Marble Mountain) 9580; (Petite Rivière) 9581; (Phinney's Cove) 9559 (v); (Port Hawkesbury wharf) 6837 (iv); (Porter's Lake) 9584 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Barry's wharf) 6873; (Blind river dredging) 6870; (Collingwood harbour dredging) 6879; (Grand River dredging) 6873; (Haileybury wharf) 6887; (Honora wharf) 6887; (Little Current channel) 6886; (Otonabee river) 6887; (Owen Sound Harbour) 6886; (Point Edward dredging) 6869; (Whitby harbour dredging) 6880 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Chateauguay dredging) 6847; (Doucet's Landing) 6849; (Little Rapids dam) 6839; (Maskinonge river) 6842; (Montmorency wharf) 6852; (Pierreville wharf) 6868; (Que., harbour improvements) 6724; (St. Alphonse de Bagotville wharf) 6868; (St. Maurice river dredging) 6851; (Sorel ice piers) 6841; (Yamaska Lock) 6868 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing 7616; (Deep Waterways Commission) 6894; (engineers, &c.) 6895 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Ottawa (bridges) 6889 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraphs — Mar. Provs. (Bay St. Lawrence) 7606; N.W.T. (Qu'Appelle and Edmonton) 6894; Quebec. (J. C. Taché, special) 6897; Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 6896 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (general vote) 7475 (iv); (rolling stock) 9514 (v); P.E.I. (working expenses) 6901 (iv).

Senate (contingencies) 6621 (iv).

Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 9037 (iv); (iron and steel bounties) 7216 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Transportation Commission (expenses) 8692 (v).

Unprovided Items (general) 6902 (iv)

Weights and Measures (inspection of staples) 9616, 9681 (v).

Yukon Ter. Govt. (additional allowance to Maj. Wood) 9250 (v).

Supreme Court, N.S., Vacancy, Appnmt. *re* (remarks)) 5210 (iii).

Thessalon Postmaster, Mr. J. B. Dobey, Irregularities, &c., on M. for Sup., 6220 (iv).

Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3651 (ii), 4681 (iii).

Toronto Harbour, Straightening River Don (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6889 (iv).

Toronto Post Office, Erection of, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6833 (iv).

Transportation Commission, Information *re* (remarks) 9680 (v).

Voters' Lists *re* Edmonton Election, Preparation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).

Ways and Means, The Budget (financial statement) 8888 (v).

——— Resolutions (m.) 8914 (v.)

——— (M.) for Com., 9798, in Com., 9801 (v).

Western Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4691 (iii).

White Lead, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8983, 9761 (v).

Wines, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8983, 9762, (v).

Wire Fencing: *See* 'N.W.T.,' &c.

Yarmouth, N.S., Investigation *re* (remarks) 9691 (v).

Finlay, Mr. J., *East Peterborough.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7895 (iv).

Campaign Literature, franked by Ministers of Crown (remarks) 1817 (i).

Collingwood Dock, Conroy Bros. Cheque (remarks) 6583 (iv).

Officials dismissed by Mr. Whitney (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iv).

Postmasters acting as Ret. Officers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6245 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.—Post Office (contingencies) 6245 (iv).

Finlayson, Mr. D., *Richmond, N.S.*

Autonomy B. 69, Attack on 'Orangeism' (remarks) in Com., 5879 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Bourgeois inlet) 9581; (Pierreville pier) 9581 (v).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney (Minister of Agriculture). *Brome.*
Agriculture, Dept. Rep. (presented) 321 (i).
Agricultural Meetings in Eastern Townships, Purposes, &c. (Ans.) 268 (i).
Agricultural Statistics, Expenditure *re* (remarks 990 (i).
Anglo-American Tel. Co., Subsidy Increases (Ans.) 108 (i).
Animals slaughtered under Diseases Act, Compensation (remarks) on conc., 6912 (iv).
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (prop. res.) in Com., 676, in Com. on Res., 736 (i), 2413 (ii); 1° m., 2441; in Com., 2841, 2844 (ii).
Archives, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 6826 (iv).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4481 (iii); in Com., sec. 2 (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8563 (v); (readjustment of representation) in Com., 5755 (iii). *See* 'Manitoba'.
Binder Twine Sale : *See* 'Cordage.'
Butter and Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Grievance, &c. (Ans.) 8886 (v).
Butter shipped in Cold Storage *re* Atlantic Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 882 (i).
Canadian Cattle, British Embargo (remarks) 455 (i).
——— on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Com., 9022 (v).
Census and Statistics (B. 5) M. for Com. on Res., 820; in Com. on Res., 990; 1°*, 52; 2° m. and in Com., 625; M. for Com., 1013; in Com., 1069, 1467 (i).
Census and Statistics Act (N.W.T.) Amt. (B. 163) 1° m., 6105 (iv); 2° m. and in Com., 8774 (v).
Census Enumerators, Appnmt. of (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 1073 (i).
Census and Statistics, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) *re* Resolution, 631 (i).
Census, Total Expenditure for 1901, Dismissal of Staff, &c. (Ans.) 588 (i).
Census (1901) Vol. 2 (presented) 50 (i).
Child Immigration, Mrs Close's Scheme, on M. for Sup., 2126 (ii).
Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, Thermograph Records, &c. (Ans.) 2775 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8201 (v).
Cold Storage *re* Steamship Service, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 868 (i).
——— Stmnts. of Mr. E. D. Smith (remarks) 874 (i).
Copyright Photographs, Legislation *re* Amendments (Ans.) 1849 (i).
Cordage at Kingston Penitentiary, Sale of 58 Tons, &c. (Ans.) 6827 (iv).
Dairy Products, Classification for Export, &c. (Ans.) 7810 (iv).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*
Facer Steel Car Co.'s Patent Relief B. 27 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 1339 (i).
Franking Privilege, Extension of Time after Prorogation (remarks) 9395.
Freight Rates on Cattle : *See* 'Holstein.'
Freight Rates : *See* 'Ry. Rates.'
Fruit Growers Ass'on., P.E.I., Govt. Intention (Ans.) 381 (i).
Fruit Inspectors, Number, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 588 (i).
Fruit Marks Act (staple commodities) Amt. B. 155) in Com., 5979 (iv).
Fruit Marks Act, Convictions *re* (Ans.) 3010 (ii).
Gillis, N. J., Emplymt. at St. Louis Exhibition, &c. (Ans.) 3361 (ii).
Glanders, &c., Expenditure *re* by O. C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6700 (iv).
——— Spread of among Horses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6690 (iv).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. (B. 174) 1°*, 7420 (iv); in Com., 9395 (v).
Hog Plague in Essex and Kent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6712 (iv). *See* 'Veterinary.'
Holstein Breeders, Complaint *re* Freight on Rys. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6680 (iv).
Immigration of Skilled Labour, Toronto Labour Council, on M. (Mr. Foster) 7507 (iv).
Inverness, N.S., Postmaster, Personal Duties, &c. (Ans.) 8885 (v).
Japan Exhibition, Trade Increase *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6273 (iv).
——— (statement) 7908 (iv).
Lake Ramsay and New Ross Post Office Mail Service (Ans.) 9696 (v).
Lefebvre, A. P., Postmaster at Markstay, Investigation *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 7096 (iv).
Lesser Slave Lake, Mail Service, &c. (Ans.) 7019 (iv).
Liege Exhibition, Expenditure *re* in Com. of Sup., 1831 (i).
Live Stock Record Associations incorp. (B. 148) 1° m., 5076; in Com., 5922; 3° m., 5927 (iii).
Live Stock Records of Can., Nationalization, &c. (Ans.) 1849 (i), 2185 (ii).
Lump-jaw in Cattle, Prevention of (remarks) on Conc., 6917 (iv).
Maladie du Coit among Horses, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6702 (iv).
Mange among Horses, Stamping out (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6719 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 3973 (ii).
Maps, Sale by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1476 (i).
Mineral Specimens *re* Exhibition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6269 (iv).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*
Montreal Dom. Exhibition, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).
Niagara Fruit Growers' Association, Cor., &c., on Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 9395 (v).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Erection of Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5701 (iii).
Northwest Territories, Cost of Surveys, Number of Miles, &c., on M. (Mr. W. J. Roche) for Ret., 1396 (i).
Patent Acts Relief, Amts. *re* (remarks) 6559 (iv).
'Patent Record,' Supply to Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1828 (i).
Post Office Clerks, Examination for Statutory Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9059 (v).
Post Office Regulations *re* Distribution of Packages (remarks) 6961 (iv).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'
Quarantine Officers, Examination of Ships, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2304 (ii).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5023 (iii).
See 'Holstein,' &c.
Seeds, Sale and Inspection (B. 7) prop. Res., 52; in Com., 54; 1°*, 66; 2° m., and in Com., 322, 1155, 1161, 1788; 3° m., 1868; on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1872; on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 1884 (i); on Sen. Amts., 7583 (iv).
Small-pox Epidemic, N.W. Ter., Prevention, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1842 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts. Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 1830; (aid to societies) 1829; (archives) 1823 (i), 6679; on conc., 6918, (iv); (Can. exhibits, Imperial Institute) 1836 (i); (creameries) 6938, 7014 (iv); (criminal statistics) 1473 (i); (dairying) 6932 (iv); (Dom. exhibition, B.C.) 9608 (v); (exhibitions) 1831 (i), 6269 (iv); (experimental farms) 6165 (iv), 9608 (v); (experimental farms, bulletins, &c.) 6926 (iv); (fumigating stations) 1831 (i); (live stock records) 6680 (iv); ('Patent Record') 1472 (i); (quinquennial Census, N.W.T.) 9608 (v); (statistics) 1828; (Year-book) 1474 (i).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (archivist) 9053; (contingencies) 9058; (patent branch) 9057 (v); (salaries) 91 (i), 9056; (private secretary) 9054; Post Office (salaries) 9058 (v).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 868 (i).
Miscellaneous (International Congress, reception at Quebec) 9622 (v); (tuberculosis grant) 7248 (iv).
Post Office (mail service) 9610; (postal maps, engraving) 9060 (v).
Quarantine (cattle) 2309 (ii), 6690; on conc., 6912 (iv); (Grosse Isle steamer) 1838 (i); (organized districts, salaries) 2302 (ii); (Public Works Health Act) 1845; (Public health, organized districts) 1842; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 1845; (William's Head) 1841; (Winnipeg hospitals) 1846 (i).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*
Thermograph Records, Ret. laid on Table, 7016 (iv).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1374 (i).
Veterinary Inspectors *re* Hog Plague, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1934 (i).
See 'Hog,' &c.
Veterinary Surgeons in Man., Number (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6704 (iv).
Wire Fencing: *See* 'N.W.T.'
Year-book Statistics, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 997 (i).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles (Minister of Justice). *Quebec County.*
Admiralty Court Registrars, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 126 (i).
Alien Labour Act, Appeal *re* Judge Anglin's Decision (Ans.) 8147 (v).
See 'Naturalization.'
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 738 (i).
Autonomy (Alberta) Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5458; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5317; in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5601; (arbitration *re* assets) 5946 (iii); (B. N. A. Acts) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8527; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) dual language, 8583, 8631 (v); (B.N.A. Act, 1867 to 1886) 5672; (B.N.A. Act) 5719 (iii).
——— (C.P.R. lands) 6060 (iv).
——— (Crown Lands) Amt., 8171, 8256-7 (v).
——— (date of Act) 8634 (v).
——— (distribution of seats) 7739 (iv); 8090 (v).
——— (election of members) 5766, 5809 (iii).
——— (executive council) 5781 (iii).
——— (H. of C. representation) Amt. in Com., 5685, 5750 (iii).
——— (Hudson Bay Co. rights) 5947 (iii), 6049 (iv), 8168, 8170 (v).
——— (joint stock companies) in Com. (amt.) 6083 (iv).
——— (lands vested in Crown) 5918, 5946, 5986 (iii).
——— (laws, courts, &c.) 5783 (iii), 6101 (iv); (amt.) 5812, 5927 (iii), 8240, 8244 (v).
——— (Lt. Gov.'s powers) 5781 (iii).
——— (readjustment of representation) in Com. (amt.) 5753 (ii).
——— (school clause) in Com. (remarks) 5817 (iii).
——— (school clause) Explanation *re* Amendments (read) in Com., 5983 (iv).
——— (school clause amt.) 7121 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8394, 8414; on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8504; on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8292 (v).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Chas.—*Con.*
Autonomy (Alberta) Bill 69 (seat of government) 5781 (ii), 8249 (v).
——— (Senate representation) 5674 (iii).
——— (subsidy to provs.) in Com., 6087 (iv).
Autonomy B. 69, in Com., on Schedules (Athabaska) 8163 ; (Edmonton city) 8160 ; (Glechen) 8166 ; (High River) 8155 ; (Lacombe) 8156 ; (Leduc) 8157 ; (Macleod) 8151 ; (Peace River) 8163 ; (Pincher Creek) 8153 ; (Ponoka) 8156 ; (Red Deer) 8155 ; (St. Albert) 8163 ; (Saskatchewan) 8161 ; (Stony Plains) 8157 ; (Strathcona) 8157 ; (Sturgeon) 8162 ; (Wetaskiwin) 8157 (v).
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to sec. 16, schools, 8805 ; on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) schools, 8837 (v).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) in Com., sec. 19 (annual subsidy) Amt. 8760 ; (Crown lands) 8760 (v).
——— (distribution of seats) 8704 (v).
——— (law courts, &c.) Amt., 8758 (v).
——— (representation, H. of C.) Amt., 8703 (v).
——— (schools) Amt., 8759 (v).
——— (Senate representation) Amt. in Com., 8703 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Scott) to M. for 3°, 8877 (v).
Autonomy B. 69, Attack on 'Orangeism' (remarks) in Com., 5878 (iii).
——— Delay in Printing (remarks) 1671 (i).
——— Explanation *re* School Clauses (remarks) 5674 (iii).
——— Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2568 (ii).
——— Pets. circulated by Jacques Cartier Club to 'Catholic Quebec,' 2570 (ii).
——— Printing and Distribution (remarks) 1755 (i).
——— School Clause, Amts. Explanation, &c. (remarks) 5818 (iii).
——— Schools Clause 16 (statement) *re* Drafting, 4828.
——— Statement *re* School Attendance (remarks) 8095 (v).
See 'Mackenzie District B. 157,' 'Manitoba,' 'N.W.T., B. 156.'
Ballot Box Frauds in Dom. Elections, on M. (Mr. Porter) to Com. of Sup, 9214 (v).
Binder Twine Industry at Kingston Penitentiary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 482 (i).
Bissonette vs. Crown, Illegal Stamping of Letters in Montreal P.O. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 198 (i).
Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Denial *re* Telegrams, 546 (i).
B.C. Judgeship, Appnmt. of W. W. B. McInnes (Ans.) 382 (i).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Chas.—*Con.*
B.C. Legislation, Disallowance of (Ans.) 189 (i).
Cabinet, ex-Ministers, Annuity B. 203 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res. (Amt.) 9738 (v).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4240 (iii).
See 'G.T.R.', 'I.C.R.', &c.
Canada Evidence Act (B. withdrawn) 9075 (v).
Canadians' Mining Rights in S. Africa (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9532 (v).
C.P.R. Tax Exemption, Interpretation, &c. (Ans.) 730 (i).
Castonguay, Dismissal by Govt. (Ans.) 5689 (iii).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1099 (i).
Companies Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 8528 (v).
Controverted Election (Dom.) Act Amt. (B. 159) 1° m., 6103 (iv).
Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4262 (iii).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. (B. 196) 1°, m., 9075; in Com., 9411; 3° m., 9524 (v).
Davie, Geo. T., Wrecking Plant *re* Ship Channel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2479 (ii).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) on Sen. Amts., 7625 (iv).
Dom. Police Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 54 (i).
Edmonton Election, Printed Lists of Voters, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5862 (iii).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) on M. for 1°, 987 ; in Com., 1401 (i), 2106, 3208 (ii).
Express Cos.: *See* 'Ry. B. 4.'
Extradition Cases before Commissioner at Montreal, &c. (Ans.) 3937 (ii).
Franchise Act (1898) Amt. (B. 52) 1° m., 818 (i); 2° m., and in Com., 2112 (ii), 9198 (v).
Gaynor-Greene Extradition Case, Charges against Mr. Lafontaine (Ans.) 3938 (ii).
Govt. Contracts Work (B. 51) 1° m., 818; 2° m., and in Com., 1672 (i).
G. T. Ry. Arbitration (B. 199) 1° m., 9279; in Com., 9529 (v).
See 'I.C.R.', &c.
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4208 (iii).
——— Statement *re* C.A.R. Amalgamation, &c., 4222 (iii).
G. T. Ry., Appeal to Judicial Committee, &c. (Ans.) 9081 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7621, 7626, 7677 (iv).
Great Northern Ry. of Canada B. 71 (Mr. J. T. Schell) in Com., 4259 (iii).
Half-Breed Scrip Investigation, Progress *re* (remarks) 9725 (v).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Chas.—*Con.*
Hamelin and Gosselin, Imprisonment, &c. (Ans.) 1849 (i).
Highway Crossings : *See* 'Ry. B. 2.'
Inspector of Insurance and Director General of Public Health (B. 200) 1° m., 2° m., and in Com., 9688 (v).
I.C.R. and C.A.Ry. Act (running rights) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 4195 (iii); in Com., 6143, 7584 (iv):
I.C.R. and G.T.R. Arbitration, Information *re* (remarks) 68, 165 (i).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act (salaries) Amt. (B. 204) M. for Com. on Res., 9702; in Com on Res., 9740 ; 1°*, 9760; in Com., 9702; (amt.) 9798 (v).
Judicial Vacancies, Length of, &c. (remarks) 7424 (iv).
——— Promotions and Appointments (statement read) 8002 (v).
Justice, (Penitentiaries) Rep. (presented) 271 (i).
Keewatin District (B. 158) 1° m., 6103 (iv).
Kentville Rifle Range, Purchase of Site, Statement (read) 9706 (v).
——— Investigation, Rep. of Evidence (remarks) 8698 (v).
——— (remarks) 7584 (iv).
Killam, Judge : *See* 'Ry. Commn. B. 36'.
Kingston Penitentiary Supplies, Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 477 (i).
Land Titles Act (1894) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 9083 (v).
Lewis, Edward Norman, Relief (B. 142) 1°*, 4550; 2° m., (amt.) 5136 (iii).
Mackenzie District (B. 157) 1° m., 6103 (iv).
——— (M.) to withdraw, 8176 (v).
Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation (denial) *re* Drafting, &c., 4013 (ii).
——— on M. to adjn., 4044 (ii).
Martineau Defalcations and Evidence *re* Bank Suit (remarks) 112 (i).
Montreal Sheds, Harbour Commissioners, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 761 (i).
Naturalization and Aliens Act Amt. (B. 184) in Com., 8685, 8689 (v).
Newspaper Reports *re* Interviewing Prisoners (remarks) 3251 (ii).
Nixon, Robert, Investigation *re* (remarks) 9788 (v).
Northwest Irrigation Act Amt. B. 161 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°*, 6104 (iv).
Northwest Territories (B. 160) 1° m., 6104 (iv); 2° m., 8763; in Com., 8765 (v); 3° m., 9408 (v).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5694 (iii).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Chas.—*Con.*
Northwest Territories Representation Act Amt. (B. 156) 1° m., 6046 (iv) ; in Com., 8769; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Agents, 8771 (v).
Northwest Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) on Sen. Amts., 7683 (iv).
Opposition Leader, Indemnity : *See* 'Senate and House of Commons,'
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 2547, 3181, 3187 (ii).
Owen, Thomas David Patent Relief B. 177 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8652 (v).
Parole System for Convicts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 467 (i).
Pilotage Act (Quebec) Amt. B. 171 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7443 (iv).
Plains of Abraham, Purchase by Govt., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
Political Crisis in Quebec, &c. (remarks) 754 (i).
Protection to Women and Children, Amt. to Criminal Code *re* Wife Beaters (Ans.) 592 (i).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Works Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Hyman) on M. for 1°, 819 (i).
Quebec Political Crisis (remarks) 823 (i).
Ry. Act (1903) Amt. B. 36 : *See* 'Railway Commissioners.'
Railways and Canals Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1674 (i).
Ry. Act (express companies) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for Adjnmt., 3246 (ii).
Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 309; (M.) to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c., 312 ; agreed to (Y. 85 ; N. 45) 314 ; on Com., 1780 (i), 3223 (ii).
Railway Act (1903) Amt. (B.) wthdrn., 6103 (iv).
Railway Commissioners (chairman) Appnmt. (B. 36) Res. prop., 319; M. for Com. on Res., 493 ; in Com. on Res., 563 ; 1° m., 582 ; 2° m., 745 ; in Com., 1596, 1599 ; 3° m., 1802 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1627 (i).
Ry. Debts Bill : *See* 'Exchequer.'
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7337 (iv).
Roads and Road Allowances, Alberta and Saskatchewan B. 195 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 9528 (v).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Wrecking Plants, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2477 (ii).
Saskatchewan, Prov. of : *See* 'Autonomy B. 70.'
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 2120 (ii), 7436 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Chas.—*Con.*

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 369, 1790 (i).

Senate and House of Commons Indemnity (B. 202) M. for Com. on Res., 9701 ; in Com. on Res., 9726, 9733 ; in Com., 9791 (v).

South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9341 (v).

Statutes, Revision of (remarks) 745 (i).

Sunday Observance, Govt. Legislation *re* (Ans.) 8656 (v).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 87 ; Justice (salaries) 72 ; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 103 (i).

Dominion Police (salaries) 138 (i).

Immigration (medical inspection) 9238 (v).

Justice, Administration of (B. C. Judges) 9683 (v) ; (Exchequer Court, salaries) 125; Man., &c. (Judges' travelling allowances) 123 ; N.W.T. (court room, Prince Albert) 124 (i) ; (N. W. Judges) 9683 (v) ; (maintenance of prisoners) 122 ; (miscellaneous) 102 ; (stenographers, Sup. Court) 125 (i).

Justice—N.S. (Judges' salaries) 124 (i).

Justice—Supreme Court (salaries) 125 (i) ; (Three Rivers Judges) 9682 (v).

Justice—Yukon (court fees) 137 ; (Judges' travelling allowances) 126 ; (law books, &c.) 136 ; (maintenance of prisoners) 135 ; (witnesses, &c., fees) 135 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 937 ; (Quebec and Natashquan) 967 ; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 949 ; (wrecking plant) 958 (i).

Miscellaneous (consolidation of statutes) 7244 (iv), 8672; (Dominion and Provincial legislation) 9685 (v); (litigation matters) 7247 (iv); (Sabbath Day legislation) 9684; (W. A. Duncan's account) 9864 (v).

Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 480 ; (Edmonton Jail) 481 (i), 9684 (v) ; Penitentiaries (general) 465 ; (contracts *re* supplies) 479 ; (Kingston) 477 ; (parole system) 465 ; (Prince Albert Jail) 481; (Regina Jail) 481; (St. Vincent de Paul) 480 ; (Stoney Mountain, Man.) 481 (i) ; (Stoney Mountain school) 9684 (v).

Post Office (detective service) 209; Yukon (salaries) 214 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle) 1111; (Montreal Inland Rev.) 1125 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Château Richer) 7290; (Montmorency wharf) 7312 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Que. (Bryson) 7586 (iv).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act (salaries) Amt. (B. 205) M. for Com. on Res., 9705; in Com. on Res. and 1°* of B., 9760 (v).

Supreme Court, N.S., Vacancy, Appnmt. *re* (remarks) 5210 (iii).

Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 4684 (iii).

Trading Stamps, Legislation *re*, &c. (Ans.) 7020 (iv).

See 'Criminal Code.'

Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 719, 1774 (i).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Chas.—*Con.*

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8637 (v).

Wire Fencing : *See* 'N.W.T.,' 'Boundary.'

Wrecking Plant 'Lord Strathcona' in Com. of Sup., 958 (i).

See 'St. Lawrence.'

Yukon Elections, Delay in opening Ballot Boxes (remarks) 988 (i).

Yukon Judges, Salaries and Allowances (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).

Yukon Member-elect, Delay in Gazetting (remarks) 453 (i).

Forget, Mr. R., *Charlevoix.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5206 (iii).

Salmon, Capt., Resignation, &c., on M. (Mr. Ames) for Cor., 397 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E., *North Toronto.*

Address, on The, 21 (i).

Admiralty Court Registrars, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 126 (i).

Adulteration of Food, Prosecutions under Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1699, 1712 (i).

Agents, I.C.R., Policy *re* Dwelling Houses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).

'Agnes G. Donohue,' Schr., Seizure of (remarks) 1508 (i).

Alberta Province : *See* 'Autonomy.'

Allan Strs., List of Sailings, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 885 (i).

Animals slaughtered under Contagious Act, Compensation *re* (remarks) on conc., 6911 (iv).

Anthracite Coal Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 136 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 5976 (iv).

Archives Building, Ottawa, in Com. of Sup., 603 (i).

Armouries, Construction of, Generally; in Com. of Sup., 1649 (i).

——— Govt. Policy *re* Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1547 (i).

Ashcroft and Cariboo Mail Service. Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3670 (ii).

Ashcroft Water and Light Co., Conditions of Lease *re* Land (Ques.) 2491 (ii).

Audit Act, Progress *re* (Ques.) 2190 (ii).

Auditor General and Audit Act (notice of motion) 9541 (v).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 9631 (v).

Auditor General's Rep., Inquiry for, 51, 97 (i).

Autonomy, Provincial, for N. W. Ters. B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5487 (iii); on M. for 1°, 1435 (i); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3363 (ii).

——— in Com. (B.N.A. Act) 5732 (iii).

——— (compensation *re* lands) in Com., 5817 (iii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Autonomy, Provincial, for N. W. Ters. B. 69
——— (distribution of seats) 7725 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8022; on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7817, 7823, 7923 (iv).
——— (lands vested in Crown) 6016 (iv).
——— (laws, courts, &c.) 5929, 5943 (iii).
——— (school clause amt.) 7122, 7137 (iv).
——— (subsidy to provs.) in Com., 6087, 6098 (iv).
Autonomy Bill, Amendments *re* (remarks) 2840 (ii).
——— Approval by Cabinet, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2270 (ii).
——— Changes *re*, &c. (remarks) 2046 (ii)
——— Delay in Printing (remarks) 1671 (i).
——— Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2557 (ii).
——— Information asked for in Rets., Inquiry for, 3091 (ii).
——— Pets. circulated in Quebec, on Ques. of Order, 2570 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order, *re* Mis-statement of Speech by Mr. Belcourt, 3517-20 (ii).
——— on Resignation of Hon. C. Sifton (remarks) 1864 (i).
——— Schedules *re* Saskatchewan (remarks) 5476 (iii).
——— School Clause, Explanation *re* Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5818 (iii).
——— Second Reading *re* (remarks) 2022 (ii).
——— (remarks) 262 (i).
See 'Manitoba.'
Badgley Island Timber Cutting, License granted (Ques.) 452 (i).
Binder Twine Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7221 (iv).
——— Industry, Kingston Penitentiary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 482 (i).
Blair, Mr., Resignation from Ry. Commission (remarks) on M. for Com. on B. 6, 524 (i).
——— Re-Hearing of N. W. Cases, &c. (remarks) 56 (i).
——— Inquiry for Tel., 697 (i).
Breakwaters, Wharfs, &c., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v).
Budget, on The, Reply to Financial Statement, 8915 (v).
——— Inquiry *re*, 2006, 2441, 2762 (ii), 7100 (iv).
Burford Armoury Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1649 (i).
Business of the House, Notices of Motions, &c. (remarks) 9523 (v).
See 'Govt. Legislation,' 'Morning,' &c.
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers, on Orders of the Day, 3566 (ii).
——— Interior Dept., Information *re* (remarks) 3450 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
'Canada'-'Cape Breton,' Collision, Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2631 (ii).
Canada and Mexico SS. Communication (remarks) 66 (i).
Canadian Cattle, British Embargo (remarks) 456 (i).
Canal Inspectors, Qualifications, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1509 (i).
Carpets purchased by Govt., Value, &c. (remarks) 8266 (v).
Catholic Mutual Benefit Association of Canada, B. 93 (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com., 2769 (ii).
Cement, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9765 (v).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 625 (i).
Centre Toronto Electoral District, Vacancy (notification) 2777 (ii).
Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 49 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 2765 (ii).
Charges by P.M.G. *re* Resignation in 1896 (remarks) 841 (i).
Citizens' Bank of Canada B. 133 (Mr. Barr) in Com., 5973 (iv).
Cold Storage : *See* 'Statements.'
Collingwood Govt. Dock, Conroy Bros. Cheque (remarks) 6579 (iv).
Commercial Agencies in G.B., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7208 (iv).
Committees, Sel. Standing, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Names, 110 (1).
Criminal Code (appeals) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) on M. for 3° (M.) to ref. back to Com. *re* Amt., 9699 (v).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9425 (v).
Customs Collections on Sunday (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 413 (i).
Customs Officers' Uniforms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 413 (i).
Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 190 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9761 (v).
Dismissals from Public Offices (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 140 (i).
Dominion Annuity Co.'s incorp. B. 82 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 2767 (ii); on M. for 3°, 2768 (ii).
Dom. Lands, Officials' Salaries, on Statement (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 9289 (v).
——— Open to Applicants, Ref. to by Prime Min. (remarks) 1935 (i).
——— Sale, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 2006 (ii).
Doukhobors Homestead Entries *re* Village Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iv).
Dredge used in Govt. Works, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 795 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Drummond County Ry., Expenditure on Capital Account, &c., (M. for ret.*) 2334 (ii).
—— (remarks) 1940 (i).
Easter, Adjournment (remarks) 4458 (iii).
Estimates, Delay in bringing down and effcient criticism (amt.) to Sup., 9085 (v).
—— (remarks) 9051 (v).
Estimates, of the Interior, Obstruction, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9276 (v).
Exports and Imports Returns, Issue of Monthly Rep. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7214 (iv).
Facer Steel Co.'s Patent Relief B. 27 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 1339 (i).
Fisheries Industry, Commission *re* Investigation, Recommendation, &c., on M. (Mr. Ganong) 6312, 6337 (iv).
Fredericton Post Office, Equipment, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 172 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys.: *See* 'Holstein.'
Gamebridge, Masonry Inspector, Dismissal, Imperfect Ret. (remarks) 5600 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Papers, 8004 (v).
See 'Ritchie.'
Gillies Brothers, Limited, B. 95 (Mr. A. A. Wright) in Com., 2764 (ii).
Glanders among Horses, Expenditure *re* by O. C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6700 (iv).
Gold Medal Furniture Co's Patent Relief B. 102 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3399 (ii).
Govt. Legislation, Inquiry for, on M. to take in Wednesdays, 820 (i).
Govt. Railways, Rails taken up and renewed, Tons, Disposition of, &c. (M. for ret.) 2066 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, Coal Supply (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2614 (ii).
—— Purchase of Supplies, in Com. of Sup., 2617 (ii).
G.T. Ry. Arbitration B. 199 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 1°, 9280 (v).
See 'I.C.R.'
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4205, 4214 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7678 (iv)
G. T. P. Ry. Commission, Appnmts. of Staff, Number, Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 916 (i).
—— (Ques.) 688 (i).
—— Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2182 (ii).
—— Interim Rep. (remarks) 6310 (iv).
—— Surveys, Information *re*, Mr. Hay's Address, &c. (remarks) 2007 (ii).
—— Surveys, Quebec and Moncton Route, Information *re* (remarks) 228 (i).
—— Surveys, Rep. in Ry. Dept. &c. (remarks) 2018 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
G.T.P. Ry., Terminals, Plans deposited with Govt. on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 2823, 2829 (ii).
—— Winnipeg Terminals, Contracts, &c. (remarks) 9541 (v).
—— Winnipeg Terminals, Cor. *re* (remarks) 6311 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip, Issue to U.S. Citizens (remarks) 6311 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip to non-residents (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6489, 6560 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip, Charges *re*, &c., on M. for Sup., Cor. &c. (read) 7647 (iv).
—— Charges *re* Mr. Chaffee's Claim (personal explanation) 7916 (iv).
—— Mr. Chaffey's Letter (read) 8183 (v).
—— Investigation, Appnmt. of Counsel (remarks) 8528, 8697 (v).
—— Instructions to Judge Myers, *re* Investigation, Inquiry for, 7723 (iv), 8179 (v).
—— O. C. *re* Judge Myers (remarks) 8003 (iv).
—— Patents issued, &c. (remarks) 8003 (v).
—— Inquiry for papers, 7099, 7422 (iv).
—— Patents *re* (remarks) 6907 (iv).
—— Issue of Patent, Inquiry for (remarks) 7020 (iv).
—— Investigation, Progress *re* (remarks) 9725 (v).
—— Complete Ret. (remarks) 9179 (v).
—— Further Papers, Inquiry for, 9029 (v).
—— Information *re* (remarks) 8777 (v).
See 'Nixon.'
Halifax and Esquimalt Defences, Cor. O.Cs., &c., with Dom. Govt. (M. for copies*) 2334 (ii).
Halifax Equipment, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6511 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers in Mar. Provs., Criticism *re* Votes for, 9101 (v).
Harbours and Rivers—N.S., Charges against Govt. Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v).
Hay transported over I.C.R., Cor. between Govt. &c. (M. for copies) 164, 280 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 919 (i), 2005, 2595, 3450 (ii).
Hillsborough Bridge, Murray Harbour Branch Ry., in Com., of Sup., 2147 (ii).
See 'Murray'.
Holstein Breeders, Complaint *re* Freight Rates on Rys. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6680 (iv).
Homestead inspectors and Govt. Officials, acting as Political Organizers, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 9255 (v).
Homestead Inspectors, Policy *re* Politicians (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6407 (iv).
See 'Nixon,' 'Leach.'
House of Commons, Furniture, Purchase of, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6614 (iv).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
House of Commons, Official Duties of Staff, Statement *re* (remarks) 9077 (v).
——— Purchases, Audit of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6617 (iv).
See 'Library,' 'Ventilation.'
Icebreaker 'Montcalm', Accident to, &c. (remarks) 4752 (iii).
Immigration in B.C., Authority for Inspection, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9332 (v).
Immigration of Skilled Labour, Statement from Toronto Labour Council, on M. for Sup., 7504 (iv).
——— Notice of Motion, 7424 (iv).
See 'North Atlantic.'
Imperial Guarantee and Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2771 (ii).
Imports and Exports, Total Amount for Home Consumption, 1904 (Ques.) 380 (i).
Indian Dept., Promotions *re* Senority of Service (remarks) in Conc., 6909 (iv).
——— on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6921 (iv).
I.C.R. and G.T.R. Arbitration, &c. (remarks) 68 (i).
——— Information *re* (remarks) 165 (i).
See 'G.T. Ry., B. 199.'
I.C.R., Chapman, F. B., Emplymnt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1342 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1954 (i).
——— Fuel Inspector, Duties, &c. (Ques.) 451 (i).
——— Hay : *See* 'Hay.'
——— Parlour Cars, &c., Net Profits (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).
——— Passes issued, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2258 (ii).
——— Private Cars, Number, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2258 (ii).
——— Railway Rates, Increases, &c. (remarks) on Explanation (Mr. Emmerson) 6118 (iv).
——— Receipts and Expenditures, Total Amount (Ques.) 688 (i).
——— Rolling Stock, Equipment, Additions from 1900 to 1904 (M. for ret.*) 736 (i).
——— Supplies, Purchase of Oil, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2246 (ii).
——— Traffic Arrangements with Foreign and Can. Rys., Amounts received (Ques.) 4703 (iii).
Interior, Minister of (remarks) 1152 (i)
Internal Economy Board, Rep. of Proceedings (remarks) 9077 (v).
International Bridge and Terminal Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 87 (Mr. Grant) on Sen. Amts., 9695 (v).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
International Postal Supply Co., Renting of Stamping Machines (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7219 (iv).
Japanese Trade with Canada, Discrimination *re* Canadian Goods (remarks) 6656 (iv).
——— on Statement (Mr. Fisher) 7908 (iv).
——— (remarks) 7816 (iv).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9743 (v).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6662 (iv).
——— (remarks) 9709, 9711 (v).
Killam, Hon. Mr. Justice, Appnmt. as Chairman of Ry. Commissioners Board (remarks) on B. 36, 524 (i).
'Kingsford' Dredge, Cost of Operation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 801 (i).
Leach, R. E. A., Dom. Lands Agents (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9251 (v).
Letter Carriers, Sick Leave, Payment, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 176 (i).
Library Accommodation, Extension of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).
London Militiamen at London Election (remarks) 7358 (iv).
Losses sustained for Damaged Goods, *re* 'Minto' Str. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2623 (ii).
McAlpine, Mr. E. H., Expenditure *re* Litigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1522 (i).
McMichael, Mr., Customs Inspector, Duties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 406 (i).
Mail Bags, Locks, Repairs, &c., Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 205 (i).
Mails carried free by Rys. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 185 (i).
Mail Carriers, System of Payments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions, Information *re* System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 923 (i).
Mail Subsidies *re* Newfoundland Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).
Man. Boundaries, M'gr Sbarretti's Explanation on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 3951 (ii).
——— Letter to Cardinal Rampolla (read) 3956 (ii).
——— Letter of Mr. Russell to Cardinal Rampolla (read) 3957 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 'naming Member,' 3859 (ii).
See 'Autonomy.'
Manitoba Elections, Duties of Ret. Officers (remarks) 1633 (i).
Manitoba Election Returns (remarks) 1672 (i).
Martineau, Defalcations, Evidence *re* Bank Suit (remarks) 112 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Meeting after Six o'clock Recess (remarks) 450 (i).
Melfort Mail Service, Charges *re* Delays (remarks) 9790 (v).
Messengers, House of Commons, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 243 (i).
Meteorological Building, Toronto, Erection of (Ques.) 1149 (i).
Meteorological Observatory, Removal to Ottawa (remarks) *re* Cor. with Mr. E. F. Clarke, 9772 (v).
Metric System, *re* Weights and Measures (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1695 (i).
Military Council, Constitution, Duties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 419 (i).
Military Equipment for Defences, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 446 (i).
Military Heads, Appnmt. to Militia Council (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 432 (i).
Militia Act (permanent force) Amt. B. 170, on prop. Res. (Sir Frederick Borden) 6905 ; on M. for 2°, 7263 (iv), 9179 (v).
Militia Armouries, &c., Supervision of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 423 (i).
Militia Canadian Garrisons, Mr. Broderick's Proposition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9109 (v).
Militia Force, Reduction of, on Explanation (Sir Frederick Borden) to M. for Sup., 6999 (iv).
Ministers of Finance and Interior, Absence, &c. (remarks) 321 (i).
Mint, Royal Canadian, Estimated Cost, Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 2185, 2326 (ii).
'Montcalm,' Accident to, &c. (remarks) 4752 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, B. 192 (Mr. Préfontaine) on M. for 1°, 9029 (v).
Moosejaw and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 20 (Mr. Scott) in Com., 2762 (ii).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9082 (v).
See 'Business.'
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2134 (ii).
Murray Harbour Branch Ry., Construction, Tenders, Plans, Specifications, &c. (M. for copies *) 2334 (ii).
Nicolas, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) on conc., 9685 (v).
Nixon, Mr., Appnmt. as Dom. Lands Agent, Macleod, N.W.T. (remarks) 5718, 6111 (iv), 9076 (v).
——— Charges *re* (M.) to adjn., 8098 (v).
——— Investigation *re* (remarks) 8697 (v).
——— 2nd Investigation *re* Charges, Letter from Mr. Beere (read) 9787 (v).
Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Nixon, Mr. (M.) to cancel Vote for Salary, in Com. of Sup., 9316, 9329 (v).
——— Reduction of Salary (Amt.) on conc., 9769, Neg. (Y. 30; N. 66) 9770 (v).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 6048 (iv).
See 'Half-breed.'
North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses *re* Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9321 (v).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9442 (v).
N.W. Cases, Re-hearing before Ry. Commission (remarks) 56 (i).
Northwest Irrigation Act Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 6104 (iv).
N.W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 8 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 460 (i).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 1891 (i), 2051 (ii).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5587 (iii).
——— on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5704 (iii).
N.W.T. Govt. Lands, Sale of in 1903-4, Rates, &c. (M. for O.C.*) 164 (i).
N.W.T. Govt. Officials, Interference in Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9718 (v).
N.W. Ters. Land Sales, Inquiry for Ret., 1154 (i).
Oats, Rolled, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9763 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2763 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 9819 (v).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5965 (iv).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) on M. for 1°, 317; on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1889 (i); in Com., 3186 (ii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7280 (iv).
Parliament Buildings, Addition to H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5801 (iii).
Parole System for Convicts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 465 (i).
Personal Explanation : *See* 'Resignation.'
Pets. *re* Autonomy Bills, Ques. of Order, 2320 (ii).
Petroleum Bounties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).
Pilotage Act (Quebec) Amt. B. 171 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7440 (iv).
Plains of Abraham, Purchase by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
Pneumatic Tube System, Cost, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 217 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Conmee & Bowman's Tender, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4469 (iii).
——— Circular Letter of Acting Minister of Public Works (remarks) *re* Cor., 4667 (iii).
Postage on Newspapers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 179 (i).
Postage Stamps and Bank Notes, Contracts *re*, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 204 (i).
Postal Rates Increases, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 221 (i).
Post Office Clerks, Examination for Statutory Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9058 (v).
P.E.I. Communication with Mainland (remarks) 833 (i).
——— Investigation *re* Tunnelling, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 2811 (ii).
Prohibitionist Principles, on Charges by P.M.G. (explanation) 842 (i).
Provident Savings Association B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5974 (iv).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Accounts Rep., Inquiry for, 97 (i).
Public Buildings, Comparison with U.S. System of Rentals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1024 (i).
Public Buildings in Towns, &c., Amounts first voted, population, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1398 (i).
Public Building Sites, &c., Non-partisan Selections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 429 (i).
Public Works Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Hyman) on M. for 1°, 819 (i).
Public Works Portfolio (remarks) 6047 (iv).
Public Works, Rep. of Minister, Delay, &c. (remarks) 601 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Tronsfer to Marine Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 772 (i).
Quebec Political Crisis (remarks) 823, 826 (i).
Railways and Canals Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1675 (i).
Railway Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 494, 524; in Com. on Res., 572; in Com., 1616., (i).
Railway Commission, Board of Maintenance, 1534 (i).
——— Number and Names of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 684 (i).
——— Staff Salaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1539 (i).
——— Rep. of Mr. Blair, Inquiry for, 1539 (i).
Resignation in 1896, Charges of P.M.G. (personal explanation) 841 (i).
Returns, Inquiry for, Delay, &c. (remarks) 4751 (iii).
——— Inquiry for, *re* Public Works, 9688 (v).
——— Inquiry for, 1594 (i), 2262 (ii), 5600 (iii).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7337 (iv).
Richelieu Bridge at Sorel, O.C. and Rep. &c., Inquiry for, 8098 (v).
Ritchie, James, Inspector of Masons *re* Trent Valley Canal, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 2777 (ii).
See 'Gamebridge.'
Riviere Ouelle Spur Line (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1981 (i).
Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 169 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6969; in Com., 7262 (iv).
Royal Trust Co., Ref. to in Com. on B. 99, 3651 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery, Cost of Establishment. &c., on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Ret., 2079, 2092 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery System, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 220 (i).
St. John, Halifax and W. Indies Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7187 (iv).
St. John Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 776 (i).
St. John Quarantine Station, Acetylene Gas Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1052 (i).
Saskatchewan, Creation of Province : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Issue of Patents, &c., (Ques.) 8267, 8655 (v).
Schukin, Ivan, Cancellation of Homestead Entry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iv).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 2115 (ii).
Seamen's Act Amt. (shipping masters) Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7428 (iv), 9030 (v).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 52; in Com., 355, 1203 (i).
Separate School Pamphlet, Official Distribution, Preparation, &c. (Ques.) 2328 (ii).
——— (remarks) 2006 (ii).
Sifton, Hon. C., Resignation (remarks) 1853 (i).
Smart, Jas. A., Emplymnt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iv).
——— Resignation, &c. (remarks) 115 (i).
S. Africa and Canada SS. Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co., on Sen. Amts., 9815 (v).
Speaker, Election of (remarks) 3 (i).
Statements of Mr. E. D. Smith *re* Cold Storage (remarks) 875 (i).
SUPPLY :
Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1699, 1712 (i).
Agriculture, &c. (creameries) 6938 (iv) ; (criminal statistics) 1473; (i) ; (dairying) 6936; (live stock records) 6680 (iv); (Patent Record) 1472 (i).
Canals—Cornwall (repairs at locks) 1494 ; Grenville (guide piers) 1500 ; Miscellaneous (inspections, &c.) 1509; (staff and

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Canals—*Con.*
repairs) 1546; Murray (repairs) 1495; Trent (improvements) 1499; (surveys) 1489; Welland (stone protection) 1496 (i).
Charges of Management, 69 (i); (Receiver General's Office) 9053 (v).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture Dept. (archivist) 9053; (private secretary) 9054 (v); (salaries) 92; Auditor Gen.'s Office (salaries) 77, 90; Customs (contingencies) 258, 405; (inspectors salaries) 405 (i); (salaries) 78 (i), 9069 (v); Finance (salaries) 78, 118 (i), 9061 (v); Geological Survey (salaries) 122 (i), 9249; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (clerical assistance) 9053 (v); (salaries) 70 (i); High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 120; Indian Affairs (contingencies) 116; Interior (salaries) 114 (i); Conc. (salaries) 6909 (iv); (salary increases) 9070 (v); Inland Revenue (salaries) 89 (i), 9069 (v); Justice (salaries) 72; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 2443 (ii), 9051; Militia (contingencies) 9068 (v); (salaries) 112 (i), 9067 (v); Post Office Dept. (salaries) 95 (i), 9058 (v); Privy Council (salaries) 71 (i); Public Works (salaries) 95 (i); Railways and Canals (law clerk) 9066; (private sec.) 9063 (v); (salaries) 93; Sec. of State (salaries) 74; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 96 (i).
Dom. Lands (Banff, pamphlets *re*) 6424; (contingencies) 6406 (iv), 9289 (v); (homestead inspectors) 6407 (iv); (land agents) 9251; (maps, printing, &c.) 6424 (iv); (outside salaries) 9251, 9289 (v); (roads and bridges) 6423; (surveys, &c.) 6406 (iv).
Dominion Police (salaries) 138 (i).
Excise (additional remuneration) 1688; (allowance to customs collectors) 1689 (inspections, &c.) 1693; (inspectors' salaries) 1679; (L. A. Frechette, translation) 1690; (methylated spirits) 1691; (preventive service) 1688; (travelling expenses) 1689 (i).
Geological Survey (surveys, &c.) conc., 9685 (v).
House of Commons (additional messenger) 6613; (committee expenses) 6594; (leather trunks) 6606; (library books) 6945 (iv); (messengers) 243 (i); (pages) 6613 (iv); (salaries) 238 (i); (sergeant-at-arms, salaries) 6611; (sessional clerks) 6595; (sessional messengers) 6612; (stationery) 6594 (iv).
Immigration (agents in Can. and G. B.) 9226, 9308; Amt. on conc., 9769; (detention hospital, B.C.) 9227; (medical inspection, B.C.) 9331; (salaries) 9313 (v).
Indians—B.C. (industrial schools) 9339; (Pemberton Band) 9340 (v).
Indians—Generally (land management fund) 237; (legal expenses) 237 (i).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (implements) 9336 (v).
Indians—Mar. Provs. (schools) 225 (i).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (legal expenses) 9336 (v); (medical attendance) 223; (surveys) 236 (i); (Treaty No. 9) 9336 (v).
Inspection of Staples (grain inspection) 7227 (iv).
Justice—Man., &c. (Judges' salaries) 123; N.W.T. (maintenance of prisoners) 122; Supreme Court (salaries) 125; (Three Rivers Judgeship) 9683 (v); Yukon (living allowances) 130; (maintenance of prisoners) 135 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7535 (iv).
Legislation — Debates (expenditure) 6592 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Annapolis and G.B.) 967; (Can. and Mexico) 895 (i), 9680 (v); (Canada and Mexico), on conc., 6909 (iv); Canada and S. Africa) 973; (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 934; (Grand Manan and Mainland) 922; (Halifax and Canso) 937; (Halifax and Nfld.) 906; (Halifax, Nfld. and Liverpool) 902; (Magdalen Islands) 906; (Manchester Line) 923; (Murray Bay and River Ouelle) 938; (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 945; (Petit de Grat) 966; (Pictou and Cheticamp) 935; (Pictou and Montague Bridge) 926; (Port Mulgrave and Canso) 936; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 927; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 919; (P.E.I. and Nfld.) 940; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 937; (Quebec and Gaspé) 927; (Quebec and Natashquan) 967; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 948; (St. John and Halifax) 923; (St. John and Minas Basin) 971; (St. John and W. Indies) 7177 (iv); (St. John and Westport) 966; (Victoria and San Francisco) 906; (Victoria and Vancouver) 939; (wrecking plant) 957 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 441 (i), 6512 (iv); (arsenals) 446 (i); (depots) 9113 (v); (Dom. arsenal) 6513 (iv); (Militia Council) 9109; (ordnance) conc., 9686 (v); (pay and allowance) 413 (i), 6511; (Royal Military college) 7003 (iv); (surveys) 440 (i); (transports, &c.) 6513 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Academy of Arts) 6959 (iv); (Champlain's monument) 9340; (Dom. and Provincial legislation) 9684 (v); (Naturalization Act) 6957 (iv.); (noon gun, &c.) 121 (i); (Pacific cable grant) 7277; (Paris agency) 6958; (secret service) 6958 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 2614; (schools of navigation) 2639 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 481; (Edmonton Jail) 481; (general) 465; (parole system) 465 (i).
Pensions (Fenian raid) conc., 6961; (militiamen, 1885) 6957 (iv).
Post Office (detective service) 209; (inspectors' salaries) 144; (letter carriers) 174; (mail service) 177; (mail service) Amt. *re* Thessalon Postmaster on conc., 9772; (postal maps, engraving) 9060 (v); (provisional allowances) 166; (ry. mail clerks) 139; (salaries) 166; Yukon (mail service) 203; (salaries) 214 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—General (armouries) 1649; (clerk of works) 1642 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 1633 (i); (Winnipeg immigration building) 9550 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Campbellton) 1048 (i); (generally) 7284 (iv); (St. John detention building) 1050; (St. John quarantine) 1052; (Woodstock armoury) 1057 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Edmonton) 9550 (v); (Moosejaw) 1638; (Prince Albert) 1638; (Red Deer court house) 1639; (Regina P.O.) 1639 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 846, 1020; (Canso) 1023; (Glace Bay) 1034; (Halifax Dom. building) 1036; (Halifax

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—*Con.*
Immigration building) 1036 ; (Inverness) 1041 ; (Shelburne) 1043 ; (Sydney Mines) 1045 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 1547 ; (Bowmanville) 1549 ; (Brantford drill hall) 1550 ; (Bridgeburg) 1550 ; (Cobourg armoury) 1555 ; (Guelph armoury) 1555 ; (Hawkesbury) 1560 ; (London military stores) 1562 ; (Military College) 1561 ; (North Bay) 1564 ; (Oshawa) 1564 ; (St. Mary's) 1579 ; (Sandwich) 1579; (Simcoe) 1581 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additions, &c.) 9542 (v); (archives) 603; (coal sheds) 1565; (elevator attendants) 1667; (lighting) 1667; (museum) 755, 765; (Post Office reconstruction) 1574; (Royal Mint) 608-620 ; (telephones) 1669 ; (Wellington St. paving) 1572; (western block, addition) 766 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Souris) 1047 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (maintenance) 1666 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Annapolis) 9576 ; (Baddeck wharf) 9585 ; (Battery Point) 9552; (Boisdale wharf) 9585; (Bourgeois inlet) 9581; (Devil's Island) 9551; (Economy wharf) 9579; (Glace Bay) 9577; (Half Island cove) 9584; (Irish cove) 9578; (Kelly's cove) 9582; (Parker's cove) 9552; (Parrsboro harbour) 9579 ; (Petite Riviere) 9580; (Phinney's Cove) 9552; (Pierreville pier) 9581; (Porter's Lake) 9583; (Pugwash wharf) 9578; (Ray's Creek) 9576 ; (River Hebert) 9578; (Round Hill wharf) 9552; (Sydney quarantine station) 9578; (Tatamagouche wharf) 9579 ; (Toney river) 9581 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur) 785 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Louise embankment) 772 (1).
Quarantine (cattle) 6700; on conc., 6911 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, construction, &c.) 2278 (ii), 6427; (surveys) on conc., 6910 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings) 6432 (iv); (Amherst accommodation) 1983; Drummondville improvements) 1960 (i); (locomotive machinery) 6428 (iv); (Mitchell diversion) 1940; (Moncton accommodation) 1946; (Newcastle improvements) 1967; (St. Fabien subway) 1981 (i); (station accommodation) 6429 (iv); (steel rails, &c.) 1989; (Sydney Mines extension) 1987 (i); (ties, &c.) 6429 (iv); (water service) 2170 (ii) ; (working expenses) 6908 (iv).
Railways and Canals—Miscellaneous (litigation) 1522 ; (engineers, &c) 1521 (i).
Railways—P.E.I. (air brakes) 2178 (ii); (Bloomfield agent's house) 6432 (iv); (Cardigan branch) 2172 (ii) ; (Charlottetown track extension) 6433 (iv); (Freetown station house) 2180; (Georgetown station) 2179; (M.C.B. couplers) 2178; (Morrell bridge swing span) 2177; (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2134 (ii); (working expenses) 6908 (iv).
Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance) 1534 (i).
Scientific Institutions (astronomical observatory) 9248 (v).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Senate (contingencies) 6943 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration Act) 7204 (iv); (salaries) 981 (i); (commercial agencies) 7208; (iron and steel bounties) 7216 (iv).
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 1698 (i); (inspection of staples) 9681 (v); (metric system) 1699; (standards) 1695 ; (travelling expenses) 1695 (i).
Yukon Ter. Govt. (additional allowance to Maj. Wood) 9250; (local council grant) 9250 (v).
Telegraph Lines in Canada and Americanization (remarks) 7646 (iv).
Thessalon Postmaster, Mr. J. B. Dobey, Irregularities, &c., on M. for Sup., 6203, 6212 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Cor., 3202 (ii).
——— Amt. to Reduce Vote, on conc., 9772 (v).
Timber Lands, sold or leased by Interior Dept., Descriptions, &c. (M. for ret.*) 9698 (v).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3651 (ii), 4680 (iii).
Tobacco Industry, Inspection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1681 (i).
Toronto, Centre, Vacancy, Issue of Writ (remarks) 3251 (ii).
Toronto Observatory, Govt. Policy *re* Removal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9248 (v).
Toronto Pneumatic Postal Service, Contract *re* Trench (remarks) 5807, 5922 (iii).
Transportation Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman (remarks) 404 (i).
——— Complete Membership and Reps. *re* (remarks) 321 (i).
Trent Valley Canal, Inspector Ritchie's Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 2777 (ii).
——— Incomplete Return (remarks) 4750 (iii).
Turriff, J. G., Employment by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 8266 (v).
Uniforms for Letter Carriers, Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 206 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) on M. for 3°, 8818 (v).
Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 8695 (v).
Walton, Mr. R. M., Arrest by U.S. Authorities in the South (remarks) 4199 (iii).
Wharfs, Piers, Docks, Constructed by Govt. since 1896 (M. for ret.) 2777 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 8178 (v).
White Lead, Tariff *re*, in Com. on B. 190, 9761 (v).
White, Mr. Odbur, Dismissal from I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2211 (ii).
Wines, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9762 (v).
Wire Fencing : *See* 'N.W.T.,' &c.

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Wrecking Plant 'Lord Strathcona,' in Com. of Sup., 957 (i).
Yarmouth Bank of N.S., Investigation *re* (remarks) 9690 (v).
Yukon, Member-elect, Delay in Gazetting (remarks) 454 (i).
——— Reforms, &c., on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 7035 (iv).
——— Salaries and Living Allowances (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 214 (iv).

Fowler, Mr. G. W., *King's and Albert, N.B.*
Acetylene Gas Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1052-3 (i).
Allan Fast SS. Service, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 894 (i).
Autonomy B. 69, in Com. (Crown Lands) 8260; (seat of Govt.) 8244 (v).
Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Conspiracy, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. on B. 36, 535 (i).
Dismissals from Public Offices, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 140 (i).
I.C.R. Employees, Messrs. Weldon, McDougall, &c., Political Partisans (Ques.) 1146 (i).
Killam, Judge, Appnmt as Chairman of Ry. Commisson (remarks) on M. for Com. on B. 36, 535 (i).
Kingston, N.B., and Jubilee Station Mail Service, Tenders *re*, &c. (Ques.) 5133 (iii).
Maccan Mail Contract, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 188 (i).
Martineau Defalcations, Collection of Guarantee (remarks) 113 (i).
Military Medical Officers, Appnmts., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 417 (i).
Militia Act (permanent force) Amt. B. 170 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6985 (iv).
Militia Buildings, Architects, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Pneumatic P.O. System, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. *See* 'Autonomy.'
Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 297 (i).
Ry. Commissioners (chairman) Appnmt. of, B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 535 (i).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7363 (iv).
St. John Quarantine Station, Acetylene Gas Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1053 (i).
St. John River, N.B., Govt. Policy *re* Wharfs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).
Sackville Ry. Station, Tenders *re* Erection, &c. (Ques.) 5133 (iii).
Sherbrooke Drill Shed, Site, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 428 (i).

Fowler, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
Silver Coins, Worn, &c., Redemption of (Ques.) 688 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture (creameries) 7016 (iv).
Canals—Grenville (guide piers) 1500; (Williamsburg (steam hoist) 1495 (i).
Chinese Immigration (salaries) 981 (i).
Civil Govt.—High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 120 (i).
Justice—Man., &c. (Judges' travelling allowances) 122; N.S. (Dodd, Judge, salary) 124; Yukon (law books) 136; (living allowances) 127 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 978; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 948, 951 (i); (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 945 (i).
Militia (Dom. arsenal) 445 (i); (Dom. arsenal) 7012 (iv); (medical officers) 417; (rifle, &c., grants) 444 (i); (Royal Military college) 7002 (iv).
Post Office (inspectors' salaries) 144; (provisional allowances) 170; (Ry. mail clerks) 139 (i).
Public Works—N.B. (Campbellton) 1048; (St. John quarantine) 1052; (Woodstock armoury) 1057 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 1021; (Inverness) 1042 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough armoury) 1578; (Sandwich) 1580; (Stratford armoury) 1581; (Toronto warehouse) 1586 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Post Office reconstruction) 1574 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Miscou harbour) 7498; (Mud Cove) 7500; (Quaco harbour) 7501; (St. John harbour) 7503; (St. John tributaries) 7502; (Salmon River) 7499; (tidal waters) 7503 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Bay St. Lawrence) 7397; (Beckerton) 7397; (Breton Cove) 7397; (Clark's harbour) 7398; (Country harbour) 7399; (Culloden) 7401; (Digby Pier) 7402; (Inverness Mines) 7405; (Mahone bay) 7408 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Yamaska River) 7394 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (general vote) 7455 (iv).
Sussex Rifle Range, Inspector (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7011 (iv).
Woodstock Armoury, N.B., Clerk of Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1058 (i).

Gallery, Mr. D., *Montreal, St. Anne.*
Montreal Inland Revenue Building, Addition and Site, *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1121 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal Inland Revenue) 1121; (Montreal P. O. improvements) 1129; (Montreal P. O., pneumatic system) 1135 (i).

Galliher, Mr. W. A., *Kootenay.*
Anthracite Coal Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 136) (M.) to present Pet., 4550; Pet. (presented) 4644; 1°*, 4807 (iii); in Com., 5976 (iv).

Galliher, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8034 ; on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Scott) C. P. R. lands, 8795 (v).
——— (C.P.R. lands) in Com., 6066 (iv).
——— (Senate representation) 5682 (iii).
Autonomy B. 69 'Yellow Dog,' Ref to in Newspapers (remarks) in Com., 5896 (iii).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) on Amt. (Mr. Scott) to M. for 3°, 8873 (v).
Budget, on The, 8971 (v).
Canada Life Assurance Co., Ref. to in Com. on B. 108, 4694 (iii).
Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 11) 1°*, 317 (i).
Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 190 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9763 (v).
G.T.P. Ry. Plans *re* Terminals, Deposited with Govt., on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 2827 (ii).
Imperial Guarantee and Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2771 (ii).
Inland Revenue (guarantee bonds) B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8680 (v).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9740, 9796 (v).
Kaslo and Lardeau-Duncan Ry. Co.s (B. 141) Pet. (presented) 3744 (ii); 1°*, 4550 (iii).
Killam, Judge, Appnmt. as Chairman of Ry. Commission, on M. for Com. on Ry. B. No. 36, 506 (i).
Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 137) 1°*, 4550 (ii).
Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 24) 1°*, 493 (i).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 493; in Com., 1706 (i).
Northwest Coal and Coke Ry. Co.'s (B. 140) 1°*, 4550 (iii).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2054 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s (B. 12) 1° m. 316 ; in Com., 1283, 1888 (i), 2532, 2714, 2951, 2958. 3177; 3° m., 3393 (ii).
Pacific Bank of Canada (B. 175) 1° m., 7420; 2° m., 7625 (iv).
Private Bills Petitions (M.) to extend time, 4375 (iii).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Railway Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com., 506 (i).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7346 (iv).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Prefontaine) in Com., 7438 (iv).
Spirits imported in Bond (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8680 (v).

Galliher, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*
SUPPLY :
Justice—Yukon (law books) 137 (i).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 4683 (iii).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. D. Ross) 2° m., 4700 (iii); in Com., 8316, 8641 ; on M. for 3°, 8828, 9045 (v).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 135) 1°*, 4550 (iii).
Western Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4689 (iii).
White Lead, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9763 (v).
Yukon, Reform *re*, Condition of Country (remarks) on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 7069 (iv).

Ganong, Mr. G. W., *Charlotte, N.B.*
Atlantic Fisheries Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 270 (i).
——— Inquiry for, 1242 (i).
Carbide Manufacture, Willson Patent, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1055 (i).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr Fisher) in Com. on Res., 1002 (i).
Cold Storage Plants for Bait, &c. (Ques.) 1505 (i).
Fisheries Industry, Commission of Investigation, Recommendation, &c. (M.) to adjn., 6312 (iv).
Fishing Bounties Fraud *re* Payment, Rep. of Mr. Matheson (M. for copy*) 1770 (i).
Grand Manan, N.B., Payments to Life-saving Crew (Ques.) 4921 (iii).
House of Commons, Rooms for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 251 (i).
James Bay Lobsters, Investigation by Govt. (Ques.) 6475 (iv).
Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) in Com. on Res., 274 (i).
Lepreaux Point Light, &c., Caretaker, Investigation *re* Dismisals, &c. (Ques.) 6475 (iv.)
Life-saving Crew, Grand Manan, N.B., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 4921 (iii).
Lobster Canneries, Licenses, Applications, &c., N.B., District No. 1 (Ques.) 584, 910 (i).
Lobster Fishing, Open Season in 1903-4-5 (Ques.) 1504 (i).
Lobsters, Legal Length in Bay of Fundy, Changes made, &c. (Ques.) 583 (i).
New Brunswick Southern Ry., Negotiations *re* Purchase, &c (Ques.) 584 (i).
Ryan, Heber W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4458 (iii).
Submarine Signal Apparatus (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 892 (i).
SUPPLY :
House of Commons (rooms) 251 (i).

Ganong, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY —*Con.*
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Can. and Mexico) 896; (Magdalen Islands) 907 (i).
Public Works—Buildings, N.B. (Campbellton) 1048; N.S. (Antigonish) 855, 1015; (Inverness) 1040; (Shelburne) 1044 (i).

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 13) 1° m., 317 (i).
Money transmitted by Mail, Par. in 'Le Soleil' &c. *re* Legislation (Ques.) 4807 (iii).
Riviere du Loup Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7323 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Fraserville harbour) 7323 (iv).

Geoffrion, Mr. V., *Chambly and Verchères.*
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. (B. 59) 1° m., 986 ; in Com., 1399 (i), 2106, 3205 (ii).
Fessenden Wireless Tel. Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 144) in Com., 6380, 6607 (iv).
Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s (B. 96) 1°*, 2005 (ii).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s (B. 47) 1°*, 728 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 149) M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 9072 ; in Com., 9340, 9586 ; on Sen. Amts., 9815 (v).

German, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4944 (iii).
Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s (B. 31) 1°*, 493 (i).
Canada Southern Bridge Co.'s (B. 29) 1°*, 493; in Com., 1286 (i).
Canada Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 30) 1°*, 493 (i).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1291 (i).
Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossing) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 302 (i).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Grenville (guide pieds) 1501 ; (Port Colborne elevator) 1269, 1291; (summit level) 1263; (stone protection) 1497 (i).
Transportation Problem *re* Waterways (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1269 (i).
Welland Canal Water Power Leases, Names, Quantity, &c. (M. for ret.) 2097 (ii).
Western Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4696 (iii).

Gervais, Mr. H., *Montreal, St. James.*
Canada Temperance Act Amt. (B. 128) 1° m., 3359 (ii).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9412 ; Res. of Boards of Trade and Cor., &c. (read) 9413 (v).

Gervais, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Crown Casualty Co. (B. 125) Pet. presented, 2322 ; 1° m., 2593 (ii).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. (presented) 493 (i).
——— (M.) to conc. 683 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. (presented) 4457 (iii).
——— (M.) to conc., 4550 (iii).
——— 3rd Rep. of Com. (presented) 4549 (iii).
——— (M.) to conc. 4551 (iii).
——— 4th Rep. (presented) 4983 (iii).
——— (M.) to conc., 5034 (iii).
——— 5th Rep. (presented) 7096 (iv).
——— 6th Rep. (presented) 9392 (v).
——— 7th Rep. (presented) 9773 (v).
——— on M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com., 9804 (v).
Fish Transportation from Boston to Montreal, via G.T.R., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1930 (i).
G.T.P. Ry. Commission, Surveys, &c., Number of Employees (M. for ret.*) 1770 (i).
——— (Ques.) 686 (i).
I.C.R. Passes for Quebec Councillors (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1922, 1925 (i).
Montreal P. O., Pneumatic System Installation, in Com. of Sup., 1131 (i).
Montreal, Quebec and Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 73) 1°*, 1592 (i).
Postal Facilities, Montreal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1131 (i).
Private Bills, Extension of Time for Pets. (M.) 2203 (ii).
Provident Savings Association incorp. (B. 134) 1°*, 4370 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Canal and Lake Champlain Co.'s (B. 43) 1°*, 625 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (pneumatic tube system, Montreal) 1131 (i).
Worthington, Col. and Independence of Parlt. Act, *re* Cor. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9164 (v).

Girard, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*
SUPPLY :
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 949 (i).

Gladu, Mr. J. E. O., *Yamaska.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) in Com., sec. 2 (B. N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) dual language, 8621 (v).

Gordon, Mr. D. A., *East Kent.*
Monarch Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 164) 1°, 6232 (iv).
Railway Commision Rep., Non-production of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6238 (iv).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Com., 4987 (iii).

Grant, Mr. G. D., *North Ontario.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4703 (iii).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 179 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 8654 (v).

Georgian Bay and Seaboard Ry. Co.'s (B. 35) 1°*, 493 (i).

Georgian Bay Islands, Sale, &c., Ques. of Privilege, 6736 (iv).

International Bridge and Terminal Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 87) on Sen. Amts., 9695 (v).

James Bay Ry., Deviation of Line, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 9697 (v).

——— Maps *re* Location, &c. (Ques.) 2190 (ii).

Murphy, Edward Albert, Relief (B. 126) 1°*, 3091 (ii).

Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3135 (ii).

Private Bills Pets. Extension of Time (M.) *re* Report, 318, 448 (i), 2491 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Rama wharf) 9602 (v).

Underwood Typewriter Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 145) 1°*, 4644 (iii).

——— (B. 146) 1°*, 4644 (iii).

Greenway, Mr. T., *Lisgar.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., 4th Rep. (M.) to conc., 6310 (iv).

——— 2nd Rep. (M.) to conc., 4081 (iii).

Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9396 (v).

Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6738 (iv).

Gunn, Mr. B. B., *South Huron.*

Adulteration of Food, Prosecutions under Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1726 (i).

Autonomy B. 69, Attack *re* 'Orangeism' (remarks) in Com., 5910 (iii).

Fruit Marks Act, Convictions *re* (Ques.) 3010 (ii).

Goderich Mail Contract, Tender *re* (Ques.) 2493 (ii).

Seaforth Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 858 (i).

Tobacco Industry, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i).

Guthrie, Mr. H., *South Wellington.*

Autonomy and Provincial Rights, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn., 1752 (i).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5153 (iii).

Autonomy Bill, on Resignation of Hon. C. Sifton (remarks) 1863 (i).

Criminal Code (1902) Amt. (B. 67) 1°*, 1421 (i).

Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9436 (v).

Dominion Elections Act (1900) Amt. (B. 9) 1° m., 263 (i).

Guthrie, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Guelph and Georgian Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 100) 1°*, 2108 (ii).

Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Ry. Co.'s (B. 112) 1°*, 2184 (ii).

Niagara-Welland Power Co.'s (B. 40) 1°*, 625 (i).

Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 1770 (i).

Haggart, Hon. J. G., *South Lanark.*

Alien Labour Law, Amts. *re* (remarks) 6232 (iv).

Animals slaughtered under Diseases Act (remarks) on conc., 6912 (iv).

Anthracite Coal and Ry. Co.'s Pet., on M. (Mr. Galliher) to present, 4550 (iii).

Auditor General and Audit Act, on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 9657 (v).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5481 (iii).

——— in Com. (B.N.A. Act) 5728 (iii).

——— (C.P.R. lands) in Com., 6055 (iv).

——— (distribution of seats) 7735 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8019; on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7852 (iv).

——— (Hudson Bay Co. rights) 5947 (iii).

——— (joint stock companies) 6084 (iv).

——— (lands vested in Crown) 5946 (iii).

——— (law, courts, &c.) 5814, 5935 (iii).

——— (school clause amt.) 7125 (iv).

——— Official Report of Division (remarks) 5432 (iii).

——— Printing and Distribution (remarks) 1754 (i).

Bank Notes, Circulation and Printing *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6251 (iv).

Bisonnette vs. Crown, Illegal Stamping of Letters in Montreal P.O. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 196 (i).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 179 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 8654 (v).

Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4236 (iii).

Canada Atlantic Ry. Purchase, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 2685 (ii).

——— Purchase by G.T.R. (remarks) 69 (i).

See 'I.C.R.' &c., 'Transportation.'

Canada Eastern Ry. Co., Purchase, &c., on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Ret., 734 (i).

——— Litigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1523 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 58 (Mr. Lamont) on Senate Amts., 9078 (v).

Canada Southern Bridge Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. German) in Com., 1287 (i).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 627, 659 (i).

Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4269 (iii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
Culbute Canal, Litigation *re* Flooding (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1522 (i).
Drummond Co. Ry., Expenditure *re* (remarks) 1942 (i).
Elevator at Port Colborne, in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1291 (i).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3205 (ii).
Freight Rates : *See* 'Ry. Rates.'
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale to Mr. F. W. Grant (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6488 (iv).
Gillies Brothers, Limited, B. 95 (Mr. A. A. Wright) in Com., 2765 (ii).
Government Contracts B. 51 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1672 (i).
Govt. Legislation (remarks) on M. to take in Wednesdays, &c., 821 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3649 (ii), 4203 ; on M. for 3°, 4233 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7677; on M. for 3°, 7861 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Plans deposited with Dept. of Rys., on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 917 (i).
G.T.P. Surveys, Quebec and Moncton Route, Reps. *re* (remarks) 228 (i).
——— Surveys, Reps. in Ry. Dept., &c. (remarks) 2009 (ii).
Great Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 71 (Mr. J. T. Schell) in Com., 4258 (iii).
Half-Breed Scrip to Non-residents, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 6565 (iv).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6501 (iv).
——— Charges, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) 7672 (iv).
Highway Crossings : *See* 'Ry. B. 2.'
House of Commons P.O., Delay in Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 200 (i).
Immigration in B.C., Medical Inspection (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9334 (v).
I.C.R. and C.A. Ry. Act (running rights) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 4190 (iii); in Com., 6140 (iv).
I.C.R. and G.T.R. Arbitration, &c. (remarks) 68 (i).
——— on Annual Statement (Mr. Emmerson) 1906 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1950 (i).
——— Rates, Increases *re*, on Explanation Min. of Rys., 6120 (iv).
——— Reply to Annual Statement (Mr. Emmerson) 7447, 7457 (iv).
Judges taken from Bench for Appointments (remarks) 517 (i).
Killam, Judge, Appnmt. as Chairman of Ry. Commission (remarks) in Com. on B. 36, 517 (i).
Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com. on Res., 274 (i).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
Lévis, Purchase of Land for I.C.R. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6670 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. W. J. Roche) for Copies, 1768 (i).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2140 (ii).
Nixon, Robt., on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to cancel Vote, in Com., of Sup., 9330 (v).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9469 (v).
N.W. Mounted Police B. 8 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 99 (i).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2056 (ii).
N.W.T. Boundary Fence, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5693 (iii).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5970 (iv).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 2542 (ii).
Poonamalie Dam, Pet. *re* Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9379 (v).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1291 (i).
Postmasters acting as Partisan Officials (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6245 (iv).
Private Bills Pets., Extension of Time for Receiving (remarks) 318 (i).
Provl. Govt. N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Works Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Hyman) on M. for 1°, 819 (i).
Quebec Bridge *re* G.T.P. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2295 (ii).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 1243 (i).
Ry. Act (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 283; in Com., 1787 (i).
Railways and Canals Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1674 (i).
Railway Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1602 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1622 (i).
Railway Commission, Board of, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1533 (i).
——— Appnmt. of Chairman, on M. for Com. on Res. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 517 (i).
Ry. Debts. : *See* 'Exchequer.'
Railway Rates, Discriminating *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5016 (iii).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 76 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2325 (ii).
Resignations in 1896, Charges of P.M.G. (personal explanation) 839 (i).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Rural Mail Delivery, Cost of Establishing &c. on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Ret., 2080 (ii).

Salmon, Capt., Resignation, &c., on M. (Mr. Ames) for Cor., 389 (i).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 351, 1798 (i).

Sifton, Hon. C., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill (remarks) 1866 (i).

South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9340 ; on M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 9072 (v).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Carillon and Grenville (guide piers) 6305 (iv).

Canals—Chambly (culvert, St. Thérèse Island) 6302 (iv) ; (macadamizing roads) 9378 (v).

Canals—Cornwall (concreting apparatus) 6298 (iv).

Canals—Farran's Point (gas plant) 6308 (iv).

Canals—Lachine (electrical installation) 9354 ; (enlargement) 6294 ; (lock gates suspension) 6301; (Mill St. paving) 6301; (power house flumes) 6300 ; (repairs) 6307; (wall underpinning) 6299 (iv).

Canals—Miscellaneous (remuneration to lockmasters) 9384 (v).

Canals—Rapide Plat (enlargement, Upper entrance) 6289 (iv).

Canals—Rideau (extension) 1333 (i).

Canals—St. Lawrence (shoals) 6289 (iv).

Canals—St. Ours (landing wharf) 6302 (iv).

Canals—St. Peters (dredging) 6304 ; (repairs) 6308 (iv).

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 1335 (i).

Canals—Soulanges (construction) 6290 (iv).

Canals—Trent (Geo. Matthews Co. damages) 6303 (iv); (Holland River) 9359 (v); lowering floor of lock 6303 (iv); (McLaren's creek bridge) 9379 (v) ; (Peterborough dam) 6303 (iv); (staff on dams) 9383 (v); (surveys) 6291 (iv) ; (surveys of dams) 9377 (v).

Canals—Welland (elevator at Port Colborne) 1266, 1291 (i); (long level deepening) 6290; (lowering head of lock No. 1) 6309 (iv); (Port Colborne level) 1263 (i).

Charges of Management (Receiver General's Office) 6249 (iv).

Civil Government—Customs (salaries) 80 (i); Geological Survey (contingencies) 6248; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (clerical assistance) 6248 (iv); (salaries) 70 (i); Interior (mines branch) 6264 (iv); Labour Department (salaries, &c.) 100; Marine and Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 102 (i), 6266 (iv); Post Office (contingencies) 6240, 6245 (iv); Railways and Canals (private sec.) 9062 (v).

House of Commons (sessional messengers) 249 (i).

Immigration (medical inspection) 9239 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (Treaty No. 9) 9336 (v).

Justice, Administration—N.W.T. (miscellaneous) 101 (i).

Legislation (House of Commons) 6268 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 884 (i).

Miscellaneous (Pacific cable grant) 7277 (iv).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works Buildings, Ottawa (museum) 757; (Royal Mint) 623 (i).

Quarantine—General (cattle) on conc., 6912 (iv).

Railways and Canals—Generally (litigation) 1522 (i).

Railways—G.T.P. (salaries, &c.) 2295; (surveys, construction, &c.) 2282 (ii); (surveys) 7496 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 9384, 9388 (v) ; (general vote) 7447, 7457 (iv); (Mitchell bridge) 7942 (i); (working expenses) 9384 (v).

Railways—P.E.I. (Hillsborough bridge) 2040 (ii); (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2140 (ii).

Railways—Ry. Commission, Board of (maintenance) 1533 (i).

Tay Canal, Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 1307 (i).

Thessalon Postmaster, Mr. J. B. Dobey, Irregularities, &c., on M. for Sup., 6210 (iv).

Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3668 (ii).

Tobacco Industry, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i).

Transportation Commission, Rep. *re* C.A.Ry. (remarks) in Com. on B. 45, 4225 (iii).

Transportation Problem *re* Waterways (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1267, 1291 (i).

Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 701, 1776 (i); on M. for 3°, 1779 (i).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8639 (v).

White, Mr. Odbur, Dismissal, &c., on M. for Cor., 193 (i).

Wire Fencing Contract : *See* 'N.W.T.'

Wright Electoral District, Issue of Warrant, &c. (remarks) 98 (i).

Hall, Mr. R. R., *West Peterborough.*

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4409 4415 (iii).

Vibert, Philip Relief B. 172, 2° m., 7261 (iv).

Harty, Mr. Wm., *Kingston.*

Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s (B. 85) 1°*, 1788 (i).

Montreal, Ottawa, Kingston and Georgian Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 97) 1°*, 2005 (ii).

Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton.*

Agriculture Committee, 2nd Rep. on M. (Mr. Greenway) to conc., 4081 (iii).

Alexandra Bridge, Ottawa, Lighting, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7586 (iv).

Allans, SS. Owners, Contract *re* Cold Storage (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 865 (i).

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 679, 742 (i), 2419; in Com., 2841 (ii).

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5440; (subsidy) 5572 (iii).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Autonomy B. 69, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4811 (iii).
——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5642 (iii).
——— (lands vested in Crown) 6041 (iv).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8511 (v).
——— (subsidy to provs.) 6088; letter from Hon. G. W. Ross to Min. of Fin. (read) 6092 (iv).
Autonomy Bill, Official Report of Division (remarks) 5433 (iii).
Autonomy B. (Saskatchewan) B. 70, in Com., sec. 12 (distribution of seats) 8750 (v); on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Scott) 8873 (v). *See* 'Lt. Govs.,' 'N.W.T. B. 160.'
Bank Note Circulation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6251 (iv).
Bank Notes lost in Circulation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6261 (iv).
Battleford and Lake Lenore Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Parmelee) on M. for 1°, 1671 (i).
Beaujeu Bank Pier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Binder Twine Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7222 (iv).
Binder Twine Industry at Kingston Penitentiary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 488 (i).
Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 179 (Mr. Turriff) on M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 8653 (v).
Bronte Lighthouse, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2868 (ii); 9176 (v).
Buffalo Specimen *re* Exhibition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6272 (iv).
Campaign Literature and Franking Privilege (remarks) 1814 (i).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 3°, 4412 (iii).
Canada Life Assurance Co., ref. to in Com. on B. 108, 4684 (iii).
Canadian Agency B. 77 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for Com., 9049 (v).
Canadian Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Com., 9004 (v).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1074 (i).
Census Enumerators, Appnmt. of (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 1074 (i).
Clinton P. O., in Com. of Sup., 852 (i).
Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8236 (v).
Colson, F., Emplymt. in Sec. of State's Office (Ques.) 8146 (v).
Cullers, Abolition of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).
Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 190 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. 9761 (v).
Desks in Chamber, Inconvenience of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1569 (i).
Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) in Com., 4971 (iii).
Farmers' Bank of Canada B. 124 (Mr. T. Martin) in Com., 4700 (iii).
Fertilizers, Inspection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1726 (i).
Fruit Marks Act (staple commodities) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5979 (iv).
Government Contract B. 51 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. 1673 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Purchase of Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2621 (ii).
Grain carried to Halifax via I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1919 (i).
Grain Inspectors, and Recommendation from Boards of Trade (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7234 (iv).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4216 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7621 (iv).
Hamilton and Kilbride Mail Contract, Cost of (Ques.) 9080 (v).
Hersey, A. H., Relief B. 167 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) in Com., 7624 (iv); 7682 (iv).
Highway Crossings: *See* 'Ry. B. 2.'
House of Commons Furniture, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
——— Locked Drawers for Private Papers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
Imperial Guarantee and Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2771 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act (guarantee bonds) Amt. B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8677 (v).
I.C.R., Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1959 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).
'Lady Laurier,' Number of Crew at Halifax (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2616 (ii).
Lead Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7223 (iv).
Lt. Governors of Alberta and Saskatchewan B. 193 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9033 (v).
Lowville to Milton Mail Service, Cost of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 9080 (v).
Metric System, Adoption of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1694 (i).
Mineral Specimens *re* Exhibitions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6272 (iv).
Murray Harbour Ry. and Hillsborough Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2169 (ii).
Northwest Territories B. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8768 (v).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5698 (iii).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*
N.W.T., Boundary Line, Wire Fence Contract, on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5585 (iii).
Oats, Rolled, Tariff changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9764 (v).
Ontario Fire Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. Boyce) in Com., 2772 (ii).
Ottawa Buildings, Cost of Maintenance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1572 (i).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 4966 (iii).
Pacific Bank of Canada B. 175 (Mr. Galliher) on M. for 1°, 7420; on M. for 2°, 7625 (iv).
Patent Act Reliefs, (remarks) *re* Amts., 6559 (iv).
Penny Banks Charters, Stmnt. *re* Business (Ques.) 687 (i).
Petroleum Crude, Bounties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1295 (i).
Post Office Regulations *re* Distribution of Packages (remarks) 6962 (iv).
Printing Bureau, Outside Printing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6951 (iv).
Provident Savings Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5975 (iv).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Buildings, Govt. Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 852 (i).
Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 308 (i).
Railways and Canals Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1676 (i).
Ry. Commission B. 36 (chairman) on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1630 (i).
——— Ques. of Order, *re* Relevancy of Debate, 558 (i).
'Reptile Press', &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1576 (i).
Rolled Oats : *See* 'Oats.'
Sarnia Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 862 (i).
Saskatchewan, Prov. of. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Sec. of State's Dept., Number of Employees (Ques.) 8147 (v).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 339, 375, 1188; on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) to M. for 3°, 1880 (i).
Sorel Workshop, Purchase of Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2488 (ii).
Spirits in Bond (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8681 (v).
SUPPLY :
Adulteration of Food (violations of Act) 1701 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (bulletins) 6928 ; (exhibitions) 6272 ; (experimental farms) 6165 (iv).
Canals—Grenville (guide piers) 1501; Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1295; (stone protection) 1496; (surveys) 1235 (i).
Charges of Management (bank notes) 6251 (iv).
Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*
SUPPLY —*Con.*
Culling Timber (salaries) 7236 (iv).
Dom. Lands (surveys, maps, &c.) 6406 (iv).
Excise (inspectors' salaries) 1682 (i).
House of Commons (sessional clerks) 6603 (iv).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6392 ; (agents, G. B. &c.) 7700; (printing contingencies) 7712 (iv).
Indians—B.C. (industrial schools) 6556; (travelling expenses) 6557 (iv).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (live stock) 6544 ; (provisions, &c.) 6550 (iv).
Indians—Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6518 (iv).
Indians—P.E.I. (medical attendance) 6538 (iv).
Inspection of Staples (grain inspectors) 7226 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7523 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 2868 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subvention (Can. and Mexico) 898; (Can. and S. Africa) 974; (G.B. and Can.) 865; St. John and W. Indies) 7199 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Acadamy of Arts) 7238 (iv). Bank of Commerce, Yukon, compensation) 9615 (v); (consolidation of statutes) 7244; (Dom. and Provincial accounts) 6959, 7242; (Pacific Cable grants) 7240; (Paris agency) 6958 (iv); (Printing Bureau machinery) 9615; (tariff commission) 9614 (v); (tuberculosis grant) 7248 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Arctic expedition) 6468 (iv) ; (govt. service) 2616 (ii).
Penitentiaries (parole system) 469 (i).
Post Office (mail service) 9609 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 852 ; Ont. (Toronto P. O. pneumatic system) 1591; Ottawa (archives) 605 ; (H. of C. improvements) 1565 (i) ; (new deptl. buildings, site, &c.) 9606 (v) ; (Printing Bureau) 1576 (i).
Public Works—Dredging—Man. (snag boat) 7577 ; Ont. and Que. (new plant) 7577 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Salmon river) 7575 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (general) 7237 ; (Margaree) 7412 ; (Scott's bay) 7416 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bronte) 7548 ; (Owen Sound) 7562 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Chateau Richer) 7292 ; (Lake St. Peter piers) 6454 ; (St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe waterways) 7384 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (architects, &c.) 7618; (cement testing) 7614 (iv); (temporary clerks) 9605 (v).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges—N.W.T. (colonization roads) 7595 ; Que. (Bryson) 7586 (iv).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 7579 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Ont. (Pelee Islands) 7609 (iv) ; Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 9605 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (general vote) 7452 (iv) ; (traffic arrangements) 1919 (i).
Trade and Commerce (iron and steel bounties) 7216 (iv).
Weights and Measures (metric system) 1694 (i).
Thermograph Records *re* Atlantic Steamers (M. for copies) 1767 (i).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Tobacco Industry, Inspection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1682 (i).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 704 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. D. Ross) on M. for 2°, 4702 (iii); in Com., 8316, 8637; on M. for 3°, 9040 (v).
Ventilation in H. of Commons (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
Walsh, Major John, Superannuation and Appmnt. of Mr. Binks (Ques.) 8146 (v).
Western Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4684 (iii).
White Lead, Tariff *re*, in Com. on B. 190, 9761 (v).
Yukon Ter. Reforms, &c., on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 7025 (iv).

Herron, Mr. J., *Alberta.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5522 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4878 (iii).
——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5619 (iii).
——— (Crown Lands) 8265 (v).
——— (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8088 (v); on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7828, 7886, 7947, 7984 (iv).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8518 (v).
——— (seat of govt.) 8248 (v).
——— (subsidy to provs.) 6088 (iv).
——— on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7772 (iv).
Autonomy B. 69, in Com. on Schedules (Macleod) 8151; (Pincher Creek) 8153 (v).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) on M for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Scott) 8869 (v).
Autonomy Bill, Mr. Haultain, Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2557 (ii).
Belly River Bridge Work (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7592 (iv).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Co., Passenger Rates, Ref. to Ry. Commission (remarks) 6836 (iv).
Experimental Farms, Establishment of in Alberta (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6171 (iv).
Fishing Rights in N. Western Lakes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2900 (ii).
Frank, Town of, Grant to Settlers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9603 (v).
Freight Rates on Cattle: *See* 'Holstein.'
Glanders among Horses, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6702 (iv).
Half-Breed Claims, Unsettled, Complaints *re* (remarks) 9813 (v).
Half-Breed Scrip to Non-Residents (remarks) on M. for Sup. 6504 (iv).

Herron, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Holstein Breeders Association, Office of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6686 (iv).
Immigration, Govt. Policy *re* Placing of Settlers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9329 (v).
Live Stock Record Associations incorp. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5925 (iii).
Macleod Land Office, Reopening of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9272 (v).
Macleod, Mounted Rifles, Trouble *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9169 (v).
Macleod, Mr. Nixon, acting as political Organizer during elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9267 (v).
Maladie du Coit, Disease among Horses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6702 (iv).
Man. and N.W.T. Govt. Officials, Resignation, &c., 1904 (Ques.) 1344 (i).
Middle Fork Falls, Location of, Conditions of Sale, &c. (Ques.) 9079 (v).
Militia Act (permanent force) Amt. B. 170 Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6987 (iv).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5583 (iii).
Provl. Govt. N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1188 (i).
Small-pox Epidemic, N.W. Ter. Prevention of, &c. remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1841 (i).
Stoney Indians, Depleting Game, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6548 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1705 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 6171 (iv); (experimental farms) 9608 (v); (live stock records) 5686 (iv).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6403 (iv); (agents, &c.) 9329 (v); (interpreters) 7702 (iv).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (live stock) 6541 (iv).
Militia (permanent force) 9169 (v).
Miscellaneous (Alaska surveys) 7720 (iv).
N.W.M. Police (Yukon) 8669 (v).
Post Office (mail service) 9612 (v).
Public Works—General (clerk of works) 1644 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.W.T. (Saskatchewan survey) 9603 (v).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges—N.W.T. (Belly River) 7592; (colonization roads) 7594 (iv).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (Gatineau River) 7631 (iv).
Quarantine—Public Health (organized districts) 1841 (i).
Yukon Govt. (additional allowance to Maj. Wood) 9251 (v).
Wire Fencing: *See* 'N.W.T.'

Hughes, Mr. J. J., *King's, P.E.I.*
Catholic Mutual Benefit Association (B. 93) 1°*, 2005; in Com., 2769 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*
Murray Harbour Branch, P.E.I. Ry., Cost of Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9486 (v).
North Lake P.O., Removal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9612 (v).
P.E.I. and Mainland Steam Communication, &c. (remarks) 1754 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Investigation *re* Soundings, &c., on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Corr., 2795 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Indemnity B. 201 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9791 (v).
Storm Signals in Lighthouses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9176 (v).
SUPPLY :
Lighthouse and Coast Service (storm signals) 9176 (v).
Militia (permanent force) 9163 (v).
Ocean and River Service (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2655 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg postal station) 9549 (v).
Railways—P.E.I. (Cardigan branch) 2174 (ii); (Cardigan branch) 9484; (Georgetown accommodation) 9486 (v).
Winter Mail Service, P.E.I., Famine *re* Cattle Feed, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2655 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. S., *Victoria & Haliburton, O.*
Autonomy (Alberta) B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5511 (iii).
——— Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3766 (ii).
——— on M. for 3°, Amt. (schools) 8833, Neg. Y. 37 ; N. 106) 8834 (v).
——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5615 (iii).
——— (B.N.A. Act) 5732 (iii).
——— (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7817, 7953, 7971 (iv).
——— (election of members) 5769, 5810 (iii).
——— (H. of C. representation) 5752 (ii).
——— (Lt. Gov.'s powers) 5781 (iii).
——— (readjustment of representation) 5757 (iii).
——— (Senate representation) 5674 (iii).
——— in Com., on Schedules (Edmonton city) 8161; (Saskatchewan) 8161; (Stony Plain) 8157; (Sturgeon) 8162 ; (Vermilion) 8155 (v).
Autonomy B. 69, School Clause Amts. (M.) that Com. rise, 5833 (iii).
See 'Manitoba.'
Autonomy Bill, Preparation of Maps *re* Schedules (remarks) 5477 (iii).
Balsam Lake Waterways, Agreement *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1524 (i).
Bowman and Commee, Contract *re* Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 797 (i).
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers (remarks) on Orders of the Day, 3569 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*
Campaign Literature and Franking Privilege, &c. (remarks) 1811 (i).
C.A. Ry. and L.C.R. : *See* 'Ry. B. 132.'
Canada Eastern Ry. Purchase, &c., on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Ret., 735 (i).
Canadian Cattle, Embargo in G.B., on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Com., 9018 (v).
Canadian Fast Mail Service, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to adjn., 9781 (v).
Castonguay, Dismissal and Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 5688 (iii).
——— (remarks) 6653 (iv).
Cattle Embargo, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 902 (i).
See 'Can. Cattle.'
Director of Operations, *re* Militia Council (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 418 (i).
Dobey, Mr. : *See* 'Thessalon.'
Dredges employed at Port Arthur (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 790 (i).
Dredges, Working Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 803 (i).
Dress Regulations for Militia (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
Elevator at Port Colborne, in Com. of Sup., 1266 (i).
Franking Privilege, Use of Stamps, &c. (remarks) 5134 (iii).
Freight Rates, Statement *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 890 (i).
See 'Ry. Rates.'
Glanders among Horses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6694 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. Terminals, Plans deposited with Govt. on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 2835 (ii)
——— Surveys, Rep. in Ry. Dept, &c. (remarks) 2017 (ii).
G.B. and Her Colonies, Inter-Imperial Parlt. (prop. res.) 2334, 2395 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Ingram) 2402 (ii).
Gregory, Col., Retirement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 418 (i).
Halifax and Esquimalt Military Defences. Govt. Control, &c., Par. in 'Journal' (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1402 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, N.S., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9572 (v).
Hay Lake Channel, Lowering of Water (remarks) 701 (i).
Highland Cadet Corps, Montreal, Efficiency, &c. (remarks) 7815 (iv).
Huron County Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 859 (i).
Immigrants : *See* 'North Atlantic.'
Indian Reserves, abandoned by Indians, Sales, (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6563 (iv).
Inter-Imperial Parlt., between G.B. and Her Colonies (prop. res.) 2334, 2395 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*
Japan, Trade Relations with Dom., on Stmt. (Mr. Fisher) 7910 (iv).
Judge Advocate General, Appnmt. of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6656 (iv).
——— Purchase of Site, on Statement (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 9708 (v).
——— Rep. *re* Evidence (remarks) 8698 (v).
Labour Union Labels : *See* 'Union.'
Letter Carriers, Brantford, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 217 (i).
Lindsay Drill Hall, Erection of (Ques.) 271 (i).
London, Bye-Election, Resignation of H. M. for S. York (remarks) 6384 (iv).
London Militiamen at Niagara (remarks) *re* London Election, 7249 (iv).
McGillicuddy, Mr. D., Letter to Sir William Mulock, Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 6601 (iv).
Man. Boundaries Extension, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) *re* 'Political Debts,' 3858 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) naming Member, 3858 (ii).
——— Mr. Speaker's Ruling (personal explanation, 3879 (ii).
Medical Officers and Independence of Parlt. Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 418 (i).
Medical Officers *re* Militia, Pay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 417 (i).
Military Camp at S. Simcoe, Establishment of (remarks) 9713 (v).
Militia Act (permanent force) Amt B. 170 (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for 2°, 7267 (iv), 9189 (v).
Militia Camp : *See* 'Kentville.'
Militia Council, Appnmt. of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 416 (i).
——— Regulations, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 416 (i).
Militia Orders *re* Civil Servants (remarks) 1261 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9453 (v).
N.W.T. Grazing Leases, &c. (remarks) *re* Question, 5478 (iii).
Order in the House (remarks) 323 (i).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5744 (iii), 5966 (iv).
Ottawa Buildings leased by Govt., Payment of Taxes, &c. (Ques.) 379 (i).
Ottawa Drill Hall, Increased Accommodation, &c. (Ques.) 271 (i).
Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c. (M.) to adjn., 5785 (iii).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*
Port Arthur, Fort William and Kaministiquia Harbours, Amount of Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1398 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 2263 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 1065 (i).
——— Dredging Contract, Conmee & Bowman's Tender, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4655 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Rep., 4644, 4921 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4462 (iii).
Post Office, H. of C., Locked Boxes, &c. (remarks 8387 (v).
Post Office in N.W.T., Establishment of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 223 (i).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Questions answered by Ministers (remarks) 1067 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Com., 5006 (iii).
See 'Freight.'
Railways (Govt.) Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6155 (iv).
Red Deer, Battleford, Calgary Ry. Co.'s B. 19 (Mr. Logan) on M. for 1°, 318 (i).
Returning Officers, Instructions, &c., Ques. of Order, 7361 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for (remarks) 5209 (iii).
Riviere Ouelle Spur Line (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1982 (i).
Rooms for Members, Rearrangement, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).
Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 169 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 7262 (iv).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 323; Leter from Mr. Hogg (read) 1793 (i).
Sessional Clerks, Employed to get Data for Speeches (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6601 (iv).
Sifton, Hon. C., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill (remarks) 1861 (i).
Statements of Mr. E. D. Smith *re* Cold Storage (remarks) 874 (i).

SUPPLY :
Canals—Soulanges (gasoline boat) 1421; Trent (construction) 1420; (surveys) 1480; Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1266 (i).
Geological Survey (surveys, &c.) 8669 (v).
House of Commons (messengers) 248 (i); (sessional clerks) 6597, 6601 (iv).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6388 (iv).
Labour Dept.—(Labour Gazette) 7512 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Mexico) 900; (St. John, N.B., and Belfast) 902 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 441; (pay and allowance) 416; (surveys) 439; (target ranges) 445 (i).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
N.W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 8660; (Yukon force) 8662 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg military) 1636 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Woodstock armoury) 1050 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Lloydminster immigrant shed) 6734 (iv); (Prince Albert 1639; (Saskatoon) 1641 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 850; (Inverness) 1042; (Shelburne) 1044; (Sydney Mines) 1045 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (London drill hall) 6733 (iv); (Owen Sound) 9548 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (addition to H. of C.) 9543 (v); (archives) 606; (Royal Mint) 608 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Phinney's Cove) 9560 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Beaverton) 7546; (Blanche river) 7547; (Bracebridge) 7548 (iv); (Port Arthur) 785; (Port Colborne) 815 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Souris) 1047 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (harbour improvements) 782 (i); (Richelieu dredging) 7377 (iv); St. Mary's Current) 814 (i).
Quarantine (cattle) 6694 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (general vote) 7447 (iv); (Halifax terminals) 2035 (ii).
Thessalon Postmaster, Mr. J. B. Dobey, Irregularities, &c., on M. for Sup., 6221 (iv).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3656 (ii).
Transportation Problem *re* Waterways, in Com. of Sup., 1275 (i).
Trent Canal Surveys, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1471 (i).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 712 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) on M. for 3°, 8825 (v).
Ventilation, H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9546 (v).
White, Mr. Odbur, Dismissal from I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2210, 2235 (ii).
Wire Fencing, N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re*, Omission from 'Hansard,' of Question (remarks) 5582 (iii).

Hyman, Hon. C. S. (Minister of Public Works), *London.*
Acetylene Gas Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1052-3 (i).
Alexandria P.O., Contract *re*, &c., (Ans.) 1760 (i).
Amherst Pier, N.S., Contract *re* Construction (Ans.) 4371 (iv).
Armouries, Construction of Generally, in Com. of Sup., 1649 (i).
——— Erection of, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1547 (i).

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*
Bic Wharf, Land purchased from P. Ross (Ans.) 1850 (i).
Brantford Parade Ground (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1554 (i).
Brantford Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 861 (i).
Breakwaters, Wharfs, &c., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v).
Canada Southern Bridge Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. German) in Com., 1287 (i).
Carpets, Purchase by Govt. for Parliament Buildings, Value, &c. (Ans.) 8266 (v).
Cascumpec Sandhills Channel, P.E.I., Amount expended (Ans.) 2773 (ii).
Catholic Mutual Benefit Association B. 93 (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com., 2770 (ii).
Centur" Life Insurance Co.'s B. 49 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 2767 (ii).
Chatham Armoury, Contract, Price, &c., *re* Erection (Ans.) 587 (i).
Civil Servants Guarantees, &c., *re* P.O. Dept. (Ans.) 1758 (i).
Clinton P.O. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 854 (i).
Cornwall Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1552 (i).
Dipper Harbour Breakwater, Construction *re* (Ans.) 912 (i).
Dominion Annuity Co.'s incorp. B. 82 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 2768 (ii).
Dredges employed at Port Arthur, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 790 (i).
Drill Hall, Fredericton, Contract *re* (Ans.) 729 (i).
Frank, Grant to Settlers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9603 (v).
Fredericton Military Buildings, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 728 (i).
Geological Survey Museum, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 759 (i).
Glace Bay, N.S., Purchase of Site for Building (Ans.) 9697 (v).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 3°, 4229 (iii).
Greece's Point Wharf, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2063 (ii).
Howard's Cove, P.E.I., Survey *re* Wharf (Ans.) 4703 (iii).
Hull Wharf, Total Cost (Ans.) 2064 (ii).
Huot, Mr. J., Payments to *re* L'Ange Gardien Beach (Ans.) 1343 (i).
Ice Jams on Thames River (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1014 (i).
Immigration Property, Leased by Govt. (Ans.) 914 (i).
I.C.R. Traffic Arrangements with Foreign and Can. Rys., Amounts received (Ans.) 4703 (iii).
Jacques Cartier Surveys, Costs, Reports, &c. (Ans.) 593 (i).

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*
'Kingsford,' Dredge, Cost of Operation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 801 (i).
Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 712, 1778 (i).
Lambert's Pier, P.E.I., Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 4373 (iii).
Lennoxville Post Office, Construction (Ans.) 4373 (iii).
Library Accommodation in Archives Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).
Magog Post Office, Erection of (Ans.) 5785 (iii).
Mail Distributing Stations, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ans.) 915 (i).
Mexico Steamers, Subsidies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1560 (i).
Miminegash River Dredging, Commencement of Work (Ans.) 3834 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 779 (i).
Montreal Inland Revenue Building Addition, Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1119 (i).
Moosejaw and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 20 (Mr. Scott) in Com., 2762 (ii).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1707 (i).
North Thompson River Improvements, B.C., Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 5784 (iii).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2052, 2325 (ii).
Ontario Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. Boyce) in Com., 2772 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2763 (ii).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5964 (iv).
Ottawa Buildings and Civic Taxation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1663 (i).
——— List of Buildings rented (read) 1664 (i).
——— Taxes paid, &c. (Ans.) 380 (i).
Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Surveys, on Inquiry for Copy of Instructions, 822 (i).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3180 (ii).
Parliament Buildings, Additions to H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5790 (iii).
Penetanguishene Dredging, Name of Owner of Boat (Ans.) 2063 (ii).
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Advertisement *re* Tender of Conmee and Bowman, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4458, 4651 (iii).
——— Tenders *re* (remarks) 5963 (iv).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 2263 (ii).
Port Arthur, Fort William and Kaministiquia Harbours, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1065 (i).
Port Burwell Work, Contractor, &c., Prices paid, &c. (Ans.) 589 (i).

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*
Port Hood, N.S., Breakwater, Estimated Cost, Approval, &c. (Ans.) 5132 (iii).
Port Perry Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2190 (ii).
Port Stanley Harbour, Tender *re* (Ans.) 1760 (i).
P.E.I. Dredging, Number and Names of Harbours, &c. (Ans.) 1148 (i).
——— Mount Stewart Wharf Accommodation (Ans.) 1763 (i).
——— Winter Communication, Tunnel, &c., on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 2813 (ii).
Provident Savings Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5974.
Public Buildings, U.S. System of Renting, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1025 (i).
Public Works Act Amt. (B. 54) 1° m. 819 (i).
Public Works, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 731 (i).
——— Delay in bringing down (remarks) 602 (i).
Quebec Drill Hall, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1145 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Transfer to Marine Dept., in Com. of Sup., 771 (i).
Questions answered by Ministers (remarks) 1068 (i).
Railway Commission, Rental of Rooms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1542 (i).
Returns *re* Public Works, on Inquiry for, 9688 (v).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4751 (iii).
Rondeau Harbour Works, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1761 (i).
Royal Mint, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 606 (i).
Rustico Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1594 (i).
St. Angel Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1759 (i).
Ste. Famille Wharfage, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1150 (i).
St. Ignace Channel Dam, Plan, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 592 (i).
St. John Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 776 (i).
St. John Quarantine Station, Acetylene Gas Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1052 (i).
St. Joseph Pier, Lake Huron, Delay in Completion (Ans.) 2774 (ii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Rep. *re* Investigation into defective Boilers in Dredges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2472 (ii).
St. Paul Land and Hydraulic Co.'s Lease, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 2777 (ii).
Seaforth P. O. Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 859 (i).
Sherbrooke Drill Shed, Immediate Erection of (Ans.) 5784 (iii).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*

Summerside Drill Shed (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1563 (i).

Summerside Harbour Breakwater, in Com. of Sup., 1739 (i).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries) 94 (i).

Public Works — Buildings, B.C. (Fernie) 1641; (Vancouver) 1642; (New Westminster, Indian Branch) 1641 (i); Dom. (heating) 1670; (rentals) 1663 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—General (armouries) 1649; (clerk of works) 1642 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 1633; (Dom. renewals) 1634 (i); (St. Boniface) 9549 (v) ; (Selkirk) 1634 ; (Virden drill hall) 1634 (i); (Winnipeg customs) 9549 (v): (Winnipeg immigration) 1635 (i), 9550 (v) ; (Winnipeg militia stores) 1635 (i); (Winnipeg postal station 9549 (v); (Winnipeg P.O.) 1636 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Campbellton) 1048; (St. John drill hall) 1049; (St. John immigration shed) 1050; (St. John quarantine) 1052 ; (Woodstock armoury) 1057.

Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Calgary P.O.) 1638; (court house) 1638; (Edmonton jail) 1638; (Edmonton) 9550 (v); (Medicine Hat) 1638; (Moosejaw) 1638; (Prince Albert) 1638; (Red Deer court house) 1639; (Regina P. O.) 1639; (Saskatoon) 1640; (Strathcona Horse barracks) 1637 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 846, 1018; (Canso) 1023; (Glace Bay) 1034; (Halifax, Dom. buildings) 1036; (Halifax, immigrant building) 1037; (Inverness) 1041; (Shelburne) 1043; (Sydney Mines) 1045; (Sydney P.O.) 1044 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 1547; (Bowmanville) 1549 ; (Brantford drill hall) 1550; (Bridgeburg) 1550; (Chatham armoury) 1551; (Cobourg armoury) 1554; (Guelph armoury) 1555; (Hamilton drill hall) 1559; (Hawkesbury) 1560; (Kingston barracks) 1560; (Kingston stables) 1561; (London barracks) 1562; (London military stores) 1562; (London P.O.) 1563; (military college) 1561; (military college drill hall) 1561 (i) ; (Neepawa) 9549 (v) ; (North Bay) 1563 (i) ; (Orillia) 9549 (v) ; (Oshawa) 1564 (i); (Owen Sound) 9547 (v); (Peterborough armoury) 1578; (St. Catharines drill hall) 1578; (St. Mary's public building) 1578; (Sandwich) 1579; (Simcoe) 1581: (Stratford armoury) 1581; (Toronto barracks) 1589; (Toronto customs) 1581; (Toronto drill hall) 1582; (Toronto postal station) 1591; (Toronto P.O.) 1590; (Toronto warehouse) 1583 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (addition and alteration) 9542 (v) ; (archives) 603 (i) ; (astronomical observatory) 9542 (v) ; (coal sheds) 1565 (i); (eastern block) 9547; (elevators) 9551 (v); (elevator attendants) 1667; (heating, &c.) 1667; (H. of C. improvements) 1565 (i); (improvements) 9549 (v); (lighting) 1667; (museum) 754 (i); (new deptl. buildings, site, &c.) 9605 ; (rentals, &c. statement (read) 9605; (post office fittings) 9551 (v); (reconstruction) 1573; (Printing Bureau) 1575 ; (repairs, &c.) 1663 (i) ; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 9550 (v) ;

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY —*Con.*

Public Works— *Con.*

Royal Mint) 606 ; (steel shelving) 1564 (telephone) 1669; (Wellington St. paving) 1571; (western block, addition) 765 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Souris) 1047 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Actonvale) 1101; (Chicoutimi) 1106; (Dom., renewals) 1108 ; (Grosse Isle) 1108 ; (Lachute) 1111 ; (Levis) 1112; (Longueuil) 1113; (Magog) 1114; (Montmagny) 1117; (Montreal barracks) 1118; (Montreal Inland Rev.) 1119; (Montreal military buildings) 1125; (Montreal P.O. improvements) 1127; (Montreal warehouse) 1119 (i) ; (Quebec hospital) 9547 (v) ; (Quebec Immigration pier) 1138; (St. John's) 1143; (Sherbrooke drill hall) 1139; (Valleyfield) 1144 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (maintenance, &c.) 1666 (i).

Public Works—Dredging (new plant) 9604 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Campbellton wharf) 1744 (i); (Dipper harbour) 9588 (v); (St. John harbour) 9588; (tidal water wharfs) 9590 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.W. T. (Saskatchewan surveys) 9603 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 9576 (v): (Apple River wharf) 1728 (i); (Baddeck wharf) 9585; (Barrington wharf) 9581; (Battery Point) 9552; (Bourgeois inlet) 9581; (Devil's Island) 9551; (Economy wharf) 9579; (Frude's Point) 9581; (Glace Bay) 9577; (Half Island Cove) 9584; (Irish Cove) 9578; (Kelly's Cove) 9582 ; (Marble Mountain) 9580 ; (Parker's Cove) 9552; (Parrsboro harbour) 9579; (Parrsboro pier) 9578 ; (Petite Rivière) 9580; (Phinney's Cove) 9553; (Pierreville pier) 9581; (Porter's Lake) 9583; (Pugwash wharf) 9578; (Ray's Creek) 9576; (River Hebert) 9578; (Round Hill wharf) 9552; (Sydney Quarantine station) 9578 ; (Tatamagouche) 9579; (Toney river) 9581 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Barrie pier) 9595; (Crowe's landing) 9600; (Echo Bay) 9598; (Honora wharf) 9597; (Manitoulin wharf) 9597; (Meaford harbour) 9599; (Midland harbour) 9601; (Owen Sound) 9600 (v); (Port Arthur) 784; (Port Colborne 815 (i) ; (Rama wharf) 9602 ; (Rosseau wharf) 9600; (Saugeen) 9602; (Severn River) 9602; (Stokes Bay) 9598; (Trenton dredging) 9600 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (creosoted timber) 1737; (Higgin's pier) 1734 ; (McPherson's Cove) 1735; (Miminegash breakwater) 1735(i); (Mount Stewart) 9585 (v); (New London) 1735; (Point Prim Island) 1736; (repairs) 1737; (Richmond Bay) 1738; (Rustico) 1738; (St. Peter's Bay) 1739; (Summerside breakwater) 1739; (Wood Island) 1743 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse l'Ilot) 9591; (Beauce wharf) 9591; (Disraeli wharf) 9593; (Douglastown) 9592; (English river) 9591; (Grande Riviere de Beaupré) 9592; (Grondine wharf) 9592 (v); (harbour improvements, Que.) 770 (i) ; (Hospital wharf, Grosse Isle) 9608; (Lake Megantic) 9591; (Laprairie ice piers) 9590; (Lotbiniere wharf) 9592 (v); (Louise embankment) 7700; (Newport breakwater)

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works.—*Con.*
9592; (Oshawa harbour) 9660; (Percé wharf) 9592; (Petite Riviere) 9591; (Riviere aux Renards) 9592; (St. Alphonse wharf) 9591; (St. Genevieve piers) 9592; (St. Jean des Chaillons) 9592 (v); (St. Lawrence channel) 2472 (ii); (St. Mary's current) 814 (i); (Sorel deep water wharf) 9593 (v).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (temporary clerks) 9605 (v); (C.P.R. account) 9604; N.W.T. (QuAppelle-Edmonton) 9604; (Descente des Femmes) 9604; (Grosse Isle system) 9604; Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 9605 (v).
Public Works — Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay survey) 9547 (v).
Thames River Survey, Lake St. Clair Region, Completion and Cost (Ans.) 591 (i).
Toronto Drill Hall, in Com. of Sup., 1582 (i).
Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Zimmerman) in Com. (amt.) 4259 (iii).
Toronto Harbour Works, Tenders *re* Breakwater at Eastern Gap (Ans.) 1761 (i).
Toronto Pneumatic Postal Service, Contract *re* (remarks) 5921 (iii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
Transportation Commission, Reps. *re* (remarks) 9687 (v).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. D. Ross) on M. for 2°, 4701 (iii).
Ventilation in H. of Commons, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
——— Mr. Manny's Offer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9544 (v).
Wharfs, Construction, on Inquiry for Ret., 8181 (v).
——— Govt. Policy *re* Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1728 (i).
Wharfs, Piers, Docks, &c., Constructed by Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2777 (ii).
Whitby Wharf Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2190 (ii).
Wire Fencing Contract, on Inquiry for Copy (remarks) 5962 (iii).

Ingram, Mr. A. B., *East Elgin.*
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 677, 742 (i).
Assiniboia and Moose Mountain Indian Agency, Rep. of Inspector (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9337 (v).
Auditor General's Resignation and Amts. to Audit Act, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6523 (iv).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5461 (iii).
——— in Com. (Alberta Boundaries) 5650 (iii).
——— (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8061 (v); on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7781, 7820, 7939, 7982 (iv).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (election of members) 5779 (iii).
——— (lands vested in Crown) 5996 (iv).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8494 (v).
——— (Senate representation) 5682 (iii).
——— in Com., on Schedules (Athabaska) 8163; (Edmonton city) 8160; (Lethbridge) 8150; (Macleod) 8152; (Ponoka) 8156; (Sturgeon) 8162 (v).
Autonomy Bill, Census *re* Rural and Town Populations (remarks) 8094 (v).
——— Edmonton Election Contest (remarks) in Com., 5888 (iii).
——— date of election (remarks) in Com., 5890 (iii).
——— Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2587 (ii).
——— Official Report of Division (remarks) 5429 (iii).
——— School Clause Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5852 (iii).
——— School Clauses, Explanation *re* Amts. (remarks) 5819 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) *re* Mr. Belcourt's Charges, 3521 (ii).
See 'Edmonton,' 'Man.'
Bills from the Senate, on M. (Mr. A. Johnston) to place on Order Paper, 8096 (v).
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers, on Orders of the Day (remarks) 3583 (ii).
Cadet Corps, Ammunition supplied, &c (remarks) 7815 (iv).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4236 (iii).
See 'I.C.R.'
'Canada'-'Cape Breton,' Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2638 (ii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Total Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1922 (i).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 668; in Com. on Res., 1008; in Com., 1070 (i).
Census Enumerators, Appnmt. of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1076 (i).
Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 874 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8204 (v).
Commercial Agencies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7211 (iv).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 4551 (iii).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) in Com., 4976 (iii).
'Druid,' Expenditure *re* Maintenance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2703 (ii).
Drummond County Ry., Expenditure *re* (remarks) 1941 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Edmonton Election, Voters Lists, Refusal to Conservatives (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5852 (iii).
——— List of Voters, Names (read) 5855 (iii).
Exports and Imports, Monthly Rep. (remarks) in Com. of Cup., 7215 (iv).
Fishing Rights in N. Western Lakes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2900 (ii).
Gas and Electric Light Inspection, Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1692 (i).
Government Contracts B. 51 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1673 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Coal Supply (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2608 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3885 (ii), 4130, 4202 (iii).
——— on M. for 3°, 4228 (iii).
——— Summary Statements of C. A. Ry., 4231 (iii).
——— Statement *re* Mileage, 4223 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7622 (iv).
G. B. and Her Colonies, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes), Ques. of Order, 2402 (ii).
Immigrant SS. Contracts: *See* 'North Atlantic.'
Index to Hansard (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1570 (i).
I.C.R. and C. A. Ry. Act (running rights) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 3°, 4196 (iii); in Com., 6141 (iv).
I.C.R., on Annual Statement (Mr. Emmerson) 1903 (i).
——— Dining Cars, Losses *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2255 (ii).
——— Private Cars, Number, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2259 (ii).
——— Sidings and Spur Lines, in Com. of Sup., 1974 (i).
——— Supplies, Purchase of Oil (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2248 (ii).
——— Traffic Arrangements and Freight Diversions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2219 (ii).
——— Traffic Arrangements and Freight Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2234 (ii).
Jamieson, Dr., Payment to *re* Berens Agency (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).
Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com. on Res., 279; in Com., 710 (i).
Lead Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7222 (iv).
Live Stock Record Associations incorp. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 5083 (iii).
London Malitiamen and London Election (remarks) 7253 (iv).
Mail Bags, Locks, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 209 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*con.*
Manitoba Boundaries, 'Race and Religious Cry', Ref. to by Mr. Paterson (remarks) 4028 (ii).
——— M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 4073 (ii).
Metric System, Adoption *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1694 (i).
Mexico Steamers, Subsidies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1560 (i).
Midland Range Lights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2738 (ii).
Military Equipment for Defences, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 447 (i).
Montreal Bridge and Terminal Co.'s B. 138 (Mr. Piché) on M. for 2°, 4703 (iii).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2133 (ii).
Nixon, Mr., Dom. Lands Agents, Charges Against, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8109 (v).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, Termination of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9441 (v).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Erection of Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5714 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5589 (iii).
Oils, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7618 (iv).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 4969 (iii).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7281 (iv).
Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5792 (iii).
'Patent Record', Supply to Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1827 (i).
Père Marquette Ry. Co., Emplymt. of Aliens, Rep. *re* (remarks) 6232 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 7916 (iv).
Petroleum, Bounties *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7221 (iv).
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contracts, Tender of Conmee & Bowman, &c., on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4467 (iii).
P.E.I. Winter Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2678 (ii).
Public Works Rep., Date of Issue (remarks) 755 (i).
Ry. Act (crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 3244 (ii).
Railway Commission B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Ques. of Order, 1623 (i).
Railway Commissioners' Board, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1528 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Car (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1538 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Railway Commission Rep., Non-Production of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6235 (iv).
'Reptile Press,' &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1577 (i).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Election, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7339 (iv).
Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 103 (Mr. Tobin) on M. for 2°, 2297 (ii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Wrecking Plant, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2476 (ii).
Saskatchewan, Prov. of: *See* 'Autonomy.'
'Scout,' Str., Claims *re* Injuries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6463 (iv).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7425 (iv).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) to M. for 3°, 1880 (i).
Separate Schools, Issue of Circulars, &c. (remarks) 2410 (ii).
Statements of Mr. E. D. Smith *re* Cold Storage (remarks) 874 (i).
SUPPLY:
Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1703, 1723 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (aids to societies) 1829; (archives) 1826; (Can. exhibit, Imperial Institute) 1836 (i); (experimental farms) 6172 (iv); (statistics) 1827 (i).
Canals—Miscellaneous (surveys) 1521 (i); Trent (Holland River) 9360 (v).
Chinese Immigration (salaries) 983 (i).
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 6267 (iv).
Excise (inspectors' salaries) 1687; (methylated spirits) 1692 (i).
Fisheries (protection service) 2909 (ii).
House of Commons (sessional clerks) 6601 (iv).
Immigration (medical inspection, B.C.) 9230 (v).
Indians—B.C. (industrial schools) 6557 (iv).
Indians—General (Dr. Bryce, salary) 6558; (printing) 6558 (iv).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (implements) 9337 (v); (provisions, &c.) 6550; (seed grain) 6539 (iv).
Indians—Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6534 (iv).
Indians—N.W.T. (inspectors) 6548 (iv).
Indians—P.E.I. (medical attendance) 6537 (iv).
Inspection of Staples (grain inspectors) 7226 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7511 (iv).
Legislation (House of Commons) 6269 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoys) 2704; (salaries) 2703 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Mexico) 900 (i), 9622 (v); (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 935; (Halifax and Newfoundland) 906; (Manchester Line) 933; (Pasbebiac and Gaspé) 945; (Port Mulgrave and Canso) 935; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 929; (P.E.I. and Newfoundland) 943; (Quebec and Gaspé) 926 (i); (St. John and W. Indies) 7200 (iv); (wrecking plant) 959 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Miscellaneous (consolidation of statutes) 7246; (Dom. and Provincial accounts) 7241; (Mining Institute grant) 7248; (Pacific cable grant) 7240 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Aberdeen boilers) 6465; (Arctic expedition) 6471 (iv); (govt. steamers) 2608; (life saving awards) 2624; (life saving stations) 2635 (ii); (Mr. Low's honorarium) 6743 (iv); (schools of navigation) 2642 (ii); (steamers, maintenance) 6464 (iv); (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2662 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (heating) 1670; (repairs, &c.) 1665 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—General (clerk of works) 1642 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dom. renewals) 1634; (Virden drill hall) 1634; (Winnipeg, immigration) 1635; (Winnipeg, military stores) 1635; (Winnipeg P.O.) 1637 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Woodstock armoury) 1061 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Saskatoon) 1641 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 851, 860; (Sydney Mines) 1045 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Bridgeburg) 1550; (Guelph armoury) 1555; (Hamilton drill hall) 1559; (London military stores) 1562; (St. Mary's) 1578 (i).
Public Works — Buildings—Ottawa (coal sheds) 1565; (heating, &c.) 1667; (improvements) 1569; (lighting) 1668; (Museum) 756 (i); (new deptl. buildings, site, &c.) 9607 (v); (post office reconstruction) 1574; (repairs, &c.) 1663; (telephones) 1669; (Wellington St., paving) 1571 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Magog) 1116 (i).
Public Works—Dredging—Man. (snag boat) 7577 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (repairs, &c.) 7575 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Dauphin) 7571; (Lake St. Francis) 7572; (Selkirk) 7573.
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Campbellton wharf) 1744 (i); (Miscou harbour) 7499 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.W.T. (repairs, &c.) 7573 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Apple River wharf) 1730 (i); (Cow Bay, Port Morien) 7399; (Culloden) 7401; (Cunningham Point) 7402; (Devil's Island) 7402; (Digby pier) 7402; (Janvrin's Island) 7406; (L'Ardoise) 7407; (Lunenburg) 7408; (Main-à-Dieu) 7409; (Margaree) 7409; (Port Hood) 7414; (Scott's bay) 7415 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Amherstburg) 7546; (Bayfield pier) 7546; (Belle River) 7546; (Cobourg) 7549; (Collingwood) 7549; (Depot Harbour) 7552; (Goderich) 7553; (Grand Bend) 7554; (Lake Temiscaming) 7559; (Little Current) 7560; (Matchedash bay) 7560; (Oliphant harbour) 7561; (Owen Sound) 7562; (Point Edward) 7562; (Port Burwell) 7563; (Sarnia)7564 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (creosoted timber) 1737; (Point Prim Island) 1737; (Rustico) 1738; (St. Peter's Bay) 1739 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Canton Fabre) 7289; (Chateau Richer)

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY —*Con.*
Public Works.—*Con.*
7294; (Lake St. Peter piers) 6461 (iv); (St. Lawrence channel) 2476 (ii); (St. Simeon) 7393 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (architects) 7618, 7620; (cement testing) 7613; (clerical assistance) 7620 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges—N.W.T. (colonization roads) 7594, 7598 (iv).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (Gatineau River) 7631; (St. Maurice) 7582; (Upper Ottawa Co.) 7629 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Dom. generally) 7626 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—N.W.T. (Qu'Appelle and Edmonton) 7633 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 7636 (iv).
Post Office (mail bags, &c.) 209 (i).
Quarantine, &c. (public health, organized districts) 1845 (i).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, construction, &c.) 2289 (ii); (surveys, plans, &c.) 9495; (terminals, &c.) 9499 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings and spurs) 1974; (bridge strengthening) 1921 (i); (Cape Road crossing) 6432; (general vote) 7455 (iv); (gratuities) 2183 (ii); (locomotive machinery) 6428 (iv); (Mitchell bridge) 1940 (i); (revenue collections) 2219 (ii); (rolling stock) 1987 (i), 9519 (v); (St. Moise station) 1976; (steel rails, &c.) 1990; (Sydney Mines extension) 1988 (i); ties, &c.) 6430 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (Cardigan branch) 2175; (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2133 (ii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance) 1528 (i).
Steamboat Inspection (salaries) 2696 (ii).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration Act) 7208; (commercial agencies) 7211; (iron and steel bounties) 7216 (iv).
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 1697; (inspectors, &c.) 1692; (electric light inspection) 1696; (metric system) 1698 (i).
Thompson, Capt. Thos., Preventive Officer at Port Bruce, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1763 (i).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 710 (i).
See 'Labour.'
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. D. Ross) on M. for 2°, 4701 (iii).
Water Meters Inspection B. 188 (Mr. Broder) in Com., 9410 (v).
White, Mr. O., Dismissal from I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2211 (ii).
Wire Fencing: *See* 'N.W.T.'
Wrecking Plant, 'Lord Strathcona' in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
Wrecking Plants, Bonus to Capt. Leslie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2476 (ii).

Jackson, Mr. S. J., *Selkirk.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) in Com., sec. 16 (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8398 (v).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9400 (v).

Jackson, Mr. S. J.—*Con.*
Grasshopper Scourge, Man., Relief to Farmers (Ques.) 909 (i).
Manitoba Voters Lists, Control of by Dominion Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6783 (iv).
Ninety-Fifth Battalion, Reduction, &c. (Ques.) 909 (i).

Jackson, Mr. Wm., *West Elgin.*
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 2439 (ii).
Poultry Experiments on Farms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6184 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 6171 (iv).
Senate (contingencies) 6621 (iv).

Johnston, Mr. A., *South Cape Breton.*
Autonomy B. 69, Attack on 'Orangeism' (remarks) *re* in Com., 5877 (iii).
——— (election of members) in Com., 5776 (iii).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8461 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com., 5825 (iii).
Bills from the Senate (M). to place on Order Paper, 8096 (v).
Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Conspiracy, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. on Res., 553 (i).
Estimates, Obstruction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9273 (v).
Facer Steel Car Co.'s B. 27 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 1285 (i).
G. B. and Her Colonies, Inter-Imperial Parlt., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2398 (ii).
Hersey Relief B. 167 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) in Com., 7682 (iv).
I.C.R., Transportation Facilities *re* Fish Trade (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1931 (i).
McKenzie, Mr. D. D., Resignation, &c., Ques. of Order, 8475 (v).
Marine Offiecers at Halifax, Complaints *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2755 (ii).
Nixon, Mr., Dom. Lands Agent, Charges against, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8139 (v).
'Orangemen,' Attack *re* Quotations from Quebec Papers *re* (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 8350 (v).
Printing Bureau, Outside Printing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iv).
Ry. Commissioners, (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 553 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Com., 4999 (iii).
Rifle Range in Cape Breton (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9169 (v).

Johnston, Mr. A.—*Con.*

S. Africa and Canada SS. Service, Dates of Sailing, Values, &c., of Exports carried, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1397 (i).

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (dog-fish experiments) 9174 (v).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7520 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (keepers' salaries) 2698; (lightships) 2753 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Halifax and Canso) 938; (Manchester Line) 933; (P.E.I. and Nfld.) 940; (P.E.I. and Newfoundland) 7093; (St. John and W. Indies) 7197 (iv).
Militia (association rifle grants) 9169 (v).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 2598 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Cow Bay, Port Morien) 7399 (iv).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 7581 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 9512 (v); (steel rails) 2001 (i).

Telephone Grievances, on M. (Mr. Maclean), Discussion out of Order, 9535 (v).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s (B. 79) 1°*, 1671 (i).

Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 1773 (i).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) on M. for 3°, 8828; Ques. of Order, 8829 (v).

Wrecking Plants in St. Lawrence Channel (remarks) *re* Discussion, 2480 (ii).

Johnston, Mr. T. G., *West Lambton.*

Harper, Geo. Dance, Relief (B. 154) 1°*, 5919 (iii); in Com., and 3°, 6377 (iv).

Hersey, Arthur Howe, Relief (B. 167) 1°*, 6232; in Com., 7624, 7682 (iv).

International Terminal and Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 87) 1°*, 1933 (i); in Com., 3135 (ii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1357 (i).

Kemp, Mr. A. E., *East Toronto.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4922 (iii).

C.A.R. and I.C.R. : *See* 'Ry. B. 132.'

Canada Life Assurance Co., Ref. to in Com. on B. 108, 4692 (iii).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 640 (i).

Criminal Code (trading stams) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9425 (v).

Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 190 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9764 (v).

Dumping Clauses, Amts. to (remarks) in Com. on B. 190, 9767 (v).

——— Customs Instructions *re*, &c. (M. for copies) 695 (i).

Fog Horns : *See* 'Toronto Island'.

Hay, Free Transportation over I.C.R., &c. (Ques.) 59 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1929 (i).

Kemp, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Advertising Car, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2257 (ii).

——— Coal, Free Transportation, Quantity in 1902-1903, &c. (Ques.) 2065 (ii).

——— Coal carried to Ottawa free in 1902-1903 (Ques.) 2192 (ii).

——— Freight Rates, Increases, &c., on Explanation of Min. of Rys., 6124 (iv).

——— on Annual Statement (Mr. Emmerson) 1897 (i).

——— Passes Issued, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2257 (ii).

——— Purchases by Tender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2181 (ii).

——— Supplies, Purchase of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2251 (ii).

——— Traffic Arrangements with other Rys. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1915 (i).

Japan Trade Relations with Can., on Stmnt. (Mr. Fisher) 7911 (iv).

Loans by Govt., Temporary or Permanent, Total Amount, Rate of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 4921 (iii).

Oats, Rolled, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9764 (v).

Passenger and Freight Rates, Advancement of, Information *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1542 (i).

Pneumatic System in Toronto P.O., in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).

P.E.I. and I.C.R., Claims for Damages, Amounts paid (Ques..) 383 (i).

Printing Bureau, Printing of Reps., &c., in Com. of Sup., 1575 (i).

Railway Commission, Freight and Passenger Rates, Advancement *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1542 (i).

Railway Act (running rights) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6141, 6150 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Can. exhibits, Imperial Institute) 1836 (i).
Canals—Miscellaneous (repairs, &c.) 1547 (i); Trent (Holland River) 9360; (Surveys) 9354 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (London, barracks) 1562; (London, military stores) 1562; (Toronto, barracks) 1590; (Toronto, customs) 1581; (Toronto, drill hall) 1582; (Toronto, postal station) 1592 (i); (Toronto, P.O.) 1590; (Toronto, warehouse) 1587 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (H. of C. improvements) 1565; (paving Wellington street) 1571; (post office reconstruction) 1573; (Printing Bureau) 1575; (steel shelving) 1564 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Lachute) 1112; (Sherbrooke drill hall) 1141 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 1913 (i), 9386 (v); (double track) 1933 (i), 9390 (v); (revenue collections) 2204 (ii).
Railways—Miscellaneous (school of transportation) 9382 (v).

Kemp, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Railways—P.E.I. (air brakes) 2178; (Cardigan branch) 2171; (Summerside improvements) 2177 (ii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance) 1524, 1542 (i).
Toronto Drill Hall, in Com. of Sup., 1582 (i).
Toronto Island Fog Horn, Testing, &c., Complaints *re*, Cor., &c. (read) 9281 (v).
Trading Stamps : *See* 'Criminal.'
Water Meters Inspection B. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 9410 (v).
Western Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4692 (iii).
Yonge Street Bridge, Toronto, Order *re* Construction, Tel. *re*, &c. (Ques.) 586 (i).

Kennedy, Mr. J. B., *New Westminster.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5256 (iii).
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers (remarks) on Orders of the Day, 3583 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3200 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 7581 (iv).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8643 (v).

Lake, Mr. R. S., *Qu'Appelle.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3532 (ii); in Com. on Res., 5483 (iii).
——— (Alberta boundaries) in Com., 5661 (iii).
——— (C.P.R. lands) in Com., 6072 (iv).
——— (Crown Lands) 6036 (iv). 8257 (amt.) 8259 (v).
——— (date of Act) 8634 (v).
——— (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8026; on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7772, 7825, 7848, 7888, 7940 (iv).
——— (election of members) in Com., 5772 (iii).
——— (readjustment of representation) 5755 (iii).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8494 (v).
——— (seat of govt.) 8256 (v).
——— (Senate representation) 5676 (iii).
——— (subsidy to provs.) 6089 (iv).
——— on M. for 3°, Amt. (distribution of seats) 8862 (v).
Autonomy (Saskatchewan) B. 70, in Com., sec. 12 (distribution of seats) 8704 (v).
——— in Com., Schedules (Grenfell) 8757 (v).
——— (Crown lands) 8761 (v).
——— on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Scott) 8871 (v).

Lake, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*
Autonomy Bill, Census Statistics *re* Population (remarks) in Com. on B., 8093 (v).
——— Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2521 (ii).
——— (personal explanation) *re* Draft Bill, 1902, 4348 (iii).
——— School Clause Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5842 (iii).
See 'N.W.T., B. 156.' 'Priv., Ques. of.'
Bredt, P. M., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 189. 265 (i).
C.P.R. Tax Exemption, Interpretation *re* (Ques.) 730 (i).
Cement, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8995 (v).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 671 (i).
Dom. Lands, Open to Applicants, &c., Ref. to by Prime Minister (Ques.) 1935 (i).
Doukhobor Homestead Entries *re* Village Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
Electoral Lists for N.W.T., Names of Qualified Electors (Ques.) 7684 (iv).
Entennier, Mr. Henry, Entries for Homestead Lands, &c. (Ques.) 190 (i).
See 'Homestead.'
Fisher, Mr. P. G., Retirement, &c. (Ques.) 264 (i).
Fishing Rights in N. Western Lakes, Lease to F. H. Markey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2901 (ii).
Glanders arong Horses, Compensation *re* Slaughter (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6697 (iv).
Govt. Officials in N.W.T., acting as Political Partisans (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9267 (v).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9494 (v).
Hamelin and Gosselin, Sentence and Imprisonment, &c. (Ques.) 1849 (i).
Homestead Entries, Bogus Entries by Land Companies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9270 (v).
——— Henry Entennier's Location (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9268 (v).
See 'Entennier.'
Homestead Inspectors, Policy *re* Politicians (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iv).
Homestead Inspectors acting as political organizers (remarks) in Com of Sup., 9261; Prime Minister's speech (quoted) 9263 (v).
Homesteads for Residents, N.W.T., Second Applications, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2067 (ii).
Indian Agents acting as Magistrates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6545 (iv).
Indian Reserves, Sale of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9740 (v).

Lake, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*
N.W.T. Govt. Officials, Interference in Election Campaigns (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9713 (v).
Northwest Territories Representation Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Agents, 8772 (v).
Pollock, Mr. J. R., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 190 (i).
Porter, S., Dom. Lands Agent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9252 (v).
——— Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 190 (i).
Privilege (Ques. of) *re* Separate Schools, Par. in 'Globe,' 3649 (ii).
School Lands, Sold by Auction, in N.W. Ters., Number of Acres (Ques) 730 (i).
Schukin, Ivan, Cor. *re* Homestead Patent concelled (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6408; Cor., &c. (read) 6410 (iv).
Shaw, Mr. J. B., Retirement, &c. (Ques.) 264 (i).
——— Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2334 (ii).
Smart, Mr. Jas., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6419 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Arts—Agriculture, &c. (quinquennial census, N.W.T.) 9609 (v).
Dom. Lands (homestead inspectors) 6408 (iv), 9261; (land agents) 9252; (land sales) 9267 (v).
Govt. of N.W.T. (general vote) 9622 (v).
Immigration (agents G.B., &c.) 7698 (iv).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (annuities) 6538; (live stock) 6545; (surveys) 6552 (iv).
Inspection of Staples (grain inspection) 6901 (iv).
Quarantine (cattle) 6697 (iv).
Weights and Measures (inspection of staples) 9616, 9682 (v).
Wire Fence, Contract *re* N.W.T. Boundary Line, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5697 (iii).

Lalor, Mr. F. R., *Haldimand.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5055 (iii); (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8022; on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7941 (iv); (election of members) in Com., 5772 (iii); (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8510; on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8322 (v); (Senate representation) in Com., 5682 (iii).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) on M. for 3°, 8866 (v).
Autonomy Bills, Attack on Orangeism (remarks) in Com., 5902 (iii); School Clause Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5866 (iii).
Bank Notes lost in Circulation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6261 (iv).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 642 (i).
Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8210 (v),

Lalor, Mr. F. R.—*Con.*
Dredging, System of Hiring Dredges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6843 (iv).
Dunnville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1656 (i).
Fishing Rights, Lease to F. H. Markey, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2899 (ii).
Grenville Canal, Lumber for Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1515 (i).
I.C.R. Freight Rates, Increases, &c. on Explanation of Min. of Rys. 6134 (iv).
Jams, &c., Prosecutions *re* Adulteration, &c. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 1721 (i).
Kingston Lighthouse Depot, Establishment of (Ques.) 915 (i).
Lighthouse Depot at Prescott, Tenders *re* Contract (Ques.) 1340 (i).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6792 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Order with or without Tender (M. for ret.*) 1397 (i).
Marine, Deptl. Supplies, Inquiry for Ret., 2594 (ii).
Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5790 (iii).
Patent Medicines, Inspection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1726 (i).
Public Works Labourers, Emplymt. by Govt. *re* Political Influence (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6859 (iv).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 335, 1799 (i).
Sorel Workshops, Purchase of Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2488 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1703, 1727; (jams, &c.) 1721 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Can. exhibits at Imperial Institute) 1837 (i).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (live stock) 6541 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 2607; (winter mail service. P.E.I.) 2678 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—General (armouries) 1656 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (St. Peter's Bay) 1739 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Lake St. Peter piers) 6432; (Maskinonge River dredging) 6843; (Montmorency wharf) 6855 (iv).
Thessalon Postmaster, Mr. J. B. Dobey, Irregularities, &c., on M. for Sup., 6205 (iv).
Welland Canal, Emplymt. of Labour, Political Influence (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6855 (iv).
Wire Fencing, Contract *re* N.W.T. Boundary Line, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5698 (iii).

Lamont, Mr. J. H., *Saskatchewan.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4329 ; in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5563 (iii).

Lamont, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
Autonomy B. 69, in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8068; on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7893 (iv).
——— (election of members) in Com., 5768 (iii).
——— (lands vested in Crown) in Com., 6021 (iv).
——— (schools) Amt. 8491 (v).
Autonomy (Saskatchewan) B. 70, in Com. (Distribution of seats) 8712, 8743 (v).
Autonomy B. 69, School Clauses Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5825 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 58) 1°*, 986 (i); on Sen. Amts., 9078 (v).
Edmonton, Yukon & Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 62) 1°*, 1241 (i).
G.T.P. Ry., Location of Line from Winnipeg (remarks) 9814 (v).
Hudson's Bay Servants, Claims *re* Estate of Lord Selkirk, Cor. with Rev. Mr. Taylor (M. for copies*) 9698 (v).
Saskatchewan, Prov., Permanent Capital (remarks) 1596 (i).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln & Niagara.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3424 (ii).
——— in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7946 (iv).
——— (Hudson Bay Co. rights) 5948 (iii).
——— (Lt. Gov.'s powers) 5781 (iii).
——— (readjustment of representation) in Com., 5764 (iii).
——— School Clause Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5827 (iii).
Dom. Lands, B.C., Sale to Mr. T. W. Patterson, &c. (Ques.) 4371 (iii).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3208 (ii).
Farmington and Wilmot Mail Contractor, Name, Guarantee, &. (Ques.) 2330 (ii).
Franking Privilege, Abuse of, *re* Circulars of Dental Institute (remarks) 1807 (i).
G.T.P Ry. Terminals, Plans deposited with Govt., on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 2824 (ii).
Green, Samuel H., Postmaster at Kaslo, B.C., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2331 (ii).
Inverness Postmaster, Personal Duties, &c. (Ques.) 8885 (v).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9741 (v).
Kaslo Postmaster, S. H. Green, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2331 (ii).
Kent, Miss A., Dismissal as Postmistress at Kent, N.S. (Ques.) 2331 (ii).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6669 (iv).
Killarney and Little Current, Contractor *re* Mail Service (Ques.) 3669 (ii).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*
Labour Union Labels: *See* 'Union.'
Lake Ramsay and New Ross Postoffice Mail Service (Ques.) 9696 (v).
McDermot, Clara Bidwell Relief B. 152 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 6275, 6347; on M. for 3°, 6376 (iv).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. (B. 3) 1°*, 9; B. (withdrawn) 733 (i).
——— (B. 44) 1° m., 684; 2° m., 918, 1399 (i).
——— on M. for Adjnmt., 3249 (ii).
Patterson, T. W., Sale of Dom. Lands to, in New Westminster, B.C. (Ques.) 4371 (iii).
Postmasters acting as Ret. Officers, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6244 (iv).
Railway Act (1903) Amt. (B. 2) 1°*, 9; 2° m., 281; in Com., 312, 1780 (i), 3223 (ii).
Railway Commission Rep., Non-production of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6236 (iv).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to M. for 3°, 1885 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Welland (lowering head of lock No. 1) 6309; (Vanderburg, Stephen, claims *re* injuries) 6306 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Post Office (contingencies) 6244 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Chatham armoury) 1553; (Cobourg armoury) 1555; (Military College stables) 1562; St. Catharines drill hall) 1578; Ottawa Post Office reconstruction) 1573 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Apple River wharf) 1732; Ont. (Port Colborne) 815 (i).
Thessalon Postmaster, Dismissal *re* Irregularities (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6226 (iv).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 1776 (i).
Welland Canal Employees during Oct., Nov. (Ques.) 453 (i).

Lapointe, Mr. E., *Kamouraska.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) in Com., sec. 2 (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8565, 8615 (v).

Laurence, Mr. F. A., *Colchester.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4745, 4753 (iii).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) in Com., 4972; on M. for 3° (amt.) 5113 (iii).
Fishery Overseers in Colchester Co., N.S., Number and Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 5978 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, construction, &c.) 2288 (ii).

Laurier. Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G. (Prime Minister), *East Quebec.*
Address, on The, 36 (i).
——— (M.) to present to His Ex., 50 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*

Address, The, Reply to from His Ex. (presented) 1340 (i).

'Agnes Donahoe,' Schr., Seizure by Uruguayan Govt. (remarks) 6108, 6137 (iv).

Agriculture Committee, Meetings, &c. (remarks) 404 (i).

Alberta Bill : *See* 'Autonomy.'

Alberta Steamer Service, Number of Navigable Miles, &c. (Ans.) 6904 (iv).

Alien Labour Law, Amts. *re* (remarks) 6232 (iv).

See 'Telegraph,' &c.

Animals slaughtered under Contagious Act, Compensation (remarks) on conc., 6914 (iv).

Anthracite Coal and Ry. Co.'s Pet., on M. (Mr. Galliher) to present, 4550 (iii).

Arctic Expedition, Capt. Peary's Voyage (remarks) 4753 (iii).

Ashcroft and Cariboo Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ans.) 3670 (ii).

Ashcroft Water and Light Co., Lease of Land, &c. (Ans.) 2492 (ii).

Ash-Wednesday, Adjournment (M.) 2112 (ii).

Associated British Canadian Society and Labour Dept., Complaints *re* Graeme Hunter (Ans.) 2189 (ii).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co., Payments to (remarks) 7021 (iv).

Atlantic SS. Service, Shipping Space and American Shippers (remarks) 5428 (iii).

Auditor General and Audit Act, on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 9627 (v).

Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (presented) 271 (i).

——— Part I (presented) 109 (i).

——— on Inquiry for, 51, 97, 1151 (i).

Aud. General's Resignation, Legislation *re* Audit Act (Ans.) 590 (i).

Autonomy (Alberta) B. (No. 69) in Com. on Res., 5434, 5479 (iii); 1° m., 1421 (i); 2° m., 2915 (ii); (M.) for Com., 5423 (iii).

——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5601 (iii).

——— (B.N.A. Act, s. 2) 5719 (iii), 8526 (v).

——— (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8564, 8571 (v).

——— (C.P.R. lands) 6051 (iv).

——— (date of Act) 8634 (v).

——— (distribution of seats) 7724 (v); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8010; on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7817, 7821, 7922 (iv).

——— (Hudson Bay Co. rights) 5954 (iii).

——— (legislative assembly) 5815 (iii).

——— (schedules *re* constituencies) 5815 (iii).

——— (school clause amt.) 7145 (iv), Amt. (m.) 8269; on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8495 (v).

——— (Senate representation) 5674 (iii).

——— (Subsidy clause) in Com. on Res., 5489 (iii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*

Autonomy (B. 69) 3° m., 8777 (v); on Amt. (Mr. Scott) C.P.R. Land Taxes to M. for 3°, 8792 (v); on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8852 (v).

——— in Com. on Schedules (Gleichen) 8153; (Macleod) 8152; (Pincher Creek) 8153 (v).

Autonomy (Saskatchewan) B. (No. 70) 2° m., 5424 (iii) 8698; in Com., 8702 (v).

——— (distribution of seats) 8705 (v).

——— (Moosejaw) 8758 (v); 3° m., 8866; on Amt. (Mr. Scott) to M. for 3°, 8874 (v).

Autonomy Bills, Alberta, Province of, Financial Clauses (prop. res.) 2913 (ii).

——— Approval by Cabinet (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2268 (ii).

——— on Constitutionality of, &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2196 (ii)..

——— Debate *re*, on Personal Explanation (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2045.

——— Delay in Printing (remarks) 1671 (i).

——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 6836 (iv).

——— Franchise System (remarks) 5477 (iii).

——— Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2502 (ii).

——— Information asked for in Rets., on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 3091 (ii).

——— on Inquiry for Papers, &c. (remarks) 2595 (ii).

——— Lt. Gov. Salaries) (prop. res.) 8693 (v).

——— Meridian Divisional Line between Alberta and Saskatchewan, Letter (read) 8634 (v).

——— Notice of Amendment, &c. (remarks) 2761 (ii).

——— Notice of Procedure (remarks) 3169 (ii).

——— Number of Votes polled, Census, &c., (List read) in Com. on Bill, 7733 (iv).

——— Official Report of Division (remarks) 5429 (iii).

——— Population *re* Saskatchewan Boundaries (remarks) 5920 (iii).

——— Printing, &c. (remarks) 1755, 1788 (i), 8762 (v).

——— Provincial Rights, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn., 1751 (i).

——— Ry. Subsidies to Provs., &c. (remarks) 4202 (iii).

——— (remarks) 262 (i).

——— on Resignation of Hon. C. Sifton (remarks) 1866 (i).

——— Resolutions *re* (remarks) 1594 (i).

——— Saskatchewan, Province of, Financial Clauses (prop. res.) 2914 (ii).

——— Schedules *re* (remarks) 4375, 4750 (iii).

——— Schedules, Population and Votes cast (remarks) 5576 (iii).

——— Schedules *re* Saskatchewan (remarks) 5475 (iii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Autonomy (B. 69) Second Reading, &c. (remarks) 2022, 2112 (ii).
See 'Manitoba Boundaries.'
Badgley Island Timber Cutting, Licenses granted (Ans.) 452 (i).
Ballot Boxes, Payments to Mr. Cayouette (remarks) 989, 1337 (i).
Ballots, Blank, Method of Issuing, Complaints *re* S. Lanark and Ottawa (Ans.) 1342 (i).
——— Printing, &c., for Carleton, Glengarry, &c. (Ans.) 587 (i).
——— Procedure *re* Printing, &c. (Ans.) 911 (i).
Banking, Act Amt., Legislation (remarks) 2442 (ii).
Binder Twine Mounties paid, &c. Statement (read) in Com. of Sup., 7221 (iv).
Blair, Mr., Resignation, &c. and Re-hearing of N.W. Cases (remarks) 56 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ry. B. No .36, 511 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Tel., 697 (i).
Boissevain Postmaster, Mr. Alex. McKnight, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2328 (ii).
Borden, Mr. R. L., Congratulations to *re* Election (remarks) 624 (i).
Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Co.'s B. 179 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 8655 (v).
Bredt, Mr. Emplymt. by Govt., 190, 265 (i).
B.C. Immigration Legislation, Dissallowance of (Ans.) 6475 (iv).
Britton, Judge, Rep. *re* Investigation, on Inquiry for Ret., 1152 (i).
Brunet, Mr., G.T.P. Ry. Commissioner, Resignation of (remarks) 5036 (iii).
Business of the House, Ms. for Sup., &c. (remarks) 1241 (i)..
——— notices of motions (remarks) 9523 (v).
——— Cold Storage discussion (remarks) 8181 (v).
See 'Govt. Business.'
Cabinet Changes, Mr. Aylesworth's Position (remarks) 1336 (i).
Cabinet Vacancy (remarks) 4086 (iii).
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers (remarks) on Orders of the Day, 3562 (ii).
Cabinet Vacancy, Interior Dept., Information *re* (remarks) 3450 (ii).
——— Minister of Public Works, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn. 5474 (iii).
——— Representation in N.W. Ters. (remarks) 3252 (ii).
See 'Autonomy,' 'Resignation,' 'Hudson,' 'Ministers,' 'Oliver,' 'Public Works.'
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4236 (iii).
Can. Atlantic Ry., Purchase of by G.T.R. (remarks) 69 (i).
See 'I.C.R.'

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
C.P.R. Land Taxation, Judgment of Sup. Court (remarks) 2023 (ii).
Canadian detained on U.S. Borders (remarks) 5921 (iii).
Canadian Shippers via Atlantic SS. Co.'s and Armour's Contracts (remarks) *re* B. 45, 4235 (iii).
Carbide purchased by Marine Dept., Quantity and Price (Ans.) 915 (i).
Castonguay, A. B., Cause and Report *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 6653 (iv).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 631 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) *re* Resolution, 631 (i).
Château Richer, Removal of Obstruction (remarks) 1154 (i).
Chesley Postmastership Vacancy, Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 9081 (v).
Child Immigration to Can., Assistance by Govt. (Ans.) 1341 (i).
Child Immigration, Mrs. Close's Scheme (Ans.) 1936 (i).
Choquette, Judge, Date of Resignation and Appnmt. to Senate (Ans.) 1344 (i).
Civil Service Appnmts. since 1896 (Ans.) 585 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 5808 (iii), 6232 (iv).
Civil Service Examiners Rep. (presented) 5428 (iii).
Civil Service List (presented) 51 (i).
Clarke, Mr. E. F., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 2108 (ii).
Coal, Anthracite, Quantity used by Govt. (Ans.) 192 (i).
Colonial Conference and Tariff Discussions (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7099 (iv).
Colson, F., Appnmt. and Salary (Ans.) 8147 (v).
Commercial Agencies in G.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7208 (iv).
——— Letter *re* Mr. Jackson's Ability (read) in Com. of Sup., 7210 (iv).
Commercial Agents in Quebec, Collection of Taxes on (remarks) 9811 (v).
Committees, Sel. Standing (M.) 7 (i).
——— Lists (presented) 60 (i).
——— (conc.) 111 (i).
——— Addition of Names (M.) 110, 624 (i), 3090 (ii), 5210, 5576 (iii).
——— Changes of Names (M.) 227 (i).
Commodities, Packing and Sale (B. 152) 1°*, 5960 (iii).
Congdon, F. T., Appnmt. as Legal Adviser (Ans.) 7020 (iv).
Criminal Code (appeals) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) on M. for 3° (amt.) 9699 (v).
Consumption : *See* 'Tuberculosis.'

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9430; on M. for 3°, 9525 (v).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Passenger Rates, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6836 (iv).
Debates, Official, Sel. Com. (M.) 111 (i).
——— (M.) to add Name, 3090 (ii).
——— 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 5034 (iii).
——— on M. to conc. in 7th Rep., 9802 (v).
'De Lévis,' Str., Hydrographic Surveys, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 914 (i).
Demers, Mr. L. J., Decease of (remarks) 5139 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amts., Bills, Consideration during Recess (remarks) 9813 (v).
Dom. Lands, Open to Applicants, Ref. to in Speech (Ans.) 1935 (i).
——— Sale, &c., on Inquiry for Ret., 2006 (ii).
Dukus Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber, &c. (Ans.) 3202 (ii).
Easter Adjournment (M.) 4750 (iii).
——— (remarks) 4375, 4458 (iii).
Election, General, 10th Rep. (presented) 8001 (v).
Electoral Lists in N.W.T., Names of qualified Electors, &c. (Ans.) 7422, 7684 (iv).
'Emigration of State Children,' Cor. with Mr. C. Kinloch Cooke *re* (Ans.) 5478 (iii).
Entennier, Mr. Henry, Entries for Homestead Lands (Ans.) 190 (i).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Abandonment by Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 188 (i).
Estimates (1905-6)—(presented) 58 (i).
Estimates, Delay in bringing down and efficient Criticism, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) 9096 (v).
Exports and Imports, Returns, Issue of Monthly Rep. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7214 (iv).
Fencing Wire, Inspection by Govt. (Ans.) 585 (i).
See 'Wire.'
Fisheries Industry, Commission *re*, Recommendation, &c., on M. (Mr. Gamong) 6312, 6339 (iv).
Freight Rates : *See* 'Canadian Shippers.'
Georgian Bay Canal, Reps., &c. (Ans.) 192 (i).
Georgian Bay Islands, Jurisdiction Ontario and Dom. (remarks) 6487 (iv).
Georgian Bay, Lake Huron, &c., Fisheries, Requests *re* Investigation (Ans.) 5479 (iii).
Geographical Board of Canada, Rep. (presented) 625 (i).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays (M.) 3361 (ii).
——— Precedence on Wednesdays and Thursdays (M.) 820 (i).
See 'Business.'

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Graeme, Hunter, Complaints *re* Immigration Frauds (Ans.) 2189 (ii).
Grain Inspectors, List (read) in Com. of Sup., 7224 (iv).
Grain Survey Board, Pets. *re* Appnmts., on M. (Mr. Ames) for Cor. 1766 (i).
——— Recommendation of Montreal Board of Trade (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7232 (iv).
Grand Bend Pier, Delay in Building (Ans.) 1344 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3649 (ii), 4205, 4226; on M. for 3° (remarks) 4228 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry., Plans deposited with Dept. of Rys, on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 918 (i).
——— Question answered by Govt. (remarks) 1596 (i).
——— Surveys, Information given out of Dept. of Rys., &c. (remarks) 2008 (ii).
——— Surveys, Reps. to Commission, &c. (remarks) 229 (i).
——— Survey of Route Moncton to Winnipeg Information *re* (remarks) 6135 (iv).
——— Terminals at Winnipeg, Cor., &c. (remarks) 9812 (v).
——— Terminus at Port Arthur, Ques. of Order, 6138 (iv).
Grass Seeds, Quantity exported (Ans.) 913 (i).
G. B. and Her Colonies, Inter-Imperial Parlt., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2392 (ii).
Half-Breed Claims unsettled, Complaints *re* (remarks) 9814 (v).
Half-Breed Scrip, Charges, *re* Mr. McDonald, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) 7675 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 7100 (iv).
——— Further Papers, on Inquiry for, 9029 (v).
——— Instructions to Judge Myers, *re* Charges (remarks) 8180 (v).
——— Instruction to Judge Myers, on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) 7723 (iv).
——— Investigation, Appmnt. of counsel (remarks) 8528, 8697 (v).
See 'Nixon.'
Half-Breed Scrip to Non-residents, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 6569 (iv).
——— Patents *re* (remarks) 6907, 7020 (iv).
——— Statements *re*, 8777 (v).
Halifax Fishery Awards, Payments to Provs., Ref. *re* (Ans.) 2065 (ii).
Hamilton and Kilbride Mail Contract, Cost of, &c. (Ans.) 9080 (v).
Herring Fishing Industry, Rep. of Commission, Printing, &c. (remarks) 4552 (iii).
High Court of Justice, Ont., Appnmt. *re* (remarks) 5209 (iii).
Highway Crossings : *See* 'Ry. B. 2.'

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Hudson's Bay, Sovereignty of Can. (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5609 (iii).
Immigrants deported, Nationalities, Number, &c. (Ans.) 1847 (i).
——— (remarks) *re* Question, 1592 (i).
Immigrants, Examination *re* Qualifications (Ans.) 2188 (ii).
——— False Representations to (remarks) *re* Bills, 8178 (v).
——— Number arriving in 1904 (Ans.) 1148 (i).
——— Office, G.B., Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 593 (i).
See 'North Atlantic.'
Indian Dept., Promotion of Mr. Bray (statement) 6920 (iv).
Indian Affairs, Report (presented) 111 (i).
I.C.R. and C.A. Ry. Act (running rights) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 4191 (iii).
I.C.R., Sydney Station, Collections for Freight, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Ret., 1768 (i).
Interior, Appnmt. of Minister (remarks) 4200 (iii).
——— Appnmt. of Dep. Minister (Ans.) 4371 (iii).
——— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 453 (i).
——— Minister of (remarks) 1152 (i).
——— Vacancy *re* Interior Dept. (remarks) 3362 (ii).
See 'Cabinet.'
Internal Economy Committee (M.) 8 (i).
——— Rep. *re* Proceedings (remarks) 9076 (v).
International Waterways Commission, Appnmt. of (remarks) 701 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7218 (iv).
James Bay Lobsters, Investigation by Govt. (Ans.) 6475 (iv).
'James W.,' Schooner, Rescue of Crew by SS. 'Durango' (remarks) 4199 (iii).
Johnson, T. G., Late, M.P., Decease of (remarks) 8694 (v).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9752 (v).
Killam, Judge, Appnmt. as Chairman of Ry. Commission, on M. for Com. on Ry. B., 36, 511 (i).
Killarney and Little Current Mail Service, Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 3670 (ii).
Kingston Lighthouse Depot, Establishment of (Ans.) 915 (i).
Labour, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 54 (i).
Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com. on Res., 279; in Com., 703, 918; on M. for 3°, 1779 (i).
Leach, R. E. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1065, 1151 (i).
Lead Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7222 (iv).
Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Legal, M'gr., Quotation *re* Separate Schools, N.W.T. (Ans.) 6188 (iv).
Library and Printing Com. (M.) to add Name, 5686 (iii).
Life Boat Crews, N.S., Number, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 912 (i).
Lighthouse Depot at Kingston, Establishment of (Ans.) 914 (i).
Live Stock Record Association B. (remarks) 5808 (iii).
Live Stock Record Associations, Delay to Farmers (remarks) 5577 (iii).
Lloydmaster and Meridian Line between Provs. of Alberta and Saskatchewan (remarks) 8634 (v).
Lobster Canning Licenses in District No. 1, Govtl. Intention (Ans.) 910 (i).
Logberg Printing Co., Winnipeg, Payments to (Ans.) 4373, 4457 (iii).
London Militiamen and London Elections (remarks) 7256 (iv).
London and North Oxford Bye-Election, Issue of Writs (notification) 6311 (iv).
See 'Returning,' &c.
Lowville to Milton, Mail Service, Cost of Contract, &c. (Ans.) 9080 (v).
McCormack & Sharples, Messrs, Patent Relief, on M. (Mr. Calvert) to receive Pet. (objection) 6559 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries, Former Pets. *re* (remarks) 4084 (iii).
——— Mr. Jackson's Speech *re* Settlement (remarks) 4844 (iii).
——— O.C. of March 21st, 1905 (remarks) 3745 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. W. J. Roche) for Copies, 1768 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, M'gr. Sbarretti's Demands from Man. Govt. (stmnt.) 3834; Cor., &c. (read) 3841 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 3947 (ii).
Manitoba Election Returns (remarks) 1672 (i).
——— Duties of Returning Officers) 1507, 1633 (i), 4679 (iii).
Manitoba Farmers, Relief *re* Grasshopper Scourge (Ans.) 909 (i).
Man. and N.W.T. Govt. Officials, Resignations, &c., 1904 (Ans.) 1345 (i).
Manitoba School Fund, Amount paid, Amount claimed (Ans.) 379 (i).
Martin, Eli, Emplymt. in Customs Dept. (Ans.) 7097 (iv).
Militia, King's Regulations and Orders, Report (presented) 54 (i).
Mimiegash Breakwater, Contracts *re* Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 1350 (i).
Ministers of Finance and Interior, Absence, &c. (remarks) 323 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Montreal Harbour Sheds, Claims of P. Lyall & Sons (Ans.) 687 (i).
——— (remarks) *re* Ques., 697 (i).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness, Collections, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 403 (i).
Morning Sittings (M.) 9081 (v).
Nicolas, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) on conc., 9685 (v).
Nixon, Mr., Charges against, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8116 (v).
——— on Inquiry for Papers, 6048 (iv).
——— Investigation *re* (remarks) 8698, 9788 (v).
See 'Half-Breed.'
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, Protests *re* (remarks) 8887 (v).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9446 (v).
N.W. Mounted Police Pay (B. 8) prop. Res., 59; in Com. on Res., 98 (i); 1°*, 110; 2° m., and in Com., 459 (i).
N.W. Ters. B.: *See* 'Autonomy'.
N.W.T. Govt. Officials, Interference in Elections, Statement of Policy, on M. for Sup., 9721 (v).
N.W.T. Grazing Leases (remarks) *re* Question, 5478 (iii).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°*, pro forma, 5 (i).
Oliver, Hon. Frank, Appmnt. as Minister of Interior (notification) 4200 (iii).
Ontario Boundaries, Cor. with Dom. Govt., on Inquiry for (Mr. Barker) 3591 (ii).
——— Cor. with Ross Govt., on Inquiry for, 4078 (ii).
Ontario-Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2763 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com. (M.) to ref. to Special Com., 1888 (i); in Com., 3176 (ii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Number of Employees (Ans.) 382 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Expenditures *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7280 (iv).
Oxford, N., Issue of Writ, &c. (remarks) 6136 (iv).
——— Resignation of Mr. D. D. McKenzie (remarks) in Com. on Autonomy Bill, 8475 (v).
Pacific Cable Grants by Imp. Govt., Statement (read) in Com. of Sup., 7276 (iv).
Papal Ablegate : *See* 'Manitoba Boundaries'.
Parent, Hon. S. N., Appnmt. to Transcontinental Ry. Commission (remarks) 699 (i).
Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5799 (iii).
Patterson, T. W., Sale of Dom. Lands to in New Westminster, B.C. (Ans.) 4372 (iii).
Penny Banks, Charters, Stmnt. of Business, &c. (Ans.) 687 (i).
Petroleum Crude, Bounties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Pictou Cattle Disease, Investigation and Experiments *re* Cause (Ans.) 9079 (v).
Pollock, Mr. J. R., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 190 (i).
Port Arthur, &c., Dredging Contract, Ques. of Order *re* Irrelevancy of Debate, 4666, 4674 (iii).
Port Burwell Dredging Contract, Purchase of Dredge, &c. (Ans.) 8656 (v).
Porter, Mr. Sydney, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 190 (i).
Postmaster General's Dept. Rep. (presented) 54 (i).
Post Office Assessment System, Collections *re* (Ans.) 3671 (ii).
Post Office Regulations *re* Distribution of Packages, &c (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6835 (iv).
Preston, W. T. R., Immigration Agents, Salary, Reps., &c. (Ans.) 452 (i).
——— Visit to Canada (Ans.) 451 (i).
P.E.I. and G. B. Mail Subsidy, Statement (read) in Com. of Sup., 7088 (iv).
P.E.I. and Mainland, Mail Service, Delays, &c. (remarks) 280 (i).
P.E.I. and W. Indies SS. Subsidy, Amount paid, Representations *re* (Ans.) 591 (i).
Printing Bureau, Enlargement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6948 (iv).
Private Bills, Extension of Time, &c., on M. (Mr. Gervais) 2203 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Grant) 448 (i).
Prorogation, Probable Date (remarks) 9801 (v).
Provincial Autonomy : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Provincial Rights, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn., 1749 (i).
Provincial Stock as Trust Investments in G.B., Cor., &c. (remarks) 9540. (v).
Provincial Subsidies, Readjustment of, on M. (Mr. Carvell) for Ret., 2103 (ii).
Public Works, Minister of, Rumour *re* Resignation (denial) 5035 (iii).
Public Works, Acting Min. of, Unconstitutionality of, &c. (remarks) 1938 (i).
Public Works, Delay in Rep. (remarks) 601 (i).
Public Works Portfolio (remarks) 6047 (iv).
Quebec Bridge *re* G.T.P. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2296 (ii).
Quebec Political Crisis (explanation) 825 (i).
——— Ques. of Order, 823 (i).
Ry. Act (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 282; in Com, 1787 (i).
Railway Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) Quels. of Order, 320 (i).
Railway Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com., 511 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Railway Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 Ques. of Order, in Com., 1621 (i).
Ry. Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman (remarks) 54 (i).
——— Board of Maintenance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1534 (i).
——— Opinion of Min. of Jus. *re* (remarks) 6233 (iv).
——— on M. for Sup., 6233 (iv).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 2262 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4751 (ii).
Royal Military Act Amt. B. 169 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6971 (iv).
Royal Mint, Ottawa; in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
Ret. Officers, Deputy, Delay *re* Payments (remarks) 6560 (iv).
Returning Officers at Elections, Instructions *re* Form of Oath, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7333 (iv).
See 'London.'
St. Abdon Post Office, Establishment of, &c. (Ans.) 6653 (iv).
St. Francois Wharf, Expenditure *re* in Fall of 1904 (Ans.) 1344 (i).
Salvation Army and Immigration, Cor. *re* (Ans.) 7684. (iv).
Saskatchewan Boundaries, Addition to (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5622 (iii).
——— Conference *re* (remarks) 8268 (v).
Saskatchewan Prov., Permanent Capital (remarks) 1596 (i).
See 'Autonomy.'
Sbarretti, M'gr. : *See* 'Manitoba Boundaries.'
School Lands sold by Public Auction in N.W. Ters. (Ans.) 730 (i).
'Scout' Str., Explosion of Acetylene Gas, Investigation *re* (remarks) 4842 (iii).
Secretary of State, Deptl. Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 8147, 8656 (v).
——— Deptl. Report (presented) 5428 (iii).
Selkirk Ret. Officer, Occupation (Ans.) 1762 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Indemnity B. 202 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9729 (v).
Separate School Pamphlet, Preparation by Official Authority (Ans.) 2006, 2328 (ii).
Sessions, Earlier Meeting (remarks) in Discussion on Estimates, 9096 (v).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall, Purchase of Site, &c., (Ans.) 191 (i).
Sherbrooke Post Office, Improvements, &c. (Ans.) 192 (i).
Sifton, Hon. Clifford, Resignation (explanation) 1851 (i).
Silver Coins, Worn, &c., Redemption (Ans.) 688 (i).
Smart, Dep. Min. of Interior, Resignation (remarks) 115 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Smart, Resignation and Employment by Govt. (Ans.) 4371 (iii).
Speaker, Election (M.) 1 (i).
——— Dep. (M.) to appoint, 50 (i).
Speeches of Members, Delay in Printing Bureau (remarks) 7724 (iv).
Supply Bill 168, 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 6966 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c.—Experimental Farms (bulletins) 6931 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Finance (salaries) 118 (i); Geological Survey (contingencies) 6248 (iv) ; (salaries) 122 ; High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 120; Indian Affairs (salaries) 116; Interior (contingencies) 116; (salaries) 114; Militia (salaries) 112; Miscellaneous (noon gun, &c.) 121; N.W.M. Police (salaries) 78; Privy Council (salaries) 71 (i).
Culling Timber (salaries) 7236 (iv).
House of Commons—Library (salaries) 6944 (iv).
Indians Generally (agricultural grants) 237; (land management fund) 236; (legal expenses) 237; (St. Regis lockup) 237; Mar. Provs. (schools) 225; Ont. (blankets, clothing) 225; (medical attendance) 223; (surveys) 236; Que. (Oka band) 235; (schools) 225 (i).
Inspection of Staples (grain inspectors) 7224 (iv).
Legislation—General (printing, and binding, &c.) 6948; (laws, printing, &c.) 6948; (voters' lists) 6954; H. of Commons) 6269 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and New Zealand) 7094; (France and Can.) 7094; (Murray Bay and River Ouelle winter nav.) 7091; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 7088; (P.E.I. and Newfoundland) 7092; (St. John, Halifax and London) 7087; (St. John and W. Indies) 7087, 7176; (Victoria, Vancouver and Skagway) 7091; (wrecking plant) 7094 (iv).
Militia (permanent force) 9158 (v); (Royal Military college) 7004 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Academy of arts) 6959; (Can. Temperance Act) 6957; (Dom. and Provincial accounts) 6959 ; (N.W.M. Police) 6957 (v); (Naturalization Act) 6957; (Pacific cable grant) 7276; (Paris agency) 6958; (printing) 6957; (secret service) 6958 (iv).
N.W. Mounted Police (pay of force, &c.) 8657; (Yukon Force) 8662 (v).
Pensions (compensations) 6956 ; (Fenian Raid) 6956 ; conc., 6961 ; (militiamen 1885) 6957 ; (N.W.M. Police) 6957 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (generally) 7284 (iv); Ottawa (Royal Mint) 607, 612 (i).
Quarantine—General (cattle) on conc., 6914 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, construction, &c.) 2283 (ii); I.C.R. (working expenses) 6907 (iv); Ry. Commission, Board of (maintenance) 1534 (i); Transcontinental (surveys) on conc., 6910 (iv).
Senate (contingencies) 6943 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration Act) 7204; (commercial agencies) 7208; (iron and steel bounties) 7216 (iv).
Supreme Court, N.S., Vacancy *re* (remarks) 5036 (iii), 6837 (iv).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Supreme Court Reports, Delay in Printing (Ans.) 1342 (i).
Sutherland, Hon. James, Decease of (remarks) 5316 (iii).
Telegraph Lines in Canada and Americans violating Alien Labour Act, on M. (Mr. Monk) to adjn., 7645 (iv).
Telephone Committee's Rep. (remarks) 9687 (v).
Telephone Grievances, and Tel. Com. Rep. (remarks) on M. (Mr. Maclean) 9535 (v).
Telephone Lines, Pet. *re* Municipal Control, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1248 (i).
Thermograph Records *re* Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Henderson) for Copies, 1767 (i).
Tignish Breakwater, Tenders *re*, &c. (Ans.) 7018 (iv).
Timber Sales in Man. and N.W.T., Advertisements *re* (Ans.) 7098 (iv).
Tison, B. Aimé, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6475 (iv).
Toronto, Centre, Vacancy, Issue of Writ (statement) 3362 (ii).
——— Registration, &c. (remarks) 3251 (ii).
Trading Stamps, Abolition of, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 5425 (iii), 7684 (iv).
——— (remarks) 5134 (iii).
——— Rels. from Boards of Trade *re* Legislation (Ans.) 6903 (iv).
See 'Criminal Code.'
Transcontinental Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman (remarks) 7916 (iv).
See 'G.T.P.'
Transportation Commission, Complete Membership, &c. (remarks) 321 (i).
——— Interim Rep., on Inquiry for (remarks) 731 (i), 2595 (iii).
——— Mr. Reford's Appnmt. (announcement) 492 (i).
——— Rep. *re*, (remarks) in Com. on B. 45, 4226 (iii).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on M. (Mr. Perley) for Special Com., 8636 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. Perley) to conc., 9522 (v).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8637; on M. for 3°, 8818 (v).
Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 8696 (v).
Veterans of 1886 and 1870, Grant of Lands (remarks) 6047 (iv).
Voters' Lists for Man., Printing, &c. (Ans.) 60 (i).
Voters' Lists, Preparation and Revision for Algomas, &c. (Ans.) 594 (i).
Walsh, Major John, Superannuation and Appnmt. of Mr. Binks (Ans.) 8146 (v).
Walton, Mr. R. M., Arrest by U.S. Authorities in the South (remarks) 4200 (iii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfred. G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 6966 (iv.)
Wharfs Construction, on Inquiry for Ret., 8179 (v).
Wire Fence along N.W.T. Boundary Line (Ans.) 5478 (iii).
——— Letter from Dep. Min. Cory (read) 5689 (iii).
——— Letter from Hon. Mr. R. F. Sutherland (read) 5691 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5580 (iii).
———on Inquiry for Ret., 5808 (iii).
Wire Fencing, Inspection of (Ans.) 686 (i).
Yonge Street Crossing Bridge, Construction, &c., Tel. *re* to Mayor (Ans.) 586 (i).
Yukon Commissionership, Vacancy *re* (remarks) 5036 (iii).
Yukon Elections, Delay in Ballot Box Opening (remarks) 988 (iii).
Yukon Ter., Ordinances Rep. (presented) 54 (i).
Yukon Elections Return of Member Elect, Telegrams (read) 1066 (i).
——— Returning Officer (remarks) 1152 (i).
——— Ret. Officer, &c., on Cor. with Govt. (remarks) 1259 (i).
Yukon Reforms *re* Condition of Govt (remarks) on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 7073 (iv).

Lavergne, Mr. A., *Montmagny.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3745; in Com. (school clause amt.) 7152 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8348, 8373 (v); (B.N. A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) dual language, 8556, 8612; on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) dual language, 8842; (personal explanation) *re* not voting, 8866 (v).
——— Orangemen, Attack on, Ques. of Order, 8365 (v).
Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 179) 1°*, 7642 (iv).
By-Elections, Resignations of Members, &c. (remarks) 7423 (iv).
Canada Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 178) 1°*, 7642 (iv).
Edmonton, Election *re* (remarks) 4201 (iii).
I.C.R. 'Maritime Express,' Running Time (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6831 (iv).
Legal, Mgr., Quotation *re* Separate Schools in N.W.T. (Ques.) 6187 (iv).
Liege Exhibition, and Prov. of Quebec, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 9698 (v).
London By-Election, Resignation of Member for S. York (remarks) 6384 (iv).
Newspapers Sensational Reports *re* Interviewing Prisoners (remarks) 3250 (ii).
Owen, David Thos., Patent Relief (B. 177) 1°*, 7642 (iv).

Lavergne, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Public Buildings erected since Confederation, Cost, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1398 (i).

Ry. Act (1903) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 281 (i).

SUPPLY :

Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7534 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Mitchell Bridge) 1943 (i).

Lavergne, Mr. L., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*

Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8235 (v).

Drummond Co. Ry., Expenditure *re* (remarks) 1943 (i).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1283 (i), 3172 (ii).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A., *Prince, P.E.I.*

Anglo-American Tel. Co., Agreement *re* Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7606 (iv).

——— Subsidy Increases, &c. (Ques.) 108 (i).

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 678 (i).

Binder Twine Industry at Kingston (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 486 (i).

Canso Herring Industry and Bait Freezers, &c. (Ques.) 1146 (i).

Cascumpec Sandhills Channel, P.E.I., Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 2773 (ii).

Cornwall Canal, Employees during Election Campaign (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1223 (i).

Fisheries Protection Service Strs., Monthly Pay-roll, &c., Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1350 (i).

Fishermen for Cod Fisheries, P.E.I., Immigration of from Ireland, &c. (Ques.) 586 (i).

Hay exported from Quebec to Boston, Number of Tons (Ques.) 689 (i).

Herring Industry and Bait Freezers, Canso, Establishment of (Ques.) 1146 (i); 5425 (iii).

House of Commons, Rooms for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 253 (i).

Howard's Cove, P.E.I., Surveys, &c. *re* Wharf (Ques.) 4703 (iii).

'Lurcher' Lightship, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2747 (iii).

Marconi Station at Table Head, Delay in Operating (Ques.) 383 (i).

Marconi Tel. System on Strs. 'Stanley' and 'Minto' (Ques.) 188 (i).

Midland Harbour Range Lights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2855 (ii).

Miminegash Breakwater, Contract *re* Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 1350 (i).

Miminegash River Dredging, Commencement of Work, &c. (Ques.) 3834 (ii).

Murray Harbour Branch Ry. and Hillsborough Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2127, 2168 (ii).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Ocean and River Service, Amt. of Payments on Pay-roll, &c. (Ques.) 1349 (i).

Oyster Culture, Depletion in P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2911 (ii).

P.E.I. Mail Service, Delay, &c. (remarks) 1152 (i), 2261 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).

PE.I. Ry., West Cape Branch Survey (Ques.) 589 (i).

P.E.I. Steam Communication, Contract with Steam Navigation Co. (Ques.) 5316 (iii).

P.E.I. Steam Communication, Snow Blockade, &c. (remarks) 1753 (i).

P.E.I. Tel. : *See* 'Anglo-American.'

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Investigation *re* Soundings for Pier at Cape Carleton, &c. (M. for cor.) 2778 (ii).

——— Pet. from Travellers *re* Delay, &c. Refund of Expenditure, &c. (Qpes.) 4807 (iii).

Rural Mail Delivery, Cost of, &c. on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Ret., 2096 (ii).

Summerside Drill Shed (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1562 (i).

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (oyster culture) 2911 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (P.E.I. and G.B.) 7690; (P.E.I. and Newfoundland) 7092 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (examination of masters and mates) 2624; (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2677 (ii).
Public Works — Dredging — P.E.I. (new dredge) 6891 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Cape Tormentine) 7497 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Apple River wharf) 1731 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Higgin's pier) 1734; (Miminegash) 1735; (Rustico) 1739; (Summerside breakwater) 1739 (i).
Public Works — Telegraphs — Mar. Provs. (Bay St. Lawrence) 7606 (iv).
Railways — G.T.P. (surveys,, construction &c.) 2286 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (general vote) 7495 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (Cardigan branch) 2171 ; (Murray Branch and bridge) 2127 (ii); (Murray Harbour) 7494; (Summerside improvements) 2176 (ii).

Tignish Breakwater, Tenders *re*, &c. (Ques.) 7018 (iv).

Wire Fencing, Inspection by Govt. (Ques.) 585, 685 (i).

Lemieux, Hon. R. (Solicitor General), *Gaspé, Nicolet.*

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5445 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3304 (ii); in Com., (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8546 ; (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8457 (v).

——— in Com. on Schedules (Stony Plain) 8160 (v).

Lemieux, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers, on Orders of the Day, 3557 (ii).

Companies' Act Amt. B. 187, 1° m., 8528 (v).

Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9435 (v).

Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3207 (ii).

Fessenden Wireless Tel. Co. of Canada incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6381 (iv).

Fisheries Industry, Commission *re* Investigation, Recommendation, &c., on M. (Mr. Ganong) 6342 (iv).

Gillies Brothers, Limited, B. 95 (Mr. A. A. Wright) in Com., 2763 (ii).

Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6669 (iv).

Lévis, Purchase of Land for I.C.R. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6669 (iv).

McDermot, Clara Bidwell, Relief B. 152 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 6353 (iv).

Orangemen, Attack *re* 'Yellow Dog' Quotations (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 8350 (v).

——— 'Yellow Dog,' &c., Translation (read) 8367 (v).

'Protestants driven out of Quebec,' Ref. to in Speech on Autonomy Bill, 3305 (ii).

Provident Savings Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5975 (iv).

St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Defective Boilers in Dredges, Litigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2470 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 934; (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 945; (Quebec and Gaspé) 926 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal Inland Rev.) 1122 (i)..

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Hawkesbury) 6838 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Doucet's Landing) 6849 (iv); (Grande Riviere de Beaupré) 9592 ; (Laprairie ice piers) 9590; (Maskinonge river) 9590 (v); (Montmorency wharf) 6852 (iv); (Petite Rivière) 9591 (v); (St. Maurice River dredging) 6852 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (Mitchell bridge) 1941 (i).

Lennox, Mr. H., *South Simcoe.*

Auditor General and Audit Act (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 9623 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6525 (iv).

Auditor General's Resignation, Acceptance by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6522 (iv).

——— Legislation *re* Audit Act (Ques.) 590 (i).

Audit Office and Treasury Board, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 1935 (i).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4112, 4136 (iii).

——— (election of members) in Com., 5778 (iii).

——— (laws, courts, &c.) 5930 (iii).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Autonomy B. 69 (schools) on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8365 (v).

——— (subsidy to provs.) in Com., 6088 (iv).

Autonomy Bill, Official Report of Division (remarks) 5432 (iii).

——— Pets. circulated in Quebec (remarks) 2574 (ii).

Cabinet, ex-Ministers' Annuity B. 203 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 9738 (v).

Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers, on Orders of the Day (remarks) 3580 (ii).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co's B. 22 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 1100 (i).

Campaign Literature and Franking Privilege, &c. (remarks) 1813 (i).

Canadian Cattle, British Embargo, Par. in Montreal 'Star' (read) 454 (i).

Cardinal Canal, Claims of Contractors: in Com. of Sup., 1221 (i).

Cement, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8988 (v).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 654, 672, 1082, 1467 (i).

Cornwall Canal Employees during Election Campaign (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1225 (i).

Criminal Code Amt. (B. 23) 2° m., 733 (i).

Dom. Lands Act, Regulations *re* Yukon Ter., on M. (Mr. Oliver) to approve, 9784 (v).

Fruit Marks Act. (staple commodities) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5982 (iv).

Geological Survey Museum, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 760 (i).

Glanders among Horses, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6698 (iv).

Grain Carrying via I.C.R., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1920 (i).

G. T. Ry., Appeal to Judicial Committee, &c. (Ques.) 9080 (v).

G. T. P. Ry., Plans deposited with Dept. *re* Terminals, on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 2823, 2833 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act (guarantee bonds) Amt. B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8677 (v).

I.C.R., Supplies purchased, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2249 (ii).

Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9753; in Com., 9793 (v).

Live Stock Record Associations incorp. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5922 (iii).

Military Camp at S. Simcoe, Establishment of (remarks) 9712 (v).

Murray Harbour and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2146 (ii).

Northwest Territories B. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 8763; in Com., 8768 (v).

Orangemen, Attack *re* 'Yellow Dog', Quotations from Quebec Newspapers (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 8365 (v).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5741, 5970 (iv).

Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1311 (i).

Ry. Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 495; in Com. on Res., 575; in Com., 1602; on M. for 3° (amt.) 1802; Neg. (Y. 47; N. 93) 1805 (i).

Railway Commission, Board of, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1528 (i).

——— staff salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1541 (i).

——— Rep., Opinion of Min. of Jus. *re* (remarks) 6233 (iv).

——— Rep. of Board, Preparation of (remarks) 2007 (ii).

——— Rep., Inquiry for, 2685 (ii), 6136 (iv).

Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment in Can., Probable Cost, &c. (M. for reps., &c.) 2067 (ii).

Saskatchewan, Prov. of: *See* 'Autonomy.'

Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 326, 1202, 1789; on M. for 3° (amt.) 1882; on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) to M. for 3°, 1872 (i).

Senate and House of Commons Indemnity B. 202 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9727 (v).

Statutes Revision, Indexing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8673 (v).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock records) 6682 (iv).

Canals—Cornwall (enlargement) 1220; Galops (enlargement) 1220; Grenville (guide piers) 1500; North Channel (dam) 1230; Trent (construction 1420; (surveys) 1484; Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1311; (stone protection) 1497; (surveys) 1237 (i).

Indians—Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6522 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse repairs) 6642; (Port Arthur, &c., fog alarms) 6645 (iv).

Miscellaneous (revision of statutes) 8673 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Toronto warehouse) 1589; Ottawa (museum) 760; Que. (Montreal P.O., improvements) 1129; (Montreal P.O., pneumatic system) 1138 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Barrie pier) 9595 (v).

Quarantine (cattle) 6690, 6698 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (traffic arrangements) 1920 (i); P.E.I. (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2146 (ii); Ry. Commission (maintenance) 1528 (i).

Trent Valley Canal, Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 1311 (i).

Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) on M. for 3°, 1779 (i).

Vancouver Dry Dock, Suppression of Portion of Cor. (remarks) 1317 (i).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) on M. for 3°, 8826 (v).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Water Meters Inspection B. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Res., 8675 (v).

Waterways and Transportation Problem, Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 1311 (i).

Yukon Regulations: *See* 'Dom. Lands Act'.

Leonard, Mr. J. E. E., *Laval.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5393 (iii).

——— in Com., sec. 2 (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8617; (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8427; on M. for 3°, Amt. (schools) 8857; (Amt.) 8882; neg. (Y. 6; N. 124) 8882 (v).

Militia Officers gazetted *re* Examinations (Ques.) 8886 (v).

Political Crisis in Quebec, Explanation asked for, 822 (i).

——— Par. from 'Le Journal' (remarks) 753 (i).

——— 'Le Soleil's' Attitude (remarks) 830 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Terrebonne) 7394 (iv).

Trading Stamps, Res. from Boards of Trade *re* Legislation (Ques.) 6903 (iv).

Lewis, Mr. E. N., *West Huron.*

Anticosti Lightships, Expenditures *re* (Ques.) 1850 (i).

'De Lévis' Str., Hydrographic Surveys, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 914 (i).

Fisheries Protection Steamers, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1347 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service Steamers, Ports of Call, &c. (Ques.) 1850 (i).

Lighthouse Service, Aids to Navigation, Applications *re* Improvements, &c. (M. for ret.*) 917 (i).

Lurcher and East Point Lightships, Price, to Contractors, Renewals, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2333 (ii).

——— Memoranda to Dep. Min., &c. (M. for copies*) 2333 (ii).

Ocean and River Service Strs., Names and Tonnage, &c. (Ques.) 1347 (i).

P.E.I. Mail Service, Delays, &c. (remarks) 1153 (i).

Public Works, Contracts awarded, Lowest Tenders, &c. (M. for ret.*) 916 (i).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Miscellaneous (inspection, &c.) 1513; Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1280 (i).

Waterways and Transportation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1280 (i).

Logan, Mr. Hance J., *Cumberland.*

Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Conspiracy, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. on B. 36, 531 (i).

Cables of the Empire, Cor. *re* with Govt. (M. for copies*) 1397 (i).

Logan, Mr. Hance J.—*Con.*
Calgary, Red Deer and Battleford Ry. Co.'s (B. 19) 1° m., 318 (i).
Dominion Annuity Co.'s incorp. B. 82 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 2768 (ii).
House of Commons, Rooms for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 252 (i).
Immigration, Fraudulent Representations (B. 120) 1° m., 2323 (ii); in Com., 9699 (v).
Judges' Appnmt. and Promotion, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. on B. 36, 531 (i).
Montevideo, Imprisonment of British Seamen (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2691 (ii).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1707 (i).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3172; on Amt. (Mr. Stewart) to M. for 3°, 3397 (ii).
Personal Explanation *re* Ottawa City Voting, 562 (i).
Ry. Commissioners (chairman) Appnmt. of B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 531 (i).
SUPPLY :
Marine Hospitals (shipwrecked seamen) 2688 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Apple River wharf) 1733 (i).
Telephone Systems, Investigation *re* on M. (Sir Wm. Mulock) for Sel. Com., 2683 (ii).
Voting at Ottawa Elections (personal explanation) 562 (i).

Loggie, Mr. W. S., *Northumberland, N.B.*
I.C.R. Freight Rates, Increases, &c. on Explanation of Min. of Rys., 6133 (iv).

Macdonald, Mr. E. M., *Pictou.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 9 (i).
Anthracite Coal imported into Canada, Amount, &c. (M. for ret.*) 9697 (v).
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) in Com., on sec. 16 (schools) on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8288 (v).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 46) 1° m., 728 (i).; in Com., 4236; 3° m., 4412 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 58 (Mr. Lamont) on Sen. Amts., 9078 (v).
Govt. Steamers, Coal Supply (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2605 (ii).
G.T.Ry. and Can. Atlantic Ry. Purchase (B. 45) 1° m., 727 (i); in Com., 2765, 3649, 3879 (ii), 4123, 4202 ; on M. for 3°, 4229 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers—N.S., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).
I.C.R. Employees Pensions (remarks) *re*, 9029
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9750 (v).
'Lady Laurier,' Number of Crew, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2616 (ii).

Macdonald, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
'Lurcher' Lightship, Expenditure *re* Accident (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2755 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 3992 (ii).
Naturalization and Aliens Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8690 (v).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1709 (i).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5747 (iii).
Ottawa City Act Amt. B. 180 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8687 (v).
Pictou Cattle Disease, Investigation and Experiment *re* Cause, &c. (Ques.) 9079 (v).
SUPPLY :
Fisheries (dog-fish experiments) 9174 (v).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Magdalen Islands) 907; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 921 (i).
Militia (permanent force) 9167 (v).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 2602 ; (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2659 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Phinney's Cove) 9567; (Tatamagouche) 9580; (Toney river) 9581 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 9509 (v).

Macdonnell, Mr. A. C., *South Toronto.*
Alexandria P.O., Contract *re* Delay, &c. (Ques.) 1760 (i).
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 2421 (ii).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5240 (iii).
Canadians' Mining Rights in S. Africa (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9530 (v).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr Fisher) in Com., 647, 1085, 1471 (i).
Commercial and Manufacturing Industries, Statistics *re* (remarks) in Com. on B. 5 1085 (i).
Dredging Vessels, Cost of Buliding (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6892 (iv).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) on M. for 1°, 986 (i).
Immigration of Skilled Labour and Toronto Labour Council, on M. (Mr. Foster) 7510 (iv).
I.C.R., Pension Scheme for Old Age (Ques.) 2492 (ii).
——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 9288 (v).
Life Insurance Companies Funds, Total Amount, Par Value, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3204 (ii).
Monterey Electric and Gas Co.'s (B. 89) 1°*, 2005 (ii).
Paper Goods Co.'s Patent Reilef (B. 68) 1°*, 1421 (i).
Port Stanley Harbour, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1760 (i).

Macdonnell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Rondeau Harbour Works, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1761 (i).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 351, 372 (i).
South Africa and Canadian Mining Rights: *See* 'Canadians Mining,' &c.
Statutes, Revision of, Completion, &c. (remarks) 745 (i).
SUPPLY:
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7542 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (heating) 6823 (iv); General (armouries) 1657; (clerk of works 1647; Ont. (Toronto barracks) 1589; (Toronto, drill hall) 1582; (Toronto, warehouse) 1583 (i).
Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (new dredges) 6891 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Pointe au Baril route) 6888; (Port Dover) 7564; (Toronto, breakwater) 7567; (Toronto, eastern entrance) 7565 (iv).
Toronto Drill Hall, in Com. of Sup., 1582, 1657 (i).
Toronto Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 1583 (i).
Toronto Harbour, Eastern Entrance, Fog Signals, Alarms, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
——— Expenditure for 1880 to 1904 (M. for ret.*) 403 (i).
——— Straightening Don River (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6888 (iv).
——— Tender *re* Breakwater at Eastern Gap (Ques.) 1761 (i).
Toronto Island Fog Horns, Testing, &c., Complaints *re* (remarks) 9283 (v).
Toronto Post Office, Erection of a new Building (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6833 (iv).

MacLaren, Mr. A. F., *North Perth.*
Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8206 (v).
Cornwall Canal Employees, Names, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1221 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agr. Com., 5001 (iii).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1182, 1798 (i).
Sheep Disease (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6714 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance) 1539 (i).

Maclean, Mr. A. K., *Lunenburg.*
American Fishermen on N.S. Coasts, Protection *re* (remarks) 7907 (iv).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5276 (iii).
Autonomy B. 69 School Clause Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5856 (iii).

Maclean, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*
Coal, Anthracite, Quantity used, Total Expenditure, &c. (Qeus.) 192 (i).
SUPPLY:
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and W. Indies) 7203 (iv).

Maclean, Mr. W. F., *South York, Ont.*
Address, The, 42 (i).
Alien Labour: *See* 'Naturalization.'
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 745 (i).
Arctic Expedition, Capt. Peary's Voyage, &c. (remarks) 4753 (iii).
Autonomy (Alberta) B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5481; (subsidy) 5515; on M. for 2°, 5401; (objections) 5424 (iii).
——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5607 (iii).
——— (B.N.A. Act) 5729, 5749 (iii).
——— (C.P.R. lands) 6050 (iv).
——— Crown lands) 8172 (v).
——— (distribution of seats) 7727; Newspaper Rumours, Quotations (read) 7744 (iv).
——— (Hudson Bay Co. rights) 6049 (iv).
——— (lands vested in Crown) in Com., 5986, 6008 (iv).
——— (laws, courts, &c.) in Com., 6102 (iv).
——— (readjustment of representation) in Com., 5754 (iii).
——— (Senate representation) in Com., 5678 (iii).
——— on Schedules, sec. 25 (Athabasca) 8163; (Saskatchewan) 8161; (Stony Plain) 8157 (v).
Autonomy Bills, Alberta Boundaries, Letter *re* Naming of Province (read) 5637 (iii).
——— Franchise System (remarks) 5476 (iii).
——— (remarks) on Introduction of Min. of Int. *re* Election, 5235 (iii).
——— Par. in 'Le Soleil' (M.) to adjn., 1745 (i).
——— Res. *re* (remarks) 1594 (i).
——— Unconstitutionality of, &c. (M.) to adjn., 2199 (ii).
See 'Manitoba.'
Bank Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8689 (v).
Blair, Mr., Resignation, &c. (remarks) 55 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ry. B. 36, 497 (i).
Budget, The., Date of Delivery (remarks) 4920 (iii).
Business of the House, Motions for Supply, &c. (remarks) 1241 (i).
Cabinet ex-Ministers, Annuity B. 203 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 9738 (v).
Cabinet Vacancy, Minister of Public Works (M.) to adjn., 5471 (iii).
See 'Public Works,' 'Ministers.'
C.A.R. and I.C.R.: *See* 'G.T.R.'
Canada Southern Bridge Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. German) in Com., 1287 (i).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Canadian Canals Corporation B. 72 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 2°, 1757 (i).
Canadian Cattle, British Embargo (remarks) 456 (i).
Canadian Hard Wheat, Drawback by U. S. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 746 (i).
C.P.R. Land Taxation, *re* Municipalities, Judgment of Sup. Court (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2022 (ii).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 635 (i).
Commercial Agents in Quebec, Tax collected, &c. (remarks) 9811 (v).
Corporations, Trusts, &c. (remarks) in Deb. on Address, 42 (i).
Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 190 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9764 (v).
Express Cos. : *See* 'Ry. B. 4.'
Facer Steel Car Co.'s B. 27 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 1285 (i).
Fessenden Wireless Tel. Co. of Canada incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6380 (iv).
Fitz-Simons, Jane Marie, Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6379 (iv).
Franking Privilege, Abuse of, &c. (remarks) 1808 (i).
Freight Rates, Discrimination, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 891 (i).
See 'Ry. B. 4.' &c.
Glanders among Horses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6693 (iv).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3362 (ii).
Gov. Gen.'s Instructions, Changes, &c. (remarks) 227 (i).
G. T. Ry. Arbitration B. 199 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 1°, 9279 (v).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 2765, 3649, 3880 (ii).
G. T. Ry. and Can. Atlantic Ry., Purchase of, &c. (remarks) 728 (i).
G.T.P. Ry., Interim Report (remarks) 6310 (iv).
——— Surveys, O.C. *re* Commission (remarks) 229 (i).
——— Surveys, Reps. in Ry. Dept., &c. (remarks) 2009 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers—N.S., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).
Highway Crossings : *See* 'Ry. B. 2.'
House of Commons, Rooms for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 239, 251 (i).
Hudson Bay, Sovereignty of Can. (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5608-5609 (iii).
Imperial Guarantee and Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2771 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act (guarantee bonds) Amt. B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8679 (v).
Insurance Cos., Legislation *re* (remarks) in Com., on B. 200, 9689 (v).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Res., 9740 (v).
Killam, Judge, Appnmt. as Chairman of Ry. Commission (remarks) on B. No. 36, 497 (i).
Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com. on Res., 279; in Com., 705; on M. for 3°, 1779 (i).
Live Stock Record Associations, Delay to Farmers, &c. (remarks) 5577 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions, Information *re* System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 924 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Demands *re* Separate Schools from M'gr. Sbarratti, 3852 (ii).
——— on M. to adjn., 3983 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. W. J. Roche) for Copies, 1768 (i).
Ministers, Absence of (remarks) 1285 (i).
Naturalization and Aliens Act Amt. (B. 184) (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8689 (v).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Erection of Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5706 (iii).
N.W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 8 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 462 (i).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 1891 (i); on M. for 3°, 2325, 2714 (ii), 6346 (iv).
Oats, Rolled, in Com., on B. 190, 9764 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2725 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 9818 (v).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) on M. to ref., to Sel. Com., 1889; in Com., 1283 (i), 2951, 3170 (ii); on Amt. (Mr. Stewart) to M. for 3°, 3394 (ii).
——— Letter from W. A. Littlejohn, Toronto City Clerk (read) 3170 (ii).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5737 (iii), 5964 (iv).
Political Debts, Payment of, &c., Ref. to Speech on Man. Boundaries, 3857 (ii).
Port Arthur and Fort William Telephone System and Board of Railway Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Copies of Cor., 1387 (i).
P.E.I. Ry. and Murray Branch, Expenditure up to 1st Jan., 1905 (Ques.) 106 (i).
Private Bills—Extension of Time, on M. (Mr. Grant) 449 (i).
Provincial Rights, Par. in 'Le Soleil' (M.) to adjn., 1745 (i).
Public Buildings, Govtl. Policy *re* (remarks) 1027 (i).
Public Works, Acting Minister of, Unconstitutionality of, &c. (remarks) 1936 (i).
See 'Cabinet.'
Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 299 (i).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Railway Act (express companies) (1903) Amt. (B. 4) 1°*, 9 (i); on M. for Adjnmt. (remarks) 3246 (ii).
——— M. to withdraw, 3743 (ii).
——— (remarks) 109, 1619 (i).
Ry. Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 566; on M. for 2°, 745; on M. for Com., 497; in Com., 1597 (i).
——— (amt.) *re* Express Cos., 1619 (i).
———Appnmt. of Chairman, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 320 (i), on Ques. of Order, 320 (i).
——— Ques. of Order *re*, 514 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 76 (Mr. Campbell) on M. for 2°, 1757 (i).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 53; in Com., 54; in Com., 328 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Indemnity B. 202 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9731 (v).
Sifton, Hon. C., Resignation *re* (remarks) 1856 (i).
Sovereign Fire Assurance Co. of Can., B. 26 (Mr. E. F. Clarke) in Com., 1755 (i).
Spirits in Bond, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8679 (v).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock records) 6682 (iv).
Canals—Trent (Holland river) 9360; surveys) 9354 (v).
Canals—Welland (electric light plant) 9377 (v); (Port Colborne elevator) 1273 (i).
Chinese Immigration (salaries) 981 (i).
Dom. Lands (surveys) 9306 (v).
Geological Survey (surveys, &c.) 8669 (v).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7543 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 864; (Can. and S. Africa) 974; (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 945 (i); (St. John, &c., and W. Indies) 8691 (v).
Northwest Mounted Police (pay of force) 8660 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Canso) 1027 (i) ; Ottawa (additions to H. of C.) 9546 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Point Prim Island) 1736 (i).
Railways—G.T.P. (construction) 9498; (surveys, plans, &c.) 9493 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 9385 (v); (general vote) 7450, 7469 (iv); (rolling stock) 9501 (v).
Quarantine (cattle) 6693 (iv).
Telephone Grievances and Rep. of Telephone Com. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9533 (v).
Telephone Com. Rep. (remarks) 9687 (v).
Telephone Lines, Pet. *re* Municipal Control, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1244 (i).
Telephone Systems, Investigation into, on M. (Sir Wm. Mulock) for Sel. Com., 2683 (ii). *See* 'Port Arthur.'
Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Timber Regulations *re* Cutting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9297 (v).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3659 (ii).
U.S. Tariff Drawbacks on Raw Materials, on M. for Sup., 746 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8639 (v).
Wire Fencing : *See* 'N.W.T.'
Macpherson, Mr. R. G., *Vancouver City*
Bills from Senate (M.) to place on Order Paper, 8001 (v).
Canadian Cattle, British Embargo (remarks) 455 (i).
C.P.R. Steamers, Coal Loading Methods (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2615 (ii).
Century Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 49) 1°*, 817 (i); in Com., 2765 (ii).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9434 (v).
House of Commons, Rooms for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 251 (i).
Inter-Imperial Parlt. between G.B. and Her Colonies, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2357 (ii).
Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Ry. Co.'s Pet. (presented) 3744 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3172 (ii).
——— Postponement, 1338 (i).
Pet. *re* Autonomy Bill, Ques. of Privilege, 2680 (ii).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1317 (i).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Prefontaine) in Com., 2119 (ii).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7427 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Chinese Immigration (salaries) 983 (i).
Immigration (medical inspection, B.C.) 9230 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Royal Mint) 609 (i); Harbours and Rivers, B.C. (Langley) 7575 (iv).
Trading Stamps : *See* 'Criminal Code.'
Vancouver and Coast Kootenay Ry. Co.'s (B. 131) 1°*, 4081 (iii).
Vancouver Dry Dock, Suppression of Portions of Cor. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1317 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8317, 8649 (v).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s (B. 42) 1°*, 625 (i).
Yukon, Reforms *re* Govt. of Country: (remarks) on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 7067 (iv).

McCarthy, Mr. L. G., *North Simcoe.*

Autonomy Bill, 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4086 (iii).

——— in Com. (Hudson Bay Co. rights) 5949 (iii).

——— (laws, courts, &c.) 5935, 5940 (iii).

Autonomy B. 69, Attack *re* 'Orangeism' (remarks) in Com., 5909 (iii).

——— (M.) to adjn. Debate, 4078 (ii).

Edmonton Election, Date of, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5893 (iii).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 115) 1°*, 2185 (ii); in Com., 7621, 7677; 3° m., 7853, 7857 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 3963 (ii).

Midland Harbour Range Lights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2736 (ii).

Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2718 (ii).

Parry Sound Buoy Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2732 (ii).

Sifton, Hon. C., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill (remarks) 1860 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. (B. 6) 1°*, 58; 2° m., 315; M. to ref. to Special Com., 316 (i).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Trent (surveys) 9358 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoys) 2732 (ii).

McCarthy, Mr. M. S., *Calgary.*

Acres of Undisposed Lands in Provisional District, N.W.T. (M. for ret.*) 601 (i).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5495 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3332 (ii); on M. for 3°, amt. (distribution of seats) 8857; neg. (Y. 42; N. 97) 8859 (v).

——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5604, 5669 (iii).

——— (Crown Lands) 8262 (v).

——— (distribution of seats) 7734 (iv); Amt. to ref. to Judges, 7744; moved, 7770, 7819, 7931 (iv).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8017 (v).

——— (election of members) 5766, 5809 (iii).

——— (H. of C. representation) 5752 (iii).

——— (laws, courts, &c.) 5944 (iii).

——— (readjustment of representation) 5753 (iii).

——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8494 (v).

——— (seat of government) 5781 (iii), 8247 (v).

——— in Com., on Schedules (Athabasca) 8163; (Cardston) 8149; (Gleichen) 8153; Amt. 8166; (High River) 8155; Medicine Hat) 8149 (v).

Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) in Com., (distribution of seats) 8727 (v).

McCarthy, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*

Autonomy Bill, Mr. Haultain, Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2515 (ii).

——— Schedules, Preparation of (remarks) 5477 (iii).

Edmonton Election, Voters' Lists, Printing of (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5863 (iii).

Experimental Farms, Establishment of, in Alberta, N.W.T. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6170 (iv).

Lesser Slave Lake P.O., Establishment of Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 7018 (iv).

——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 69 8163 (v).

Mange among Horses, Cost of enforcing Law (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6719 (iv).

Manitoba Boundary Extension, Pets., Memorials, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2067 (ii).

Northwest Territories Representation Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8773; Amt., 8774 (v).

N.W.T. Voters' Lists, Inquiry for Ret., 2594 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 6170 (iv).

Northwest Mounted Police (Yukon) 8668 (v).

Quarantine (cattle) 2310 (ii), 6719 (iv).

Vats for dipping Quarantine Cattle (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2312 (ii).

Voters' Lists in N. W. Ters., used in Dom. Election, 1905, (M. for ret.*) 601 (i).

McColl, Mr. J. B., *West Northumberland, Ont.*

Water Meters Inspeotion B. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 9408 (v).

McCool, Mr. C. A., *Nipissing.*

Gillies Brothers, Limited, B. 95 (Mr. A. A. Wright) in Com., 2764 (ii).

Metal Volatilization Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 183) 1°*, 7810 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Lake Temiscaming) 7559; Que. (Canton Fabre) 7288 (iv).

Temagami Ry. Co.'s (B. 91) 1°*, 3005; in Com., 3135 (ii).

Vibert, Philip, Relief (B. 172) 1°*, 7095 (iv).

McIntyre, Mr. G. H., *South Perth.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., 6th Rep. (presented) 8097 (v).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5179 (iii).

Autonomy Bill, Official Report of Division (remarks) 5428 (iii).

Cattle, Canadian, Embargo, &c., 6th Rep. of Agriculture, &c., Com. (presented) 8097 (v).

House of Commons, Improvements in, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1570 (i).

Ry. Act (crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 3231 (ii).

McIntyre, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
St. Mary's and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 15) 1°*, 317 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (House of Commons improvements) 1570 (i).
Quarantine (cattle) 2313 (ii).

McIsaac, Mr. C. F., *Antigonish.*
Harbours and Rivers—N.S., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9563 (v).
Public Accounts Com., (M.) 582 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings, &c. (remarks) 404 (i).
SUPPLY :
Ocean and River Service (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2668 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 851, 1016 (i); (Phinney's Cove) 9563 (v).
Winter Mail Service, P.E.I., in Com. of Sup., 2668 (ii).

McKenzie, Mr. D. D., *Cape Breton North and Victoria.*
'Agnes G. Donohue,' Str., Seizure, &c. (remarks) 1507 (i).
'Arthur Binney,' Fishing Schooner, Small-pox Quarantine (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2307 (ii).
Autonomy (Alberta) Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3713 (ii).
Autonomy Bill in Com., Resignation, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 8480, 8486 (v).
Autonomy B. 69, School Clauses (remarks) in Com. 5898, 5912 (iii).
'Canada-Cape Breton,' Collision, Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2636 (ii).
Canadian Fast Mail Service, Quotation and Telegrams (read) M. to adjn., 9773 (v).
Govt. Steamers, Coal Supply (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2613 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers, N.S., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9575 (v).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9742; in Com., 9793 (v).
'Lady Laurier,' Number of Crew at Halifax (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 2617 (ii).
McDermot, Clara Bidwell Relief B. 132 (Mr. Campbell) on M. for 3°, 6376 (iv).
Montevideo, Imprisonment of British Seamen, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2689 (ii).
Small-pox on American Ships, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2689 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 2613 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Sydney Mines) 1046; (Sydney P.O.) 1045 (i); Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Boisdale wharf) 9585 (v).
Quarantine (organized districts) 2307 (ii).

McKenzie, Mr. P. H., *South Bruce.*
Agriculture Committee, 3rd Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 4984 (iii).
——— 6th Rep. Cattle Embargo (M.) to conc., 8998 (v).
Bruce County Armouries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1658 (i).
Canadian Cattle Embargo in G.B. (M.) to conc. in 6th Rep. of Com., 8998 (v).
Railway Rates, Discrimination, &c., on M. to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Com., 4984 (iii).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 374 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture (experimental farms) 6175 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—General (armouries) 1658 (i).
Walkerton and Lucknow Ry. Co.'s (B. 25) 1°*, 493 (i).

McLean, Mr. A. A., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Anthracite Coal used by Govt. in each Province, Quantity, Amount paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1398 (i).
Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8204 (v).
Curley, Thos., Mitchell, &c., Claims for Damages *re* Murray Harbour Branch (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9489 (v).
Gillis, N. J., Emplymt. by Govt. at St. Louis Exhibition, &c. (Ques.) 3361 (ii).
Grain carried to Halifax, via I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1918 (i).
Halifax Fishery Award, Claims of P.E.I., &c. Memorial, Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 1386 (i).
I.C.R. Dining Cars, Losses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 2255 (ii).
——— Murray Harbour Branch, Amount due Contractors, &c. (Ques.) 2064 (ii).
'James W,' Schooner, Rescue of Crew by SS 'Durango' (remarks) 4198 (ii).
Lobster Fisheries, Res. of Board of Trade, Moncton (read) in Com. of Sup., 2909 (ii).
Marconi System, Establishment of on Govt. Steamers, (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 2623 (ii).
'Minto,' Govt. Steamer, Coal Loading, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 2603 (ii).
Morrison, Hector D., Customs Officer Pinette, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2330 (ii).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2130 (ii).
——— Claims for Land Damages from T. Curley, &c. (M. for copies*) 2334 (ii).
New London Branch Ry., P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2178 (ii).
North Lake P.O., Removal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9612 (v).

McLean, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Pinette, Customs Officer, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2330 (ii).

Power, Jas., Postmaster at Wheatley River, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4374 (iii).

P.E.I. and Mainland Steam Communication, Delay in Mail Service (remarks) 2203, 2261 (ii).

P.E.I., Dredging, Number and Names of Harbours, &c. (Ques.) 1148 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Investigation *re* Pier at Cape Carleton, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 2808 (ii).

——— Delays, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2648; Cor. (read) 2649; Res. from Delegates (read) 2651 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry. Claims for Damages *re* Murray Harbour Branch (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9489 (v).

Railway Commission, Board of, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1532 (i).

Savage Harbour, P.E.I., Proposed Improvement (Ques.) 3361 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7. (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1182 (i).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 2447 (ii).

Fisheries (hatcheries) 2904 ; (protection service) 2909 (ii).

Immigration (agents, G.B.) 7700 (iv); (medical inspection) 9236 (v).

Legislation (laws, printing, &c.) 6948 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Marconi stations) 2870 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Manchester Line) 933; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 927 (i); (P.E.I. and G.B.) 7088; (St. John and W. Indies) 7197 (iv).

Miscellaneous (consolidation of statutes) 7247 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 2598; (schools of navigation) 2646; (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2648 (ii).

Post Office (mail service) 9612 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Cape Tormentine) 7497 (iv); P.E.I. (Higgin's pier) 1734; (Rustico) 1738 (i); Telegraphs—Dom. (generally) 7636 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 1918 (i); (general vote) 7495 (iv); (steel rails) 2003 (i).

Railways—P.E.I. (air brakes) 2178; (Charlottetown station) 2026 (ii); (Georgetown accommodation) 9489 (v); (Morrell bridge span) 2177; (Murray harbour branch) 2041; (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2130; (Vernon River branch line) 2177 (ii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance) 1532 (i).

Weights and Measures (electric light inspectors) 1696 (i).

Timber Sales in Man. and N.W.T. Advertisements *re* (Ques.) 7097 (iv).

Truro Dining Room, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2255 (ii).

McLennan, Mr. A., *Inverness.*

Lobster and Herring Industry, Rep. of Commission (Ques.) 4371 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Inverness) 1040 (i); Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Inverness Mines) 7404; (Mabou bridge) 7408; (Margaree) 7410 ; (Port Hood) 7414 ; (Scott's bay) 7417 (iv).

Martin, Mr. A., *Queen's, P.E.I.*

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 679 (i).

Bait Freezers, Mar. Canada, Number, Location, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1769 (i), 2067 (ii).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 671 (i).

Charlottetown, P.E.I. Ry. Station, Cor. and Reps. *re* Construction (M. for copies*) 194 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 4810 (iii).

——— Site, &c. (Ques.) 60 (i).

Cold Storage Bait Freezers, Mar. Can., Number, Location, &c. (M. for ret.) 1769 (i), 2067 (ii).

Commercial Agencies in Can., Location, &c. (M. for ret.*) 403 (i).

Fruit Growers Ass'on, P.E.I., Govt. Intention (Ques.) 381 (i).

Grand View Station, Murray Harbour Branch, P.E.I. Ry., Location, &c., Cor. (M. for copies*) 1770 (i).

Halifax Fishery Award, Distribution to Provinces, &c. (Ques.) 1593 (i).

Lambert's Pier, P.E.I., Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 4373 (iii).

Lawson, Mr. Henry, Postmaster at Stanhope, Dismissal, Cor., &c. (M. for copies.*) 1398 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1062 (i).

Live Stock Record of Can., Nationalization, &c. (Ques.) 1848 (i), 2185 (ii).

Morell River Ry. Bridge, P.E.I., Complaints *re* (Ques.) 5035 (iii).

Murray Harbour and Hillsboro Bridge Branch, P.E.I. Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7494 (iv).

Murray Harbour Branch, P.E.I. Ry., Completion, &c. (Ques.) 189 (i).

——— Delegation *re* (Ques.) 265 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9482 (v).

North Lake P.O., Removal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9613 (v).

P.E.I., Additional Subsidy in 1901, Inquiry for Ret., 4810 (iii).

P.E.I. and Mainland SS. Communication, Inspection of SS. 'Stanley' (Ques.) 687 (i).

——— Mail Service, Delays, &c. (remarks) 280 (i).

——— Terms of Union, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 9698 (v).

Martin, Mr. A.—*Con.*
P.E.I. Ry., Train Service (remarks) 697 (i).
——— Tunnel Surveys, Proposal to Delegation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6643 (iv).
P.E.I. Communication with Mainland, Delays, &c., Tel., (read) 831 (i).
——— Fisheries, Supervision, &c. (Ques.) 1762 (i).
——— Mount Stewart Shipping Facilities, Wharf Accommodation, &c. (Ques.) 1763 (i).
P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines, Construction and Surveys, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 916 (i).
P.E.I. Ry. Stanley Bridge, &c., Surveys *re* (Ques.) 266 (i).
P.E.I. Steam Communication with Mainland, Tidings of SS. 'Stanley' (remarks) 1338, 1595 (i).
P.E.I. Subsidy, Additional Grant, Cor., &c., *re* (M. for copies*) 3205 (ii).
P.E.I. and West Indies SS. Subsidy, Amount paid, Representations *re* (Ques.) 591 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Inspector's Rep. of Str. 'Stanley,' &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 916 (i).
Railways and Canals, Can., Subsidies, Construction, Expenditure, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 916 (i).
Railway and Steamboat Accidents, 1904, Investigation *re* Causes, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1397 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5026 (iii).
Rustico Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1593 (i).
St. Peter's Breakwater, P.E.I., Tenders *re*, &c. (Ques.) 5035 (iii).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 354 (i).
Stanhope P. O., Dismissal of Mr. H. Lawson, Cor., Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 1398 (i).
——— (Ques.) 1062 (i).
Stanley Bridge, P.E.I. Ry., Total Cost, Claims for Damages, &c. (Ques.) 587 (i).
SUPPLY:
Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1704 (i).
House of Commons (stationery) 6595 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 977; (Magdalen Islands) 907; (Pictou and Montague Bridge) 926; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 929 (i), 7088 (iv); (P.E.I. and Mainland) 920; (P.E.I. and Nfld.) 940 (i), 7093; (St. John and W. Indies) 7194 (iv).
Militia (depots) 9113 (v).
Ocean and River Service (ice breaking steamers) 9618 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Inverness) 1042 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Miminegash) 1735 (i); (Mount Stewart) 9585 (v); (New London) 1735; (Point Prim Island) 1736; (repairs, &c.) 1737; (Wood Island) 1743 (i).
Public Works—Telegraphs—B.C. (Kamloops) 7610 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 1913 (i); (general vote) 7495 (iv); P.E.I. Cardigan branch) 9482 (v); (Charlottetown accommodation) 2025 (ii); (Charlottetown track extension) 6434 (iv); (Hillsborough bridge) 2038; (Murray branch) 2038 (ii).
Sydney, I.C.R., Station, Collections for Freight, &c. (M. for ret.) 1767 (i).
Wheatley River, P.E.I. Postmaster, Dismissal of James Power, Cor. (M. for copies*) 9697 (v).

Martin, Mr. T., *North Wellington.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 1°, 5083 (iii).
Farmers' Bank of Canada (B. 124) in Com., 4700 (iii); on Sen. Amts. 6609 (iv).
Mutual Reserve Ins. Co., Payment of Claims, &c. (Ques.) 2332 (ii).
Officials dismissed for Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6867 (iv).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1182 (i).

Miller, Mr. H. H., *South Grey.*
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2849 (ii).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4292 (iii).
——— in Com., sec. 2 (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8624 (v).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8364 (v).
Cement, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8991 (v).
Criminal Code (summary appeals) Amt. B. 45 (Mr. Porter) on Amt. (Mr. Bureau) *re* Race Courses, 5138 (iii).
Dredging Contracts, Mr. McKay's Interests *re* (remarks) 5599 (iii).
Farmers' Bank of Canada (B. 124) 1°*, 2681 (ii).
House of Commons, Rooms for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 254 (i).
Killam, Judge, Appmt. as Chairman of Ry. Commission (remarks) on M. for Com. on Res., 561 (i).
Man. Boundaries Extension, 'Scurvy Politician' Quotation *re*, 3863 (ii).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9475 (v).
Orangemen, Attack *re*, 'Yellow Dog' quoted in Newspapers (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 8364 (v).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) on Amt. (Mr. Stewart) to M. for 3°, 3396 (ii).

Miller, Mr. H. H.—*Con.*
Postmaster, Reduction of Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iv).
Ry. Commissioner, Apptmt. of Chairman B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com, on Res., 561 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Com., 5029 (iii).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 349 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rents) 6821; Miscellaneous (cement testing) 7617 (iv).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1383 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*
Acetylene Gas Explosion : *See* 'Scout.'
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 739 (i), 2414 (ii).
Atwater Bridge over Lachine Canal, Contract *re*, &c. (Ques.) 7261, 7422 (iv).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3064 (ii); in Com., 8176 (v).
——— on M. for 3° (Amt.) Dual Language, 8839 (v), Neg. (Y. 7; N. 140) 8855 (v).
——— in Com., (Alberta boundaries) 5602 (iii).
——— (B.N.A. Acts) 8526 ; Amt., Dual Language) 8530, 8613 (v).
——— (election of members) 5777 (iii).
——— (laws, courts, &c.) 8241 (v).
——— (readjustment of representation) 5756 (iii).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8425, 8441 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8505 (v).
Autonomy (Saskatchewan) B. 70 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., sec. 2 (B.N.A. Act) Amt. 8702 (v).
Autonomy *re* N.W. Ters., Cor. *re* (M. for copies) 599 (i).
——— French and English Language, Notice of Motion, 7582 (iv).
See 'Provincial,' 'Separate Schools.'
Blair, Hon. A. G., Letter *re* Resignation (M. for copy*) 601 (i).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4243 (iii).
'Canada,' Str., Expenditure *re* Equipment, Names of Employees and Payments to, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1399 (i).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 991, 1003; in Com., 629, 1091 (i).
——— Order (Ques. of) *re* Resolution, 629 (i).
Choquette, Judge, Date of Resignation, and Apptmt. to Senate (Ques.) 1344 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Clarke, Mr. E. F., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 2110 (ii).
Coal Contracts for Penitentiaries, Montreal Firms, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 478 (i).
Cote St. Paul Water Power, Lease to J. Frothingham (Ques.) 3360 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) on M. for 1°, 986 (i); in Com., 3208 (ii).
Fish imported into New York, Prohibition *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6191 (iv).
Fishing Rights in Estuaries, Jurisdiction by Govt. (Ques.) 1346 (i).
Godbout, Mr. J., Lighthouse-keeper, Political Partisanship *re* Dom. Elections (Ques.) 1343 (i).
Govt. Legislation (remarks) on M. to take in Wednesdays, 821 (i).
G.T. Pacific Questions, Answers by Govt. (remarks) 1595 (i).
Highland Cadet Corps, Montreal, Letter (read) 7813 (iv).
Hudson Bay Expedition, Payments of Salaries: (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6729 (iv).
Huot, Mr. J., Payments to *re* L'Ange Gardien Beach (Ques.) 1343 (i).
Ice Breaker : *See* 'Montcalm.'
Immigration and Salvation Army, Cor. *re* (Ques.) 7684 (iv).
Immigration Office, G.B., Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 592 (i).
Immigration, SS. Subsidies, Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7699 (iv).
——— Ten Years' Contract, &c., Inquiry for, 8387 (v).
See 'North Atlantic.'
Immigrants, Farmer, Bonus paid by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 7811 (iv).
Isle Bizard Wharf Abutments, Expenditure *re* (M. for ret.*) 2067 (ii).
Jacques Cartier Surveys, Cost, Reps. &c. (Ques.) 593 (i).
Joliette Ry. Surveys, Total Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1346 (i).
Kingston, Lighthouse Depot, Establishment of (Ques.) 914 (i).
Lachine Canal, Cote St. Paul, Use of Water Power (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1515 (i).
Lachine Canal Water Privilege, Lease to Wm. Parkyn, &c. (Ques.) 5132 (iii).
Levis, Purchase of Land for I.C.R. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6670 (iv).
Manufacturing Industries, Statistics *re* (remarks), 1091 (i).
Meteorological Service, Names on Pay-roll, &c. (M. for ret.*) 917 (i).
Military Hospital, St. Johns, Que., Contract *re* Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 5687 (iii).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Mint, Royal of Canada, Establishment of, Cor. with Imp. Govt. (M. for copies*) 916 (i).
——— Inquiry for, Cor. (remarks) 2595 (ii), 7424 (iv), 8387 (v).
'Montcalm,' used by Dept. for St. Lawrence Ship Channel (remarks) in Sup., 2450 (ii).
Montreal and other Harbours, Dues and Charges, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Permanent Sheds, Cor. between Govt., &c. (M. for copies) 153 (i).
Montreal Inland Revenue Building, Addition and Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1122 (i).
Montreal P. O., St. Catherine St. Branch P.O., Rents paid and Unsanitary Condition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 201 (i).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness, Collections, &c. (M. for ret.) 402 (i).
Naval Militia for Canada, Total Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1346 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., and Contract *re* Immigration (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv).
——— Inquiry for, &c., 7906 (iv).
——— Protests *re* (remarks) 8887 (v).
See 'Immigrants.'
N.W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 8 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 464 (i).
Northwest Territories B. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8769 (v).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5740 (iii), 5967 (iv).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 2534 (ii).
Parole System for Convicts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 470 (i).
Prescott Lighthouse Depot, Total Area, &c. (Ques.) 1148 (i).
Preston, W. T. R., Immigration Agent, Salary, &c., Reps., &c. (Ques.) 452 (i).
——— Employees, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 592 (i).
Provincial Autonomy *re* N.W. Ters., Cor. between Govt. of N.W.T., &c (M. for copies) 599 (i).
See 'Autonomy:'
Public Accounts Com., Meetings, &c. (remarks) 403 (i).
Public Buildings in Villages, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1101 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. Prefontaine) in Com., 1243 (i).
Quebec Harbour Works, Transfer to Marine Dept., in Com. of Sup., 771 (i).
Quebec Political Crisis, Explanation asked for, 822 (i).
Railway Commission (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1606 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Railway Commission, Official Cars, Legal Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 593 (i).
Railway Surveys in Joliette Co., Engineers, Salaries, Instructions, &c. (M. for ret.) 2065 (ii).
Royal Mint: *See* 'Mint.'
St. Francois Wharf, Expenditure *re* in Sept., Oct. and Nov., 1904 (Ques.) 1343 (i).
Ste. Genevieve and Isle Bizard, Expenditure *re*, Cor., &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 601 (1).
St. Ignace Channel Dam, Plan, &c. (Ques.) 592 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Dredging, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2450 (ii).
St. Paul Land and Hydraulic Co.'s Lease, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 2777 (ii).
Salmon, Capt., Resignation, &c., on M. (Mr. Ames) for Cor., 395 (i).
'Scout' Str., Explosion of Acetylene Gas, Appnmt. of Experts on Commission (remarks) 4841 (iii).
Separate Schools, Circulars issued by Jacques Cartier Club (personal explanation) 2410 (ii).
Sorel Shipyard, Expenditure *re* Wages, Amount expended in supplies, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1399 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2457 (ii).
Statistics, Collection, &c., Information, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 1003 (i).
Submarine Signal Co., Boston, Contracts with, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 917 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 1827; (exhibitions) 1833; (Year-book) 1474 (i).
Immigration (agents, G. B., &c., salaries) 7685 (iv).
Justice—Yukon (living allowances) 128 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and France) 7094; (Canada and New Zealand 7094 (iv); (Can. and S. Africa) 979; (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 947; (Quebec and Natashquan) 967; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 950; (wrecking plant) 963 (i).
Ocean and River Service (schools of navigation) 2641 (ii).
Penitentiaries (coal contracts) 478; (parole system) 470 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—General (clerk of works) 1646 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Regina P. O.) 1639 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (museum) 761 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Actonvale) 1101; (Dom., renewals, &c.) 1107; (Grosse Isle) 1108; (Longueuil) 1113; (Magog) 1115; (Montreal, barracks) 1118; (Montreal, Inland Rev.) 1119; (Montreal P. O., improvements) 1127; (Quebec, trachoma hospital) 1138 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Grande Piles) 7327 (iv); (harbour improvements) 771 (i); (Portneuf wharf) 7314; (Repentigny wharf) 7314 (iv); (St. Lawrence Channel) 2450 (ii).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Supreme Court Rep., Delay in Printing, Cor., &c. (M. for copy*) 1398 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1341 (i).

Telegraph Lines in Canada, Americanizing of, *re* Alien Labour Act (M.) to adjn., 7642 (iv). *See* 'G.N.W.'

Trachoma Hospitals, Generally, Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1138 (i).

Trading Stamps Legislation, &c. (Ques.) 7020 (iv).

——— (remarks) 5134 (iii).

Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.'

Transportation Problem and Wharf Building, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).

Vegetables, Canned, Preserved, &c.; Value of Imports, (M. for stmnt.*) 279 (i).

Verdun, Damage by Floods, Cor. from Board of Trade, Montreal (M. for copies*) 457 (i).

Veterans, 1866 and 1870, Grant of Land (remarks) 6047 (iv).

Wrecking Plant 'Lord Strathcona' in Com. of Sup., 963 (i).

Morin, Mr. J. B., *Dorchester.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5534 (iii).

Ballot Boxes, Payment to Mr. Cayouette *re* (letter read) 989 (i).

——— (remarks) 1337 (i).

'Champlain,' Str., Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 149 (i).

See 'Montcalm.'

Chateau-Richer, Expenditure by Govt. for Public Works (M. for stmnt.*) 109 (i).

——— Obstruction, Removal of (remarks) 1154 (i).

Disraeli Wharf, Wolfe Co., Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1729 (i).

Dorchester Co., Returning Officers, Appnmt. of, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 916 (i).

Drummond Co. Ry., Expenditure *re* (remarks) 1941 (i).

G. B. and Her Colonies, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2410 (ii).

I.C.R., Time Table, Connections at Montreal (remarks) 6831 (iv).

Man. Boundaries, Mgr. Sbaretti's Explanation, on M. to adyn., 4073 (iii).

'Montcalm,' Str., Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 150 (i).

See 'Champlain.'

Quebec Citadel Wall, Repairs to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6726 (iv).

St. Abdon Post Office, Establishment of, Recommendation *re* (Ques.) 6653 (iv).

Ste. Marguerite Pastmaster, Dismissal of L. Laflamme (Ques.) 6477 (iv).

Morin, Mr. J. B.—*Con.*

St. Moise Station, Population *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1979 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rents) 6822 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Lévis) 1112, (Montmagny) 1117 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Apple River wharf) 1729 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Beauce wharf) 9591 (v); (Château Richer) 7290 (iv); (Disraeli wharf) 9593 (v); (Doucet's landing) 7300 (iv); (Grande Riviere de Beaupré) 9592 (v); (Harbour commissions) 6726; (Lake St. Peter pier) 6460; (L'Ile d'Alma) 7307 (iv); (Maskinongé river) 9590 (v); (Mille Vaches) 7310; (Montmagny wharf) 7311; (Montmorency wharf) 6852 (iv); (Peribonka river) 9591; (St. Alphonse wharf) 9591 (v); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 6458 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (Mitchell bridge) 1941; (St. Cyrille, diversion of line) 1969 (i).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm., K.C.M.G. (Postmaster General), *North York, Ont.*

Alien Labour, Employment of at Sault Ste. Marie on Govt. Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1416 (i).

Atlantic Fast SS. Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 893 (i).

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3400 (ii); (C.P.R. lands) in Com., 6081 (iv).

See 'Manitoba.'

Ballot Boxes, Payment to Mr. Cayouette (remarks) 1338 (i).

Bisonnette vs. Crown, Illegal Stamping of Letters, Cor. read, in Com. of Sup., 194 (i).

Brantford Post Office Improvements, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 220 (i).

Campaign Literature and Franking by Ministers of Crown (remarks) 1809 (i).

Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 3°, 4413 (iii).

Canada and Mexico SS. Communication, &c. (remarks) 67 (i).

See 'Mexico.'

Château Richer Public Works, Dates of Payment (Ans.) 3202 (ii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 2042 (ii).

Coldwater and Lovering Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ans.) 1848 (i), 2594 (ii).

Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4266 (iii).

Dundas, Ry. Mail Clerk, Reinstatement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).

Elevators on Welland Canal, at Port Colborne, in Com. of Sup., 1272, 1300 (i).

Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 1401 (i).

Facer Steel Car Co.'s B. 27 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 1285 (i).

Mulock, Hon. Sir William, K.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Farmington and Wilmot Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 2330 (ii).
Fessenden Wireless Tel. of Can. incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6607 (iv).
Fitz-Simons Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6378 (iv).
Franking Privilege, Abuse of, *re* Circulars of Dental Institute (remarks) 1807 (i).
——— Use of Stamps, &c. (remarks) 5135 (iii), 5963 (iv).
Free Mail Delivery, Total Cost (Ans.) 729 (i).
Glenn Ross P.O., Abolition of (Ans.) 1149 (i).
Goderich Mail Contract, Tender *re*, &c. (Ans.) 2493 (ii).
Grain Survey Boards, Toronto and Montreal, Stmts., Names, &c. (Ans.) 910 (i).
G.T. Pacific Commission, Staff and Salaries (Ans.) 688 (i).
Green, Samuel H., Postmaster at Kaslo, B.C., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2331 (ii).
House of Commons P.O., Delay in Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 199 (i).
International Postal Supply Co., Rent of Stamping Machines (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).
Kent, Miss A., Postmistress at Kent, N.S., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2331 (ii).
Kentvale Postmaster, Sureties, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 5978 (iv).
Kingston, N.B., and Jubilee Station Mail Contract, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 5133 (iii).
Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 705 (i).
Letter Carriers, Bonuses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 215 (i).
——— Payment for Sick Leave (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 176 (i).
——— Uniforms, Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
Leverette, Geo. Milton, Postmaster, Kitley, Partisan Conduct *re* Election (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6241 (iv).
Logberg Printing Co., Payments to (Ans.) 4373 (iii).
Maccan Mail Contract, Amount paid, (Ans.) 188 (i).
Mail Bags, Locks, Repairs, &c., Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 205, 209 (i).
Mail carried free by Rys, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 186 (i).
Mail Carriers, System of Payments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).
Mail Contracts, Tenders *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 179 (i).
Mail Subsidy paid to Star Line *re* River St. John (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 181 (i).
Mail Subsidies *re* Newfoundland Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).

Mulock, Hon. Sir William, K.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, M'gr. Sbarretti's Memorandum, &c. (personal explanation) 3846 (ii).
——— 'Malicious Fabrication' *re* Charges, 4035 (ii).
Manitoba Voters' Lists returned to Clerk of Crown (remarks) 1406 (i).
Melbourne and Upper Melbourne Mail Contract, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 4372 (iii).
Mexico and Canada, Exports of Canadian Goods, &c. (remarks) 897 (i).
See 'Canada and Mexico.'
Mileage *re* Mail Carriage, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 184 (i).
Ministers, Absence of (remarks) 1285 (i).
Money carried Through Mail, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 4809 (iii).
Montreal Postal Station (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1128 (i).
Montreal Post Office, Complaints *re* Registered Letters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 183 (i).
——— Illegal Stamping of Letters (cor. read) in Com. of Sup., 194 (i).
——— Improvements, New Station (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 223 (i).
——— Pneumatic System Installation, in Com. of Sup., 1134 (i).
——— St. Catherine St. Branch, Unsanitary Condition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 202 (i).
——— Stealing of Cheques, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 198 (i).
Moosejaw and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s incorp., B. 20 (Mr. Scott) in Com., 2715 (ii).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1709 (i).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fence, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5696 (iii).
——— Papers *re* Contract, on Inquiry for Ret., 5962 (iv).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2055; on M. for 3°, 2714 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2720 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1284 (i), 2954, 3178 (ii).
Owen Sound P.O., Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1029 (i).
Père Marquette Ry., Emplymt. of Aliens, Judge Winchester's Rep. (presented) 6232 (iv).
Pneumatic Tube System, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 217 (i).
Port Arthur and Fort William Telephone System and Board of Ry. Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Copies of Cor., 1389 (i).

Mulock, Hon. Sir William, K.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1272, 1300 (i).
Postage on Newspapers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 179 (i).
Postage Stamps, Bank Notes, &c., Contracts, *re* (remarks) in Com., of Sup., 204 (i).
Postal Business, Alberta District, on M. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) for Ret., 600 (i).
Postal Rates Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 222 (i).
Postmasters acting as Dep. Ret. Officers (remarks) in Com. of Spu., 6241 (iv).
Powers, Jas., Postmaster at Wheatley River, P.E.I., Dismissal, &s., (Ans.) 4374 (iii).
P.E.I., Additional Subsidy in 1901, on Inquiry for Ret., 4811 (iii).
P.E.I. and Mainland, Delay of Mail (explanation) 2261 (ii).
——— Letter from Mr. Pottinger (read) 1153 (i).
——— (remarks) 2204 (ii).
P.E.I. Communication with Mainland, (remarks) 832 (i).
——— Contract with Steam Nav. Co. (Ans.) 5316.
——— Winter Mail Service, in Com. of Sup., 2662 (ii).
Public Works Portfolio, Appnmt. of Minister (remarks) 5961 (iv).
Ry. Act (crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 3246 (ii).
Ry. Act (express companies) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for Adjnmt., 3247 (ii).
——— (remarks) 109 (i).
Reports and Rets., on Inquiry for, 1242 (i).
Resignation of Conservative Ministers in 1896 (remarks) 835, 844 (i).
Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 103 (Mr. Tobin) on M. for 2°, 2296 (ii).
Royal Mint, Ottawa, in Com. of Sup., 618 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery, Cost of Establishment, &c., on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Rep., 2079 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 221 (i).
St. James Division Branch Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 218 (i).
St. John and St. Martin's, N.B., Mail Contract (Ans.) 2776 (ii).
Ste. Marguerite Postmaster, Dismissal of L. Laflamme (Ans.) 6477 (iv).
Sarnia Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 862 (i).
Shelburne Postmaster, Dismissal, &c., on M. (Mr. Barr) for Cor., 597 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1044 (i).
Sherbrooke, Postal Rate and Delivery (Ans.) 379 (i).
Stanhope, P.E.I., Dismissal of Postmaster Lawson (Ans.) 1062 (i).

Mulock, Hon. Sir William, K.C.M.G.—*Con.*
SUPPLY :
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1272, 1300 (i).
Civil Govt.—Labour Dept. (salaries, &c.) 100 (i); Post Office—(contingencies) 6240 (iv); (salaries) 95 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Mexico) 895 (i).
Ocean and River Service, (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2662 (ii).
Post Office (compassionate allowance *re* Patrick Callery) 6628 (iv); (detective service) 209; (inspectors' salaries) 144; (inspector W. A. Cairns salary) 6629 (iv); (letter carriers) 173; (mail service) 5629 (iv); (provisional allowance) 166; (ry. mail clerks) 139; (salaries) 165; Yukon (mail service) 203; (salaries) 214 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 849; (Canso) 1029; (Shelburne) 1044 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Sandwich) 1579; (Toronto postal station) 1592; (Toronto warehouse) 1584 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Royal Mint) 618 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal military buildings) 1126; (Montreal P.O., improvements) 1127; (Montreal P.O., pneumatic system) 1134.
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Apple River wharf) 1730; (Harbour improvements) 774 (i).
Tay Canal, Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 1301 (i).
Telephone Systems, Investigation into: (M.) for Sel. Com., 2681, 2841 (ii).
——— (M.) to add Names, 4186 (iii).
Thessalon Postmaster, Appnmt. and Sureties (Ans.) 6106 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 6201 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Cor., 3202 (ii).
——— Further Papers *re* Irregularities (presented) 6232, 6646 (iv).
Toronto Examining Warehouse, in Com. of Sup., 1584 (i).
Toronto Postal Service, Pneumatic Tubes (remarks) 5807 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1591 (i).
Transportation Problem *re* Waterways (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1272, 1300 (i).
Trent Canal Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1471 (i).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1385 (i).
Uniforms for Letter Carriers, Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 206 (i).
Victoria Harbour Mail Contract (Ans.) 2191 (ii).
Waverley Postmaster, Duties and Residence, &c. (Ans.) 5427 (iii).
——— Personal Duties (remarks) 5807 (iii).
Welland Canal, Leases for Water Power, on M. (Mr. German) for Ret., 2098 (ii).
Wire Fencing : *See* 'N.W.T.'

Northrup, Mr. W. B., *East Hastings.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3121, 3136 (ii).
Autonomy Bill, Mr. Haultain's Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2598 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9758 (v).
Madoc and Eldorado Ry. Bonus, &c. (Ques.) 7261 (iv).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5969 (iv).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 327 (i).
Selkirk Ret. Officers, Occupation, &c. (Ques.) 1761 (i).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 713 (i).
Yukon Representation, Ret. of Member-Elect Delay (remarks) 453 (i).

Oliver, Hon. Frank (Minister of the Interior), *Edmonton.*
Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 118) 1°*, 2185 (ii).
Athabasca Ry. and Oil Co.'s incorp. (B. 117) 1°*, 2185 ; in Com., 3135 (ii).
Atlas, furnished by Interior Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9308 (v).
Auditor General's Resignation, Acceptance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6520 (iv).
Autonomy (Alberta) B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5485 ; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3152 (ii).
——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries), 5612 (iii).
——— (Compensation *re* Lands) 5817 (iii).
——— (Crown Lands), 8262 (v).
——— (distribution of seats), 7728 (iv) ; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden), 8017 (v) ; on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) *re* distribution of seats, 7771, 7818, 7938 (iv).
——— (lands vested in Crown), 5992 (iv).
——— (school clause amts.), 5865 (iii).
——— (seat of govt.), 8244 (v).
——— (subsidy to provs.), 6088 (iv).
Autonomy B. 69, in Com., on Schedules (Athabasca) 8163 ; (Cardston) 8149 ; (Edmonton city) 8160 ; (Gleichen) 8154, 8166 ; (Lethbridge) 8150 ; (Macleod) 8150 ; (Medicine Hat) 8148 ; (Saskatchewan) 8161 ; (Stony Plains) 8157 ; (Sturgeon) 8162 ; (Vermilion) 8155 (v).
Autonomy (Saskatchewan) B. 70 in Com., sec. 12 (distribution of seats) 8712 (v).
Autonomy B. 69, Attack on "Orangeism" (remarks) in Com., 5874 (iii).
——— Census *re* Rural and Town Population, &c., on Inquiry (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8092 (v).
Bell, Dr., Appnmt. as Director of Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9304 (v).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s (B. 22) 1°*, 378 ; in Com., 1100 (i).
Congdon, Mr., Appnmt. as Legal Adviser to Yukon Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7717 (iv).
Dom. Lands Act, Reglations *re* Yukon Ter., (M.) to approve, 9784 (v).
Dom. Lands Official Salaries, List read in Com. of Sup., 9290 (v).
Doncaster Indian Reserve, Abolition of (Ans.) 7812 (iv).
D. R. Fraser Co.'s incorp. (B. 119) 1°*, 2185 (ii).
Douhobor Homestead Entries *re* Village Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
Edmonton Election, Date of, &c. (remark) in Com. on B. 69, 5891 (iii).
——— Printing of Voters' Lists (remarks) 5865 (iii).
"Emigration of State Children ; Reply to Ques. (read) 5576 (iii).
Geological Survey Director, Appnmt. of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9303 (v).
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale to Mr. F. W. Grant (remarks) 6480 (iv).
——— Jurisdiction of, Memorandum (read) 6478 (iv).
Grazing Leases, &c., on Inquiry for Ret., 8530 (v).
Half-Breed Scrip, Applications from N. Ouellet, &c., Purchase of, &c. (Ans.) 9079 (v).
Half-Breed Scrip to Non-residents (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6500 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 6564 (iv).
——— (reply) to Hon. Mr. Foster, 7667 (iv).
——— Further Issue of Patents (remarks) 8003 (v).
——— Further Instructions laid on Table, 9075 (v).
——— Further Papers laid on Table, 9179 (v).
——— Inquiry for Copy of Instructions (Mr. Foster) 8181 (v).
——— Memo. from Mr. Coté (read) 6403 (iv).
——— on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Papers, 7423 (iv).
See 'Nixon.'
Homestead Entries, Bogus Applications (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9270 (v).
——— Sales to Settlers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9269 (v).
Homestead Inspectors and Govt. Officials acting as Political Organizers in N.W.T. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9256 (v).
——— Policy *re* Politicians (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6407 (iv).
Immigration Agents, Tabulated Statement (read) 9308 (v).
Immigration, B.C., Medical Inspection, O.C., &c. (read) in Com. of Sup., 9331 (v).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
Immigration, Bonuses paid to Transportation and Booking Cos. (Ans.) 7811 (iv).
——— Bonuses to Steamships (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9318 (v).
See 'North Atlantic.'
——— Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7710 (iv).
——— Offices in G.B., Memorandum from Toronto Trade and Labour Council (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9312 (v).
Immigrants deported from Can., &c. (remarks) in Com .of Sup., 7702 (iv).
Immigrants entered at Vancouver and Victoria, Statement (read) in Com. of Sup., 9332 (v).
Immigrant Farmers, Bonuses paid by Govt. (Ans.) 7811 (iv).
Immigrants from English Workhouses, Proposal of Mr. Neill, &c. (Ans.) 6188 (iv).
Immigration of Children (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9324 (v).
Indian Agents acting as Magistrates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6546 (iv).
Indian Reserve Sales, on M. (Mr. Hughes) 6564 (iv).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).
Jamieson, Dr., Payment to *re* Berens Agency (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).
Land Titles Act (1894) Amt. (B. 162) 1° m., 6104 (iv); in Com., 9082 (v).
Leach, R. E. A., Dom. Lands Agent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9251 (v).
Lesser Slave Lake Post Office (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 8164 (v).
Meadow Creek Ranching Co., Patent *re* Lands (Ans.) 6476 (iv).
Medical Inspection *re* Indians, Payments, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).
Middle Forks Falls, Location of, Conditions of Sale, &c., (Ans.) 9079 (v).
Moose Mountain Indian Agency, Rep. of Inspection (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9337 (v).
Nixon, Jos., Appnmt. as Lands Agent at Macleod, N.W.T., (explanation) 6110 (iv).
——— Charges against, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8107 (v).
——— Investigation at Macleod (remarks) 9075, 9789 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to reduce Salary, 9316, 9770 (v).
See 'Half-Breed,' &c.
North Atlantic Trading Co., and Contract *re* immigration (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv), 9320 (v).
——— prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9440 (v).
——— Contract with, *re* Immigrants (remarks) 7907 (iv), 8182 (v).
See 'Immigration.'
N.W.T., Govt. Officials, Interference in Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9717 (v).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
N.W.T., Grazing Leases, Number issued, &c. (Ans.) 5478 (iii)
Northwest Irrigation Act Amt. (B. 161) 1° m., 6104 (iv); 2° m. and in Com., 8775 (v).
Porter, S., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9252 (v).
Railway Belt Lands, B.C., Settlement of Complaints *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9296 (v).
Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Boundaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9298 (v).
Roads and Road Allowances in Alberta and Saskatchewan (B. 195) 1° m., 9075; in Com., 9525; on Sen. Amts., 9819 (v).
Russian Priests canvassing for Conservatives in Dom. Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9264 (v).
St. Lawrence Islands, Cor. *re* Disposal of, &c. (Ans.) 6477 (iv).
Salvation Army Colonies, Rider Haggard's Rep. (Ans.) 6188 (iv).
Saskatchewan Bill, Papers *re* Population, &c., Laid on Table, 8267 (v).
See 'Autonomy.'
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Issue of Patents *re* Homestead entries (Ans.) 8267, 8655 (v).
Schukin, Ivan, Cancellation of Homestead Patent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
Smart, Jas. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6419 (iv).
Stoney Indians Depleting Game, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6549 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.—Interior (mines branch) 6264 (iv); (salary increases) 9070 (v).
Dom. Lands (Banff, pamphlets *re*) 6424 (iv); (Banff Park waterworks) 9306 (v); (contingencies) 6406 (iv), 9289 (v); (homestead inspectors) 6407 (iv), 9253; (land agents) 9251; (maps, &c.) 9308; (Mines branch, smelting ore) 9303; (national boundary fence) 8672; (outside salaries) 9251 (v); (maps, printing, &c.) 6425; (roads and bridges) 6423 (iv); (salaries, outside service) 9290 (v); (surveys, maps, &c.) 6406 (iv); (surveys) 8671, 9306; (tree culture) 9298 (v).
Geological Survey (assay apparatus) 8671; (maps, &c.) 8670; (salaries) 9249; (surveys) B.C.) 8669; (surveys, &c.) 8669 (v).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6385 (iv); (agents in Can. and G.B.) 9308; (tabulated statement (read) 9308 (v); (agents, G.B., salaries) 7685 (iv) 9226; (detention hospital, B.C.) 9227 (v); (interpreters) 7701 (iv); (medical inspection, B.C.) 9331; (O.C., read) 9330; (seed grain) 9307 (v).
Indians—B.C.(Dom. exhibition at New Westminster) 9339 (v); (industrial schools) 6556 (iv) 9339 (v); (medical attendance) 6555 (iv); (miscellaneous) 9339; (Pemberton Band) 9339 (v); (travelling expenses) 6556 (iv).
Indians—General (Dr. Bryce, salary) 6558; (printing) 6558 (iv).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (annuities) 6538 (iv); (implements) 9336 (v); (live stock) 6539; statement (read) 6543; (provisions, &c.) 6550 (iv), 9338 (v); (seed grain) 6539; (surveys) 6552 (iv).

Indians—Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6517 (iv).

Indians—N.B. (medical attendance) 6516; seed grain) 6516; (salaries) 6515 (iv); (supt., salary) 9336 (v).

Indians—N.S. (general vote) 6514 (iv).

Indians—N.W.T. (inspectors) 6548 (iv).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (legal expenses) 9336; (park improvements) 9335; (Treaty No. 9) 9336 (v).

Indians—P.E.I. (medical attendance) 6538 (iv).

Miscellaneous (Alaska boundaries) 7719; (assay office, B.C.) 7721; (Keewatin lunatics) 7720; (litigation expenses) 7720; (maps, &c., N.W.T.) 7721; (Yoho park) 7719 (iv).

N.W. Ter. Govt. (Torrens system) 9249 (v).

Scientific Institutions (astronomical observatory) 9248 (v).

Yukon Ter. Govt. (additional allowance to Maj. Wood) 9250 (v); (local council grant) 7718 (iv), 9250 (v); (salaries, &c.) 7716 (iv).

Timber Licenses on Indian Lands, Govt. Procedure (Ans.) 9281 (v).

Timber Regulations *re* Cutting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9297 (v).

Toronto Observatory, Removal to Ottawa (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9249 (v).

Turriff, J. G., Employment by Govt. (Ans.) 8267 (v).

Yukon Regulations: *See* 'Dom. Lands Act.'

Yukon Ter. Orders in Council (prop. res.) 9724 (v).

Osler, Mr. E. B., *West Toronto.*

Acetylene Gas Cos., Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1053 (i).

Apples, Packing for Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 743 (i).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4404 (iii).

——— in Com., (election of members), 5766 (iii).

Autonomy Bill, Mr. Haultain's Letter to Prime Minister on M. for Sup., 2513 (ii).

Ballot Box Frauds in Dom. Elections, on M. (Mr. Porter) to Com. of Sup., 9218 (v).

Carpets purchased by Govt. for Parlt. Buildings, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 8266 (v).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 633 (i).

Clarke, Mr. E. F., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 2109 (ii).

Drummond Co. Ry., Expenditure *re* (remarks) 1941 (i).

Elevator at Port Colborne, in Com. of Sup., 1277, 1309 (i).

Estimates, Obstruction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9272 (v).

Osler, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*

Govt. Officials and Political Organizers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9272 (v).

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3650 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Surveys, Reps. in Ry. Dept., (remarks) 2021 (ii).

Immigration of Children (remarks) in Com. of of Sup., 9324 (v).

Immigration Office in G.B., Complaints of Toronto Trade and Labour Council, Memorandum (read) 9309 (v).

I.C.R., Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1953 (i).

Japan Trade Relations with Canada, on Stmnt. (Mr. Fisher) 7913 (iv).

Killam, Judge, Appnmt. as Chairman of Commissioners (remarks) on M. for Com. on Res., 562 (i).

Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 709 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 4033 (ii).

Moncton Shops, I.C.R., Capacity, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1965 (i).

North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, Termination of (prop. res.) 9437; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 76) 9480 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9320 (v).

——— Notice of Motion, in Com. of Sup., 9329 (v).

N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Erection of Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5712 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5584 (iii).

N. W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 8 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 462 (i).

Ottawa Public Buildings, Rentals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6818 (iv).

Parole System for Convicts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 472 (i).

Pilotage Act (Quebec) Amt. B. 171 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7444 (iv).

Plains of Abraham, Que., Erection of Tank on Martello Towers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 431 (i).

Port Colborne, Elevator on Welland Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1277, 1309 (i).

Ry. Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 562 (i).

Ross Rifle Factory, Tank on Martello Tower (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 431 (i).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1168 (i).

South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9345 (v).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Trent (Holland River) 9360; (surveys) 9356; (surveys of dams) 9377 (v); Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1271, 1309 (i).

Osler, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Dom. Lands (agents' salaries) 9253; (homestead inspectors) 9253 (v).

House of Commons (messengers) 248 (i).

Immigration (agents in G.B. and Can.) 7699 (iv), 9309 (v); (medical inspection, B.C.) 9229; (seed grain) 9307 (v).

Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (implements) 9337 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Marconi stations) 2870 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 974; (Quebec and Natashquan) 968; (St. John and Minas Basin) 971 (i).

Militia (pay and allowance) 431 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (fuel) 6822; (rents) 6818 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (immigration building) 1050; (St. John quarantine) 1053 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (repairs, &c.) 6816; (treasury vaults) 6825 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Country Harbour) 7398; (Cow Bay) 7399; (Culloden) 7401; (Inverness Mines) 7403 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Barrie pier) 9595 (v).

Railways—G.T.P. (salaries, &c.) 2293; (surveys, construction, &c.) 2281 (ii); (surveys, plans, &c.) 9490; (terminals, &c.) 9499 (v).

Railways—I.C.R. (Campbellton) 1969; (Drummondville improvements) 1961 (i); (general vote) 7475 (iv); (Halifax terminals) 2034 (ii); (Mitchell bridge) 1941; (Moncton accommodation) 1947; (Newcastle improvements) 1967; (rolling stock) 1986 (i), 2037 (ii), 9514 (v); (steel rails, fastenings, &c.) 1988; (Sydney Mines extension) 1987 (i).

Railways—P.E.I. (Cardigan branch) 9484 (v).

Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3653 (ii).

Toronto, Centre, Issue of Writ, Registration *re* (remarks) 3251 (ii).

Toronto Island Fog Horns, Complaints *re* (remarks) 9286 (v).

Toronto Trade and Labour Council, Memorandum *re* Immigration Office in G.B. (read) in Com. of Sup., 9309 (v).

Transportation Problem *re* Waterways, in Com. of Sup., 1277, 1309 (i).

Wire Fencing: *See* 'N.W.T.'

Paquet, Mr. E., *L'Islet.*

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. to M. for 2°, 4798 (iii).

Dom. Notes, Printing in English and French, &c. (Ques.) 6826 (iv).

Gas and Electric Light Inspection at Three Rivers, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1760 (i).

I.C.R. Time Tables, Printing in English and French (Ques.) 6827 (iv).

St. Angel, Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1759 (i).

Parent, Mr. Geo., *Montmorency.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s. Speech (seconded) 17 (i).

Parmelee, Mr. C. H., *Shefford.*

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4886 (iii).

Battleford and Lake Lenore Ry. Co.'s (B. 75) 1° m., 1671 (i).

Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8231 (v).

Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 18) 1°*, 317 (i).

Paterson, Hon. William (Minister of Customs), *Brant.*

Agricultural Imports to U.S. 1903-4 (Ans.) 909 (i).

Allans SS. Contracts *re* Cold Storage, Cor., &c. (read) in Com. of Sup., 865 (i).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 892 (i).

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3045 (ii).

——— in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8081 (v).

Autonomy B. 69, School Clause Amts, (remarks) in Com., 5870 (iii).

——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 6836 (iv). *See* 'Manitoba.'

Binder Twine, Manufacture in Can. for Home Consumption (Ans.) 1759 (i).

Budget, on The, 8934 (v).

Canso, Establishment of Bait Freezers, &c. (Ans.) 1147 (i).

Cattle Embargo, &c. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 902 (i).

Cement, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9765 (v).

Cement, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8985 (v).

Civil Service Insurance Act, Statement, &c. (presented) 54 (i).

Coatsworth, Customs Collector, Salary, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 261 (i).

Customs Collections on Sunday (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 413 (i).

Customs Collector, Victoria, B.C., Appnmt. of, &c. (Ans.) 271 (i).

Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 190 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9764 (v).

Discrimination *re* Freight Rates, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 889 (i).

Dumping Clause, Amts. to (remarks) in Com. on B. 190, 9767 (v).

——— Customs, Instructions *re*, on M. (Mr. Kemp) for Copies, 695 (i).

Dredges imported, Entries at Customs, &c. (remarks) *re* Ques. of Mr. Bennett, M.P., 5596 (iii).

Paterson, Hon. William—*Con.*
Dredging Plant, &c., Imported into Canada, Valuation, &c. (Ans.) 5425 (iii).
Edmonton Election, Opposition to Min. of Int. (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5884 (iii).
Fisher, P. G., Retirement, &c. (Ans.) 264 (i).
Furness, Withy & Co., Contract *re* S. African Trade, in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).
Hamilton Cove P.O., Mail Service and Revenue (Ans.) 7422 (iv).
Harvey, N.B., Customs Collector, Appnmt. of (Ans.) 9697 (v).
Hay exported from Quebec to Boston, Number of Tons (Ans.) 689, 1065 (i).
Herring Industry, &c. at Canso, &c. (Ans.) 1147 (i).
Imports and Exports, Total Amount for Home Consumption, 1904 (Ans.) 380 (i).
Imports from United Kingdom, Amounts, &c. (Ans.) 267 (i).
McMichael, Mr., Customs Inspector, Duties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 406 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions, Information *re* System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 923 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, Mr. Borden's Visit to Bishop Langevin in Winnipeg, &c., 4020 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 4018 (ii).
Meteorological Building, Toronto, Erection of (Ans.) 1149 (i).
Morrison, Hector D., Customs Officer, Pinette, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2330 (ii).
Oats, Rolled, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9764 (v).
Preferential Tariff, Amounts, Volue of Imports, &c. (Ans.) 152 (i).
Prescott Lighthouse Depot, Total Area, &c. (Ans.) 1149 (i).
Pub. Accounts (presented) 50 (i).
'Reptile Press,' &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1576 (i).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. S. Hughes) 5209 (iii).
Revenue collected in N.W. Ters., on M. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) for Ret., 601 (i).
Rolled Oats : *See* 'Oats.'
Rouse, David, Appnmt. as Customs Collector, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 452 (i).
Ste. Famille Wharfage Dues, Abolition of (Ans.) 1150 (i).
St. François and Quebec SS. Subsidy, Request *re* (Ans.) 1504 (i).
Saskatchewan, Prov. of : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Sault Ste. Marie Bonded Warehouse for Soft Coal, Establishment of (Ans.) 5688 (iii).
Savage Harbour, P.E.I., Proposed Improvement (Ans.) 3361 (ii).
Shaw, Mr. J. B., Retirement, &c. (Ans.) 264 (i).

Paterson, Hon. William—*Con.*
S. Africa and Can SS. Subsidy, Contract *re* in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).
Supply (M.) for Com., 50 (i)
SUPPLY :
Chinese Immigration (salaries, &c.) 981 (i).
Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 77, 90; Customs (contingencies) 405; (salaries) 78 (i), 9069 (v); Finance (salaries) 78; Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office (salaries) 70; Sec. of State (salaries) 74; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 96 (i).
Customs (commutation *re* navy and army) 6724 (iv); (contingent expenses) 256 (i); (Foote, J., gratuity, &c.) 6434 (iv); (inspectors' salaries) 405 (i); (remission of duty *re* army and navy goods) 6812 (iv); (revenue cruisers) 409 (i); (Shadwell, Mrs. J. B., gratuity) 6435; (Turner, Mrs. J., gratuity, &c.) 6435 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and G.B.) 967 ; (Baddeck and East Bay) 934 ; (Canada and G.B.) 864; (Canada and Mexico) 895; Canada & South Africa) 971; (Grand Manan and Mainland) 922; (Halifax and Canso) 937; (Halifax and Liverpool) 902; (Halifax and Nfld.) 906; (Magdalen Islands) 906; (Manchester Line) 932; (Montreal, Quebec and G. B.) 932; (Murray Bay and Riv. Ouelle) 938; (Paspébiac and Gaspé) 944; (Petit de Grat) 966; (Pictou and Cheticamp) 935; (Pictou and Montague Bridge) 926; (Port Mulgrave, &c.) 934; (P.E.I. and G. B.) 927 ; (P. E. I. and Mainland) 920 ; (P. E. I. and Newfoundland.) 940 ; (Port Mulgrave and Canso) 935; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 936; (Quebec and Gaspé) 926; (Quebec and Natashquan) 967; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 948; (St. John, N.B. and Belfast) 902; (St. John and Digby) 904, 966; (St. John, N.B., and Glasgow) 902; (St. John and Halifax) 923; (St. John, Halifax and London) 904; (St. John and Minas Basin) 926, 971; (St. John and Westport) 966; (St. Stephen and Black Bay) 936; (Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence) 937; (Victoria and San Francisco) 906; (Victoria and Vancouver) 938; (wrecking plant) 957 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 848 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Bridgeburg) 1550 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Printing Bureau) 1575 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (semaphores) 1986 (i).
Thompson, Capt. Thos., Dismissal as Preventive Officer (Ans.) 1763 (i).
Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 321 (i).
Trade and Navigation Rep. (presented) 50 (i).
Watson, Mr., Customs Collector at Collingwood, Superannuation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 408 (i).
Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 50 (i).
Woodstock Armoury, Ownership of Land, &c. (Ans.) 4921 (iii).
Wrecking Plant, 'Lord Strathcona', in Com. of Sup., 957 (i).
Yukon Customs, Living Allowances (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).

Perley, Mr. G. H., *Argenteuil.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3739 (ii).

——— in Com. (distribution of seats) 7735; (iv); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8072 (v); on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7864, 7970 (iv).

Carillon Canal Fishway, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 2064 (ii).

——— Establisment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2910 (ii).

Carillon Works, Emplymt. of Labourers, Affidavit read *re* Political Influence (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6856 (iv).

Greece's Point Wharf, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2063 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7301 (iv).

Grenville Canal, Appnmt, of Supt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1509 (i).

Grenville Canal Wharf, Price of Lumber (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1514 (i).

Hull Wharf, Total Cost, (Ques.) 2064 (ii).

Immigrants, Austrian, Stranded at Ottawa, (remarks) 4845 (iii).

Lumber purchased by Govt., Prices paid, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2711 (ii).

Militia Orders *re* Civil Servants (remarks) 1260 (i).

Ottawa Buildings and Civic Taxation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1663 (i).

Ottawa Improvement Commission, Number of Employees (Ques.) 382 (i).

Parry Sound Buoy Contract, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2858 (ii).

Ry. Act (1903)—(highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 281, 308 (i).

Railway Commission Board, Names of Employes, &c. (M. for ret.*) 403 (i).

Robert & Co., Lumber purchased from, Prices (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2711 (ii).

Saw Logs, Export Duty (remarks) on M. for Sup., 752 (i).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Grenville (guide piers) 1499; (inspection) 1509 (i).

Fisheries (protection service) 2910 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 2611 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (rentals &c.) 1663; Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Apple River) 1727 (i); Que. (East Templeton) 7300; (Montmorency wharf) 6856 (iv).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of (prop. res.) 1351, 1383 (i).

——— (M.) for special Com., 8636 (v).

——— Rep. (presented) 9392 (v).

——— (M.) to conc. 9522 (v).

Wharfs in N.S., Expenditure *re* (remarks) 2611 (ii).

Wharfs, Policy of Govt. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1727 (i).

Piche, Mr. C., *Montreal, St. Mary's.*

Central Trunk Ry. Co.'s (B. 81) 1°*, 1671 (i).

Halifax Fishery Award, Amount received by Can. Govt. (Ques.) 8886 (v).

Montreal Bridge Terminal Co.'s (B. 138) 1°*, 4550; 2° m., 4703 (iii).

Montreal Grain Warehouses, Preparation of Plans (Ques.) 1345 (i).

——— Grain Conveyors, Engineers' Plans, &c. (Ques.) 2187 (ii).

——— Permanent Sheds, Plans *re*, Preparation of (Ques.) 2186 (ii).

Montreal Postal Facilities, East End Extension (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).

Ottawa River Ry. Co.'s Change of Name (B. 81) 1°*, 1671 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal P.O., Pneumatic system) 1133 (i).

Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 8696 (v).

Pickup, Mr. S. W. W., *Annapolis.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Victoria beach) 7418 (iv).

Porter, Mr. E. G., *West Hastings.*

Autonomy Bill No. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4726 (iii); in Com., sec. 16 (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8474 (v).

Ballot Box Frauds in West Hastings Dom. Elections, on M. for Sup., 9199 (v).

Criminal Code, 1892 (summary appeals) Amt. (B. 66) 1°* 1336 (i); 2° m., 4260; in Com., 4260; Amt. in Com., 5137 (iii); 3° m., 9699 (v).

Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9425 (v).

Glenn Ross P.O., Abolition of, &c. (Ques.) 1149 (i).

Oxford Elections, Resignation of Mr. D. D. McKenzie (remarks) in Com. on Autonomy Bill, 8474 (v).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond (Minister of Marine and Fisheries), *Maisonneuve.*

"Acadia," Str., Disposal of Fittings, &c. (Ans.) 1849 (i).

Acetylene Gas Lights, Number, Annual, Saving &c. (Ans.) 1593 (i).

See 'Carbide,' 'Scout.'

Advances by O.C., Total Amount (Ans.) 267 (i).

'Agnes G. Donohue' Schr. Seizure of (remarks) 1508 (i).

Aids to Navigation, Res. from Boards of Trade, Programme (read) in Com. of Sup., 6641 (iv).

American Fishermen on N.S. Coasts, Protection *re* (remarks) 7908 (iv).

Anticosti Lightships, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1850 (i).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*
Atlantic Fisheries Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 270 (i).
Beaujeu Bank Pier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Bicquet Lighthouse Keeper, Name, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3202 (ii).
Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Conspiracy, &c., Denials, &c., 544 (i).
British American Fish Corporation, Lease to *re* N. Western Lakes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).
Bronte Light, Installation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2869 (ii), 9176 (v).
Brother's Light, Salary of Keeper (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).
'Canada-Cape Breton,' Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2625 (ii).
Carbide purchased for Lighthouses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2710, 2743 (ii).
Carillon Dam Fishway, Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2911 (ii).
Castonguay, Dismissal and Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 5689 (iii).
'Champlain' Str., Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 150 (i).
See 'Ice Breaker,' 'Montcalm.'
Cold Storage Bait Freezers, Location, Number, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Ret., 1770 (i).
——— Amount expended (Ans.) 1505 (i).
Cowie, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. *re* Herring Experiments (Ans.) 5425 (iii).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3210 (ii).
Fish-breeding Establishments in Lake Winnipeg (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6636 (iv).
Fishery Overseers, Colchester Co., N.S., Number and Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 5978 (iv).
Fisheries Protection Service, Enforcement of the Law (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6633 (iv).
——— Steamers, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1347 (i).
——— Service, Weekly, &c., Pay-roll, Amt. of Payments (Ans.) 1350 (i).
Fishing Regulations in Ont., Conflict with Dom. (remarks) 4752 (iii).
Fishing Rights in Estuaries, Jurisdiction *re* (Ans.) 1347 (i).
Fish imported into New York, Legislation *re* Prohibition of, on M. (Mr. Demers) to Com. of Sup., 6190 (iv).
Godbout, Mr. J., Lighthouse-keeper, Political Partisanship (Ans.) 1343 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 1349 (i).
——— Estimate of Expenditure (read) 2597 (ii).
——— Purchase of Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2617 (ii).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*
Govt. Steamers, Purchases of Supplies, Statement (read) 2619 (ii).
Grain Warehouses, Montreal, Preparation of Plans (Ans.) 1345 (i).
Halifax Fishery Award, Amount received by Can. Govt. (Ans.) 8886 (y).
——— Distribution *re* Provinces (Ans.) 1593 (i).
Halifax Lightship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2709 (ii).
Harbour controlled by Commissioners, Names &c., (Ans.) 1063 (i).
Herring and Lobster Industry, Investigation, &c., Rep. *re* (Ans.) 4371, 5425 (iii).
Hodgins, Jonathon, Resignation from Harbour Commission, Montreal (Ans.) 151 (i).
Hospital Dues *re* Sick Mariners (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2687 (ii).
Hurley, J. M., Fishery Inspector (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2895 (ii).
Icebreaker 'Montcalm', Accident to (statement) 4752 (iii).
See 'Montcalm.'
Lake Manitoba Closed to Fishing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2901 (ii).
Lemieux, Jos., Appnmt. to Lightship Service (Ans.) 1762 (i).
Lepreaux Point Lightkeeper, Dismissal, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 6475 (iv).
Life-saving Crew, Grand Manan, N.B., Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 4921 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service Steamers, Ports of Call, &c. (Ans.) 1850 (i).
Lighthouse Depot at Prescott, Contract *re* Erection (Ans.) 1340 (i).
Lighthouse Supply Depots (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2710 (ii).
Lobster Fishing, N.B., Open Season in 1903-4-5 (Ans.) 1504 (i).
Lowe, Mr., Refusal *re* Ship 'Neptune' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).
Lumber purchased by Govt., Quantity and Prices, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2711 (ii).
'Lurcher,' Lightship, Accident to, Statement (read) 2851 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2747 (ii).
See 'Salmon.'
'Maisonneuve' Str., Expenditure *re* by Govt. (Ans.) 1850 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2745 (ii).
Manitoba Lake, Closing *re* Fishing, &c., Protests, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6631 (iv).
Marconi Stations, List of Stations (read) 2869 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6625 (iv).
——— System on Strs. 'Stanley' and 'Minto,' &c. (Ans.) 188 (i).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*
Marconi Station, Table Head, Delay in Operating (Ans.) 383 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 111 (i), 2594 (ii).
Marine Insurance, Decrease in Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2865 (ii).
Marine Supplies, Purchase of, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 2594 (ii), 4753 (iii).
Markey, F. H., Fishing Rights in Western Lakes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).
Meteorological Survey, Toronto, Removal to Ottawa (statement) 9812 (v).
Midland Govt. Dock, Tenants, Rent, &c., (Ans.) 5482 (iii).
Midland Dock, on Protest (Mr. Bennett) *re* Govtl. Action (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9559 (v).
Midland Harbour Range Lights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2734 (ii).
——— Statement (read) 2852 (ii).
'Montcalm,' Accident to (statement) 4752 (iii).
——— rep. of Capt. Koenig (read) 2451 (ii).
——— Experiments *re* Ice-breaking (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).
——— Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 150 (i).
See 'Champlain.'
Montevideo, Seamen in, Imprisonment, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2689 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners (B. 192) 1° m., 9028; in Com., 9288 (v).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Appnmt. of Commissioners (Ans.) 150 (i).
Montreal Harbour, Grain Conveyers, Engineers' Plans, &c. (Ans.) 2187 (ii).
——— Sheds, Cor. between P. W. St. George and Mar. Dept. *re*, on M. (Mr. Ames) 693 (i).
——— Sheds, Plans and Specifications *re* (Ans.) 2187 (ii).
——— Raising of Sunken Elevator (Ans.) 151 (i).
Montreal Inland Revenue Building, Addition, Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1123 (i).
Moose Lake, License to Fish (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).
Ocean and River Service Strs., Names and Tonnage, &c. (Ans.) 1348 (i).
——— Total Expenditure on Pay-roll (Ans.) 1349 (i).
Oshawa Harbour Revenue (Ans.) 1504 (i).
Parry Sound Buoy Contract, Statement (read) 2856 (ii).
Parry Sound Gas Plant, Purchase of Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2726 (ii).
Pilotage Act Amt. (B. 171) 1° m., 7018; 2° and in Com., 7440 (iv).
Pilotage Commission, Sydney Harbour, Benefit Fund for Pilots, &c. (remarks) 9037 (v).
Pound Net Licenses issued by Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2892 (ii).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*
P.E.I. Fisheries, Supervision *re* (Ans.) 1762 (i).
P.E.I. Mail Service, Ice Boats, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2673 (ii).
——— Statement of Trips made (read), 2675
P.E.I. and Mainland SS. Communication, Inspection of 'Stanley' (Ans.) 687 (i).
——— (remarks) 1338 (i).
P.E.I. Steam Communication with Mainland (remarks) 1595 (i).
P.E.I. and Mainland Winter Service, Delegation *re* Tunnel, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6644 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. (B. 37) 2° m., 1242; in Com., 1243 (i).
Reid, Capt., Rep. *re* Submarine Signals (read) 2886 (ii).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 1242 (i), 2263 (ii).
St. George, Mr. P. W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 152 (i).
St. Lawrence Channel Improvements, Aids to Navigation, 2859 (ii).
——— Allan SS. Co., Res. *re* (read) 2860 (ii).
——— Res. from Montreal Board of Trade (read) 2860 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Ship Channel, Rep. of Capt. Koenig, *re* 'Montcalm' (read) 2451 (ii).
——— Suction Dredge, Description *re* (read) in Com. of Sup., 6447 (iv).
See 'Sorel.'
Salmon Canning Fisheries, B.C., Suspension, &c., Representations, &c. (Ans.) 270 (i).
Salmon, Capt., Rep. of Mr. Douglas Stevens in Answer to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2878 (ii).
——— Rep. *re* 'Lurcher' Accident (laid on table) 2878 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Ames) for Cor., 388 (i).
See 'Lurcher,' 'Stevens.'
Salmon Hatcheries and Provincial Fishing Licenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2906 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie Dry Dock Construction, Total Amount expended (Ans.) 5427 (iii).
'Scout' Str., Claims *re* Compensation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6463 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2700 (ii).
Seamen's Act Amt. (B. 147) 1°*, 4750 (ii); 2° m., and in Com., 7424 (iv), 9030 (v).
——— Victoria Board of Trade, Res. (read) 7432 (iv).
Seamen's Act Amt. (B. 38) 2° m., and in Com., 2114-5 (ii); wthdrn., 4749 (iii).
Seamen's Act B. 38, Memo from Victoria Board of Trade (read) 2117 (ii).
'Seguin,' Str., Purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 3834 (ii).
Small-pox, on Ships, Prevention, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*
Sorel Shipyards, Dredge Building, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6450 (iv).
——— Purchase of Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2457 (ii).
South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9587 ; on Sen. Amts., 9815 (v).
Steam Communication with P.E.I., Delay in Mails, &c. (telegram read) 1753 (i).
Steel Sheds, Montreal Harbour, Approval of Plans, &c. (Ans.) 151 (i).
Stevens, Douglas, Answer to Capt. Salmon's Rep. *re* Lurcher Accident, in Com. of Sup., 2878 (ii).
Submarine Signalling Bell, Shore Stations, Reps. of U.S., &c. (read) 2871 (ii).
——— Rep. of Capt. Reid (read) 2886 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 102 (i), 2443 (ii), 6266 (iv), 9050 (v).
Fisheries (bait freezers, Mar. Provs.) 9620 (v) ; (bounty distribution) 6636 (iv); (dogfish experiments) 9173 (v) ; (fish-breeding stations) 6636 (iv) ; (fish curing) 9173 ; (Fishery Commission) 9172 (v) ; (hatcheries) 2904 (ii) ; (inspectors' disbursements) 6630 (iv) ; (inspectors' salaries) 2878, 2890 ; (oyster culture) 2912 (ii) ; (protection cruiser 'Petrel') 6630 (iv) ; (protection service) 2907 (ii) ; (Venning, R. N., honorarium) 6630 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies) 2705 ; (aids to navigation) 2759, 2850, 2859 (ii) ; ('Arctic' patrol boat) 9177 (v) ; (buoys) 2730 ; (engineers' salaries) 2760 (ii) ; (ice boats) 9177 (v) ; (keeper's salaries) 2697 (ii) ; (lighthouse repairs) 6636 (iv), 9035 ; (light-keepers salaries) 9175 (v) ; (maintenance, lightship) 2706 ; (Marconi stations) 2869 (ii) ; (Parry Sound buoy) 9175 (v) ; (pilotage) 2760 (ii) ; (Port Arthur, &c., fog alarms) 6645 ; ('Scout,' repairs) 6643 (iv) ; (signal service) 2760 ; (submarine signals) 2871 (ii) ; (N. W. M. Police patrol boat) 9178 ; (wrecking plant, Mar. Provs.) 9177 (v).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Mexico) on conc., 6910 (iv).
Marine (hospitals) 9172 ; (naval militia) 9178 (v) ; (St. John, N.B.) 6628 (iv) ; (sick seamen) 2686, 2688 (ii).
Ocean and River Service ('Aberdeen' boilers) 6464; (Arctic expedition) 6468 (iv); (examination of masters and mates) 2623 ; (Govt. steamers) 2595 (ii) ; (Harrison, Capt., allowance, &c.) 6466 (iv) ; (hydrographic surveys) 2679 (ii), 6623; (ice breaking steamers) 6464 (iv), 9034, 9617 (v) ; (life-saving rewards) 2624 (ii); (Mr. Lowe's honorarium) 6473; (maintenance *re* steamers) 6463 (iv) ; (meteorological service) 2679 ; (obstruction, removal) 2647 (ii) ; ('Quadra' repairs) 9171 (v) ; (schools of navigation) 2639 ; (tidal surveys) 2648 (ii) ; (winter mail service) 6467 (iv) ; (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2648 (ii) ; (wrecks investigation) 6466 (iv).
Public Works Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks) 1118 ; (Montreal Inland Rev.) 1123; (Montreal military buildings) 1126

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Dredges (new plant) 9171 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (compensation to Jos. Paul) 6463 (iv); (Lake St. Peter piers) 6453 (iv), 9171 (v) ; (St. Lawrence channel) 2448 (ii); (St. Lawrence ship channel (suction dredge) 6436 (iv).
Scientific Institutions (hydrographic surveys) 9172; (purchase of steamer) 9172 (v).
Steamboat Inspection (gratuities) 6628 (iv) ; (salaries) 2695 (ii).
Toronto Island Fog Horns, Testing, &c., Complaints *re* (remarks) 9283 (v).
Transportation Commission, Progress *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6438 (iv).
Verdun, Protection *re* Floods, on M. (Mr. Monk for Cor., 459 (i).
Vessels, Registered, List of : Rep. (presented) 6907 (iv).
Wireless Telegraph Regulation (B. 186) 1° m., 8177; in Com., 9031 (v).
Pringle, Mr. R. A., *Stormont.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4273 (iii).
——— in Com. (readjustment of representation) 5762 (iii).
——— (school clause amt.) 7172 (iv).
Ballots, Dom Elections, Printing, &c. for Carleton, Glengarry, &c. (Ques.) 587 (i).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 641 (i).
Cornwall Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1552, 1659 (i).
Cornwall Basin, Dredging Contract, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 588 (i).
——— Dredging, Contract *re*, Advertising (Ques.) 686 (i).
——— Employees during Election Campaign (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1224 (i).
——— Employees for October and Nov., 1904 (Ques.) 107 (i).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9759 (v).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co's (B. 92) in Com., 5736 (iii). 5963 (iv) 5971.
Port Burwell Work, Contractor, Prices paid, &c. (Ques.) 589 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Contract *re* Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1410 (i).
——— Dredging, U.S. and Canadian Contractors, Prices paid, &c. (Ques.) 589 (i).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Galops (channel completion) 1230, Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 1410; (Welland (obstruction, &c.) 1231; (Port Colborne, deepening) 1232; (Port Colborne, entrance) 1230; Welland (surveys) 1234 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Chatham armoury) 1552; (Cobourg armoury) 1558 (i).
Welland Canal Deepening, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 588 (i).

Proulx, Mr. E., *Prescott.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) in Com. (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8515 (v).

Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4271 (iii).

Reid, Mr. J. D., *Grenville.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5301 (iii).

Burritt's Rapids Locks, Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 8384 (v).

Canada Eastern Ry., Total Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1923 (i).

Cardinal Canal Swing Bridge and Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1418 (i).

Dredging Contracts, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1419 (i).

Maps, Sale by Govt., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1476 (i).

St. Lawrence Channel, Capt. Leslie's Wrecking Plant, Bonus to, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2476 (ii).

St. Louis Exhibition, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1832 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 1832 (i).

Canals—Cornwall (lock repairs) 1494; Galops (leakage) 1492; Welland (stone protection) 1497; Williamsburg (steam plant) 1494 (i).

Indians—Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6521 (iv).

Quarantine (Grosse Isle steamer) 1839; (public health organized districts) 1843; (Public Works, Health Act) 1845; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 1845 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (Sydney accommodation) 1912 (i).

Riley, Mr. G., *Victoria City, B.C.*

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) on M. for 3°, 9041 (v).

Roche, Mr. Wm., *Halifax.*

'Agnes Donahoe,' Schr., Seizure by Uruguay Govt., Telegram (read) 6137 (iv).

Canadian Fast Mail Service, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to adjn., 9781 (v).

Halifax Lightships (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2708 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers, N.S., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9573 (v).

'Lady Laurier,' Number of Crew, Names (read) 2665 (ii).

Militia Act (permanent force) Amt. B. 170 (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for 2°, 9186 (v).

Montevideo, British Seamen, Imprisonment (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2691 (ii).

Musquodoboit Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6226 (iv).

See 'Stewart.'

North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9476 (v).

Roche, Mr. Wm.—*Con.*

St. John, Halifax and W. Indies Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iv).

Stewart, Mr. J. S., Charges against (remarks) 9614 (v).

See 'Musquodoboit.'

SUPPLY :

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lightship maintenance) 2708 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and W. Indies) 7190 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Phinney's Cove) 9573; (Porter's Lake) 9583 (v).

Railways—I.C.R. (Halifax terminals) 2036 (ii).

Roche, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*

Acreage in Provisional Districts of Alberta, Sask., &c., Disposed of, &c. (M. for ret.*) 601 (i).

Alberta District, Postal Business, &c. (M. for ret.) 599 (i).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5563 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3672 (ii).

——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5624 (iii).

——— in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8038, 8083 (v).

——— on M. for 3°, Amt. (distribution of seats) 8860 (v).

Autonomy Bill, Mr. Haultain's Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2524 (ii).

——— Schedules, Population and Votes cast (remarks) 5575 (iii).

British America Fish Co., Contract *re* Fishing in Western Lakes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).

Cattle Quarantine, Man., System *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2316 (ii).

Fish-breeding Establishments in Lake Winnipeg (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6635 (iv).

Fishing Rights in Nelson River, &c., Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).

Glanders among Horses, Jurisdiction *re* Compensation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6705 (iv).

G. T. P. Ry., Route proposed West of Winnipeg, Plans, &c. (Ques.) 729 (i).

Homestead Inspectors acting as Liberal Organizers (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 9254 (v).

See 'Nixon.'

Immigration, Govt. Policy *re* bonusing Steamships (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9318 (v).

Indian Agents acting as Magistrates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6550 (iv).

Lake Manitoba closed to Fishing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2901 (ii).

Lake Winnipeg Fish Hatcheries, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2905 (ii).

Leach, R. E. A., Dom. Lands Agent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9252 (v).

Roche, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*
Leach, Mr. (Ques.) 1065 (i).
Logberg Printing Co., Winnipeg, Payments to (Ques.) 4373, 4457 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Pets., &c., *re* (M. for copies) 1768 (i).
——— Res. passed by Man. Legislature (remarks) 4082 (ii).
Manitoba Lake, Closing *re* Fishing, Protests, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6751 (iv).
Markey, F. H., Lease *re* Fishing Rights in N.W. Lakes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).
Marquette Voters' Lists, Original Copy (M. for copy*) 97 (i).
Milk River Ranche Co., Quarantine *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2312 (ii).
Minnedosa Drill Hall, Representations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9170 (v).
Moose Lake, License to Fish (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).
Nixon, Mr., Dom. Lands Agent, Charges against, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8122 (v).
See 'Homestead.'
North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonus *re* Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9318 (v).
North Thompson River, B.C., Improvements, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 5783 (iii).
Northwest Ters., Surveys, Number of Miles, Total Cost, &c. (M. for ret.) 1396 (i).
Postal Business, Alberta District (M. for ret.) 599 (i).
Ret. Officers, Deputy, Payments *re*, Letter from Mr. E. Walker (read) 6560 (iv).
Revenue collected, Customs and Inland Rev., in N.W. Ters., &c. (M. for ret.) 600 (i).
Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Boundaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9298 (v).
Russian Priests canvassing for Conservatives in Dom. Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9264 (v).
Saskatchewan, Prov. of: *See* 'Autonomy.'
SUPPLY:
Customs (collectors' salaries) 407 (i).
Dom. Lands (land agents) 9252; (tree culture) 9298 (v).
Fisheries (fish-breeding stations) 6635 (iv); (hatcheries) 2905 (ii); (inspectors' disbursements) 6630 (iv); (inspectors' salaries) 2896 (ii).
Immigration (agents' salaries) 9318 (v).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (annuities) 6538; (live stock) 6539 (iv).
Indians—Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6518 (iv).
Justice—Man. (judges' salaries, &c.) 123; Yukon (living allowances) 129 (i).
Legislation—Franchise Act (voters' lists) 6898 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Fernie) 1641 (i).
Roche, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 1634; (Dom. renewals) 1634; (Winnipeg, immigration) 1635; (Winnipeg, militia) 1635; (Winnipeg P.O.) 1636; (Virden drill hall) 1634 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Edmonton jail) 1638; (Moosejaw) 1638; (Regina P.O.) 1640 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Dauphin) 7569 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines—N.W.T. (Qu'Appelle and Edmonton) 6893; Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 6896 (iv).
Quarantine (cattle) 2312 (ii); (contagious diseases, Man.) 1843; (Winnipeg, &c., Hospitals) 1846 (i).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1368 (i).
Voters' Lists for Man. Constituencies, Printing, &c. (Ques.) 60 (i).
——— Printing and Proof-reading, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6898 (iv).
See 'Marquette.'
Water Rights Reservations, N.W.T., Rep. of Mr. Burley, &c. (M. for copies*) 1398 (i).
Young, Thos., and McNab, G. C., Homestead Inspectors, Canvassing for Liberal Candidate (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9254 (v).
See 'Homestead.'

Ross, Mr. D., *Yale-Cariboo.*
Autonomy Bill, Separate Schools Pets. (remarks) 2319 (ii).
Man. Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 4068 (ii).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2050 (ii).
Railway Belt Lands, B.C., Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9296 (v).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 1777 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Navigation Co.'s (B. 139) Pet. (presented) 3743 (ii); 1°*, 4550; 2° m., 4700 (iii); in Com., 8315, 8637; 3° m., 8818, 9040 (v).

Schaffner, Mr. F. L., *Souris.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2° 4622 (iii).
Autonomy Bill, Mr. Haultain's Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2548 (ii).
Binder Twine Industry at Kingston, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 483 (i).
Boissevain Postmaster, Mr. A. McKnight, Dismissal &c. (Ques.) 2327 (ii).
Man. Public Buildings, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 857 (i).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6771 (iv).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 346 (i).

Schaffner, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 857 (i) ; Roads and Bridges—N.W.T. (colonization roads) 7597, 7598 (iv).
Timber Licenses on Indian Lands, Govt. Procedure (Ques.) 9280 (v).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1373 (i).

Schell, Mr. J. T., *Glengarry.*
Great Northern Ry. of Canada (B. 71) in Com., 4258 (iii).

Schell, Mr. M. S., *South Oxford.*
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 680 (i), 2435 (ii).
Brantford and Woodstock Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 63) 1°*, 1241 (i).
Canadian Cattle, Embargo in G.B., on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Com., 9015 (v).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5007 (iii).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. 1179 (i).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1366 (i).

Scott, Mr. W., *West Assiniboia.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5502 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3591 (ii).
——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries), 5627 (iii).
——— (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8598 (v).
——— (C.P.R. lands) 6058 (iv).
——— (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8073 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7772, 7891, 7924 (iv).
——— (election of members), 5777 (iii).
——— (lands vested in Crown), 6010 (iv).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8509.
——— (seat of govt.) 8245 (v).
——— (subsidy to provs.) 6099 (iv).
——— on M. for 3°, Amt. (C.P.R. taxes) 8777; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* schools, 8809 (v).
Autonomy (Saskatchewan) B. 70, in Com. (distribution of seats) 8711 8725 ; in Com. on schedule (Grenfell) 8757 ; (Lumsden) 8757; on M. for 3°, 8866 ; (Amt.) 8873 ; Neg. (Y. 11 ; N. 126) 8881 (v).
Autonomy B. 69, Edmonton Election, Date of Contest, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5890 (iii).
——— Statement *re* Net Revenue of Public Lands in N.W.T. (read) 5505 (iii).
Edmonton Election, Voters' Lists *re* (remarks) in Com. on Bill 69, 5853 (iii).

Scott, Mr. W.—*Con.*
Moosejaw and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s (B. 20) 1°*, 317 (i) ; in Com., 2715, 2762 (ii).
Northwest Territories Elections, Interference of Govt. Employees (remarks) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* B. 156, 8772 (v).
Northwest Territories Representation Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8769 (v).
Regina and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 41) 1°*, 625 (i).
Saskatchewan Bridge Co.'s (B. 111) 1°*, 2184 (ii).

Sifton, Hon. C., *Brandon.*
Autonomy Bill, B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3092 (ii).
Resignation, Personal Explanation, 1851 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 2447 (ii).

Sinclair, Mr. J. H., *Guysborough.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5121 (iii).
Binder Twine, Home Consumption, Manufacture in Can., &c. (Ques.) 1759 (i).
Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4262 (iii).
Fog Horn Nuisance at Toronto Island (remarks) 9287 (v).
Lifeboat Crews, N.S., Number, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 912 (i).
'Lurcher' Lightship, Accidents to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2754 (ii).
Presbyterian College Board (B. 123) 1°*, 2681 (ii).
Public Buildings, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).
Safety of Ships (B. 21) 1° m., 319 ; in Com., 731 (i).
Small-pox Epidemic in N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (hatcheries) 2907 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lightkeeper salaries) 2698 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 974 ; (Port Mulgrave and Canso) 936 (i).
Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 2688 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Canso) 1033 (i) ; Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Half Island cove) 9584 ; (Tatamagouche) 9579 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 9513 (v).
Steamboat Inspection (fees *re*) 2696 (ii).

Sloan, Mr. W., *Comox-Atlin.*
Esquimalt Naval Station, Abandonment by Imp. Govt (Ques.) 188 (i).
G.T. Pacific Ry., Surveys, B.C., Information *re* (Ques.) 3009 (ii).

Sloan, Mr. W.—*Con.*
Halibut Fisheries, B.C., American Encroachments, &c. (Ques.) 585 (i).

Smith, Mr. R., *Nanaimo.*
Alien Labour Act, Appeal *re* Judge Anglin's Decision (Ques.) 8147 (v).
Associated British Canadian Society, and Labour Dept., Complaints *re* Graeme Hunter (Ques.) 2188 (ii).
B.C. Immigration Legislation, Disallowance *re* (Ques.) 189 (i), 6474 (iv).
Celeste Joly, Patent Relief (B. 107) 1°*, 2184 (ii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s (B. 90) 1°*, 2005 (ii).
Hunter, Graeme, Complaints *re* Immigration Frauds (Ques.) 2188 (ii).
Labour Union Labels (B. 10) prop. Res., 272 (i) ; in Com. on Res., 272 ; in Com., 701, 918, 1770, 1774 ; 3° m., 1779 (i).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. R. F. Sutherland) *North Essex.*
Address from Gov. Gen. (read) 6 (i).
——— Reply to from His Ex. (read) 1340 (i).
Assent to Bills, Mess. from His Ex., 6084 (iv).
See 'Bills.'
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) on Amt. (Mr. Léonard) to M. for 3° (ruling) 8857 (v).
Autonomy Bill, Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 2570 (ii).
——— Members' remarks checked, 2277 (ii).
——— Official Report of Division (remarks) 5430 (iii).
——— Presenting Pets. (remarks) 2319 (ii) ; (ruling) 2320 (ii).
——— on Resignation of Hon. C. Sifton (remarks) 1864 (i).
See 'Man. Boundaries,' 'Order, Ques. of,' 'Petitions.'
Bills, Assent to, Com. from Gov. Gen. Sec. (read) 6991 (iv).
——— Mess. from His Ex., 6084 (iv).
Blair, Mr., Resignation, Conspiracy, &c., Ques. of Order, *re* Denials from Minister's (ruling) 546 (i).
Borden, Mr. R. L., Notification of Election, 583 (i).
Campaign Literature and Franking by Ministers of Crown (remarks) 1810 (i).
Carleton Electoral District, Vacancy, &c. (issue of warrant) 98 (i).
Controverted Elections, Lisgar, Judges' Certificate (presented) 9 (i).
Debates, French Edition, Delay in Issuing, &c. (remarks) 240 (i).
Edmonton Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 5131 (iii).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*
Edmonton Electoral District, Vacancy (notification) 4200 (iii).
——— Issue of Writ, 4200 (iii).
Fitz-Simons, Jane Marie Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6378 (iv).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 3°, 4228 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry. Surveys, Rep. *re* &c., Members remarks checked, 2021 (ii).
G. B. and Her Colonies, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 2401 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Ingram) 2402 (ii).
House of Commons, Desks for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).
——— Purchases, Audit of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
——— Rooms for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 238 (i).
——— Supplies, Furniture, Purchase of, Res. from Internal Economy Com. (read) 6614 (iv).
Lévis Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 7175 (iv).
Lévis Vacancy, Issue of Writ (notification) 6474 (iv).
Library of Parlt., Joint Rep. (presented) 8 (i).
London Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 8001 (v).
——— Issue of Writ (notification) 6473 (iv).
Man. Boundaries, Ques. of Order, Naming Member, 3858 (ii).
——— Question of Order, 'Political Debts, Payment of,' &c., 3857 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order *re* 'Scurvy Politicians,' 3863 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex., Estimates, Suppl. (presented) 6165 (iv).
Mess. from His Ex. (Opening of Parliament) 4 (i).
Messengers, House of Commons (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 240 (i).
Order, Ques. of, Man. Boundaries, Ruling *re* Naming Members, on Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 3879 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 13 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., Members remarks checked, 3190 (ii).
Oxford, N., Electoral Division, Certificate of Election (notification) 8177 (v).
——— Issue of Writ (notification) 6046 (iv).
Petition presented *re* Autonomy Bill: (Ruling *re* Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Macpherson) 2681 (ii).
Petitions, Presenting of, Endorsement *re* (remarks) 2490 (ii).
Private Bills Pets., Extension of Time for Receiving (remarks) 318 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen. Sec. (read) 9815 (v).
Quebec Centre, Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 110 (i).
Ry. Act (1903) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2° (remarks) *re* Translation, 282 (i).
Ry. Commissioners B. 36, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 558 (i).
Railway Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman, on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Debate, on prop. Res. (ruling) 320 (i).
Returning Officers, Instruction *re* Form of Oath, on Ques. of Order (Mr. S. Hughes) 7361 (iv).
Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 103 (Mr. Tobin) on M. for 2°, (remarks) 2297 (ii).
Rooms for Members, Re-arrangement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) ruled out of order, 1868 (i).
Senate and House of Commons, Conferences *re* Amts. to Bills, Mess. (read) 9028 (v).
Speaker, Election of (remarks) 3 (i).
Speech from the Throne (read) 6 (i).
Steward for Speaker's Rooms (remarks) 240 (i).
SUPPLY :
House of Commons (additional messenger) 6614; (committee expenses) 6594; (expenditure) 6592 (iv); (contingencies) 239, 250 (i); (leather trunks) 6606 (iv); (messengers) 240 (i) ; (pages) 6613 (iv) ; (salaries) 238 (i); (Sergeant-at-arms, salaries) 240 (i), 6610 (iv); (sessional clerks) 239 (i), 6595 (iv) ; (sessional messengers) 6612 ; (stationery) 6594 (iv).
Telephone Grievances, &c., on M. (Mr. Maclean) Ques. of Order, 9534 (v).
Toronto Centre, Electoral District, Certificate (notification) 4370 (iii).
——— Vacancy (notification) 2841 (ii).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) on M. for 3°, 1779 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) on M. for 3°, on Ques. of Order (rulings) 8828, 8829 (v).
Vibert, Philip Relief B. 172 (Mr. Hall) on M. for 2°, (remarks) 7261 (iv).
Wright Electoral Division, Certificate of Election (notification) 1846 (i).
——— Vacancy (remarks) 98 (i).
Yukon Ter. Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 2322 (ii).

Speaker, Deputy (Mr. C. Marcil), *Bonaventure.*
Autonomy B. 69, Members' remarks checked, 5654, 5660 (iii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) *re* Misstatement of Facts by Mr. Belcourt (ruling) 3520 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. Deputy—*Con.*
Autonomy B. 69, Ques. of Order (Mr. A. Johnston) Resignation of Mr. D. D. McKenzie, 8475 ; (ruling) 8476 (v).
——— School Clauses, Irrelevancy of Debate, 5832 (iii).
Cabinet, Ex-Ministers Annuities B. 203 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., Amt. (read) 9796 (v).
Carleton County, Electoral District, Certificate (notification) 583 (i).
Census and Statistics B. 5, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) Ruling reserved, 632 (i).
Fessenden Wireless Tel. of Can. incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6608 (iv).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45, Ques. of Order (ruling) 4221 (iii).
Mess. from His Ex., Suppl. Estimates (read) 8718, 9392 (v).
Nicolet Electoral District, Certificate *re* Pet. (notification) 9081 (v).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2052 (ii).
Orangemen, Attack *re*, on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8365 (v).
Port Arthur, &c., Dredging Contract, on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Irrelevancy of Debate (ruling) 4666 (iii).
Provident Savings Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5974 (iv).
Ry. Commission (chairman) B. 36 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. (ruling) 1632 (i).
Seeds, Sale B. 7, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 361 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., Amt. (Mr. Borden) read, 9587 (v).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3656 (ii).
Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Zimmerman) Amt. (read) 4259 (iii).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. D. Ross) on M. for 2° (remarks) 4701 (iii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*
Acetylene Gas Co.'s Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1054 (i).
Alien Labour Investigation *re* G.T.P., Inquiry for Rep., 821 (i).
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 676, 738 (i), 2413 (ii).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5436 (iii).
Autonomy for N. W. Ters. B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 1430 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3010 (ii).
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to sec. 16 (schools) 8811; on Amt. (Mr. Scott), C.P.R. land taxes 8789 (v).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Autonomy B. 69, in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5654 (iii).
——— (B.N.A. Act) 5730 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language) 8547, 8594 (v).
——— (C.P.R. lands) 6072 (iv).
——— (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8027 (v); on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7981 (iv).
——— (H. of C. representation) 5751 (iii).
——— (lands vested in Crown) 5918 (iii), 5995 (iv).
——— (laws, courts, &c.) 5928 (iii), 6101 (iv), 8243 (v).
——— (readjustment of representation) 5757 (iii).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8473; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8295; on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8341; (Mr. Lamont) 8493 (v).
——— (Senate representation) 5681 (iii).
——— (subsidy to provs.) 6086 (iv).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) on M. for 3°, Amt. (schools) 8884 (v).
Autonomy Bill, Approval of Cabinet, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2275 (ii).
——— *re* Attack on 'Orangeism' (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5873 (iii).
——— Cor. ref. to by Prime Minister, Inquiry for, 2593 (ii).
——— on Mr. Haultain's Letter, Ques. of Order *re*, 2569, 2590 (ii).
——— Official Report of Division (remarks) 5429 (iii).
——— Pets. presented *re* (personal explanation) 2320 (ii).
——— Printing, &c. (remarks) 1788 (i).
——— Printing before 3rd Reading (remarks) 8762 (v).
——— School Clauses Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5836 (iii).
——— School Clauses, Amts, *re* Explanation (remarks) 5822 (iii).
——— "Yellow Dog," Quotation from Halifax 'Chronicle,' in Com., 5873, 5879, 5901 (iii).
See 'Lt.-Govs,' 'McKenzie, D.D.,' 'Pets.,' 'Separate,' 'N.W.T. B. 160,' 'Yellow Dog.'
Ballots, Blank, Dom. Elections, Procedure *re* Printing, &c. (Ques.) 911 (i).
——— Method of Issuing Complaints *re* S. Lanark and Ottawa (Ques.) 1342 (i).
Bank Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 7642 (iv).
Bank Notes, Printing and Circulation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6263 (iv).
Bills from the Senate, on M. (Mr. Macpherson) to place on Order Paper, (remarks) 8001 (v).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Binder Twine Industry at Kingston (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 482 (i).
Blair, Mr., Resignation, &c., Ques. of Order, 553 (i).
B. C. Customs Collector, Appmnt. of (Ques.) 270 (i).
B. C. Judgeship, Appnmt. of W. W. B. McInnes (Ques.) 382 (i).
Britton, Judge, Rep. *re* Investigation, Inquiry for, 1152, 1242 (i).
Cabinet, ex-Ministers', Annuities B. 203 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9792 (v).
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers, on Orders of the Day, 3572 (ii).
Cabinet Vacancies, N. W. Ters. Representation (remarks) 3252 (ii).
Cadet Corps of Montreal (remarks) 7815 (iv).
Campaign Literature, franked by Ministers of Crown (remarks) 1820 (i).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 3°, 4413 (iii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Total Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1925 (i).
Canada Southern Bridge Co.s B. 29 (Mr. German) in Com., 1286 (i).
Canadian Cattle Ehbargo in G. B., on M. to conc. in 6th Rep., 9004, 9017 (v).
Canadian Fast Mail Service, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to adjn., 9780 (v).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 993 (i); in Com., 638, 1069 (i).
Child Immigration, Mrs. Close's Scheme (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2127 (ii).
Civil Service Appointments since 1896, Inside Service (M. for ret.*) 2333 (ii).
Civil Service Appnmts., Permanent and Temporary, &c. since July 1st, 1896 (Ques) 585 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 5808 (iii), 6232, (iv), 8002, (v).
Clarke, Mr. E. F., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 2111 (ii).
Customs Collector at Victoria, B.C., Appnmt. of (Ques.) 270 (i).
Cold Storage, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8202, 8238 (v).
Congdon, Mr., Legal Adviser to Yukon Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7717 (iv).
Consumption: *See* 'Tuberculosis.'
Country Postmasters, Increases in Salaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 143 (i).
Debates, Official, 4th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) 4984 (iii).
——— on M. to conc. in 7th Rep., 9802 (v).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) in Com. 4977 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act, Yukon Regulations on M. (Mr. Oliver) to approve, 9786 (v).
Express Cos.: *See* 'Ry. B. 4.'
Freight Rates: *See* 'Ry. Rates.'

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Georgian Bay Indian Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 236 (i).
Gold Medal Furniture Co.'s Patent Relief B. 102 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3399 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3891 (ii).
G.T.P. Ry., Surveys, Reps. *re* (remarks) 229 (i).
Grazing Leases, &c., Inquiry for Rets., 8529 (v).
G. B. and Her Colonies, Inter-Imperial Parlt., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2405 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order, 2401 (ii).
Half-Breed Scrip, Further Papers *re*, 9029 (v).
Harbours and Rivers, N.S., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9570 (v).
Hersey, A. H., Relief B. 167 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) in Com., 7682 (iv).
House of Commons Employees, Inquiry for Ret., 5209 (iii).
House of Commons P.O., Complaints *re* Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 199 (i).
Immigration : *See* 'North Atlantic.'
I. C. R. Freight Rates, Increases, &c., on Explanation of Min. of Rys., 6124 (iv).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. 9793 (v).
Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Ry. Co. Pet., on M. (Mr. Galliher) 3744 (ii).
Killam, Judge, Appnmt, as Chairman of Ry. Commission, on M. for Com. on Ry. B. No. 36, 509 (i).
Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., on Res., 277 ; in Com., 703 (i).
Letter Carriers Uniforms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).
Lt. Governors of Alberta and Saskatchewan B. 193 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9033 (v).
Live Stock Record Ass'ns. incorp. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 5078 (iii).
L'Union St. Joseph of Ottawa, on M. (Mr. Belcourt) to present Pet., 2491 (ii).
McKenzie, D. D., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill, on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. Johnston) 8479 (v).
Mail Bags, Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 213 (i).
Mail Carriers, System of Payments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).
Mail Contracts, Tenders *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 179 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions, Information *re* System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 924 (i).
Mallein Test for Cattle (remarks) in Com, of Sup., 2317 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Memorandum of Mgr. Sbarretti *re* Separate Schoo s, 3873 (ii).
——— on M. to adjn., 4005 (ii).
Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Mileage *re* Mail Service, Additional (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 184 (i).
Military Camps, Indemnity *re* Injuries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9158 (v).
Militia Estimates, on General Statement, in Com. of Sup., 9145 (v).
Montreal Post Office, Illegal Stamping of Letters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 197 (i).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1707 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9469, 9471 (v).
N.W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 8 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 459 (i).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5583 (iii).
——— on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5696 (iii).
N.W.T. Grazing Leases, Number issued, &c. (Ques.) 5478 (iii).
Northwest Irrigation Act Amt. B. 161 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 6104 (iv).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2323 (ii).
Northwest Territories (Rupert's Land) B. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 8763, 8766 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3135 (ii).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5748 (iii), 5966 (iv).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1890 ; in Com., 1284 (i), 2532, 3176, 3194 ; on Amt. (Mr. Stewart) to M. for 3°, 3396 (ii).
Owen Sound P.O., Site chosen by P.M.G. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1029 (i).
Oxford, N., Electoral Vacancy (notification) 5961 (iv).
Parliament Grounds Paving Contract, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5794 (iii).
Pets. *re* Autonomy Bill, Signature *re* (remarks) 2261, 2322 (ii).
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Conmee & Bowman's Tender, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4463, 4659 (iii).
Port Arthur Harbour Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 808 (i).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1321 (i).
Private Bills, Extension of Time, on M. (Mr. Grant) 318, 448 (i), 2491 (iii).
'Protestants driven out of Quebec,' Reply to Mr. Lemieux *re* Speech on Autonomy Bill, 3306 (ii).
Provident Savings Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5975 (iv).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Public Buildings, Govtl. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1028 (i).
Quarantine Officers, Examination of Ships, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2306 (ii).
Quebec Political Crisis (remarks) 830 (i).
Questions answered by Ministers (remarks) 1068 (i).
Railways and Canals Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1674 (i).
Ry. Act (express companies) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for Adjnmt., 3248 (ii).
Railway Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com., 509 ; in Com., 1601 ; on M. for 3°, 1804 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1623 (i).
Railway Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on Ques. of Order, 320 (i).
Railway Commission, Board of, Maintenance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1536 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Com., 5004 (iii).
Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 103 (Mr. Tobin) on M. for 2°, 2296 (ii).
Roads and Road Allowances for Alberta and Saskatchewan B. 195 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 9526 (v).
Salmon Canning Fisheries, B.C., Suspension, &c., Representations, &c. (Ques.) 269 (i).
Saskatchewan, Prov. of : *See* 'Autonomy B. 70.'
Seeds Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 322, 361, 1162, 1201, 1797 ; on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) to M. for 3°, 1878 (i).
——— Ques. of Order, 361 (i).
Separate Schools, Circulars addressed to Orange Lodges (remarks) 2405 (ii).
Separate Schools, Pets. from E. Assiniboia, Ques. of Priv., 2412 (ii).
Sifton, Hon. C., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill (remarks) 1860 (i).
Small-pox Epidemic in Man., Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2306 (ii).
South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) on M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 9073 (v).
Speeches of Members, Delay in Printing Bureau, &c. (remarks) 7723 (iv).
Sunday Observance, Govt. Legislation *re* (Ques.) 8656 (v).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (aids to societies) 1829 ; (Can. exhibits, Imperial Institute) 1838 (i); (exhibitions) 6270; (experimental farms) 6176 (iv); (public health organized districts) 1843 (i).
Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 1334; Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1321 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Charges of Management (bank notes) 6263 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Sec. of State (salaries) 6249 (iv).
Dominion Police (salaries) 138 (i).
Indians—Ont. (medical attendance) 225; (St. Regis lock-up) 237; (surveys, &c.) 236 (i).
Justice—Yukon (sheriff's allowances) 132 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G. B. and Can.) 868; (P.E.I. and G.B) 932; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 951; (wrecking plant) 959 (i).
Militia (permanent force) 9113 (v).
Miscellaneous (Alaska surveys) 7720; (maps, &c., N.W.T.) 7721 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Arctic expedition) 6469 ; (expenditures, &c.) 6466; (Mr. Low's honorarium) 6473 (iv).
Post Office (letter carriers) 174; (mail carriers uniforms) 212 ; (provisional allowance) 168 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg postal station) 9549 (v) ; N.S. (Canso) 1028 (i) ; Ont. (Owen Sound) 9547; Ottawa (additions, &c., H. of C.) 9545 (v) ; (Museum) 755; Que. (Montreal military buildings) 1125 ; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 1141 ; (trachoma hospitals) 1139 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S (Phinney's Cove) 9559; (Porter's Lake) 9584 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur) 808; (Port Colborne) 815 (i).
Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay surveys) 9547 (v).
Quarantine (cattle) 2309 (ii); (Grosse Isle steamer) 1839; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 1845; (William's Head) 1841 (i).
Railways—G.T.P. (construction) 9498 (v); (surveys, construction, &c.) 2298 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (double tracking) 1933; (expenditure, &c.) 1925 (i).
Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance) 1536 (i).
Yukon Govt. (local govt grant) 7718; (salaries, &c.) 7716; (school grant) 7719 (iv).
Telephone and Telegraph Systems, Govt. Control (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 187 (i).
Telephone Lines, Pet. *re* Municipal Control, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1251 (i).
Thermographs *re* Cold Storage on Atlantic Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 868 (i).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3653 (ii).
Tobacco Industry, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1686 (i).
Transportation Commission, Rep. of Mr. Bertram (remarks) 1288 (i).
Treadgold Concession, Rep. of Judge Britton (remarks) 821 (i).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1363 (i).
——— Joint Com., Rep., on M. (Mr. Perley) to conc., 9523 (v).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 277, 703 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. D. Ross) on M. for 2°, 4701 (iii) ; in Com., 8315 ; on M. for 3°, 8818 (v).
——— Pet., on M. (Mr. D. Ross) 3743 (ii).
Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 8696 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9545 (v).
Wire Fencing : *See* 'N.W.T. Boundary.'
Wrecking Plant, and 'Lord Strathcona' in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
"Yellow Dog" applied to Orangemen, Quotations, &c. (read) in Com. on B. 69, 8350 (v).
Yukon : *See* 'Congdon.'

Staples, Mr. W. D., *Macdonald.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4312 (iii).
See 'Man.,' &c.
Bernier, Mr. J. P., Postmaster at St. Claude, Man., Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re* (M. for copy*) 1397 (i).
Fairford River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7570 (iv).
Glanders among Horses, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6695 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip, Application from N. Ouellette, &c., Purchase of, &c. (Ques.) 9078 (v).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, M'gr Sbarretti's Memorandum *re* Separate Schools (remarks) 3851 (ii).
——— Letter of Mr. Rogers sent to Prime Minister (remarks) *re* Mr. Paterson's Charges, 4022 (ii).
Man Public Works, Claims for Damages, Pet *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7571 (iv).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6740, 6793 (iv).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1176 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture (live stock records) 6688 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg immigration) 1635 (i) ; Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Dauphin) 7570 (iv).
Quarantine (cattle) 6695 (iv).
Veterinary Surgeons in Man., Number (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6704 (iv).
Voters' Lists for Macdonald, &c. (M. for copy*) 697 (i).

Stewart, Mr. R., *Ottawa.*
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4241 (iii).
Central Counties Ry Co.'s (B. 64) 1°*, 1336 (i).
Fitz-Simons, Jane Marie Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6377 (iv).

Stewart, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 2532, 2950, 2961, 3177, 3182 ; Letter from Sec. Treas, D. R. Street (read) 3183 ; (amt.) 3201 ; on M. for 3° (amt.) 3393 (ii) ; Neg. (Y. 56 ; N. 80) 3398 (ii).
Owen, Thomas David, Patent Relief (B. 177) in Com., 8652 (v).

Stockton, Mr. A. A., *St. John City and County.*
Admiralty Court Registrars, &c. Fees, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 125 (i).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5380 (iii).
——— on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to sec. 16, Schools, 8814 (v).
——— in Com. (laws, courts, &c.) 5814, 5935 (iii).
——— (school clause amt.) 7129 (iv).
——— School Clauses Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5832 (iii).
Blair, Mr. Resignation of, Conspiracy &c., Denial *re* Election Speaking, 557 (i).
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers (remarks) on Orders of the Day, 3578 (ii).
Collingwood Govt. Dock, Conroy Bros. Cheque (remarks) 6583 (iv).
Criminal Code (summary appeals) Amt. B. 45 (Mr. Porter) on Amt. (Mr. Bureau) *re* Race Courses, 5138 (iii).
Debates and Internal Economy Committees (remarks) 9804 (v).
Dredging, System of Hiring Dredges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6844 (iv).
Fisheries Industry, Commission *re* Investigation, Recommendation, &c., on M. (Mr. Ganong) 6341 (iv).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3884 (ii), 4203 (iii).
Halifax and Esquimalt Garrison (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9114 (v).
I.C.R., Freight Arrangements and Traffic, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2222 (ii).
——— Freight Rates, Increases, &c., on Explanation of Min. of Rys., 6127 (iv).
——— Time Table, Changes and Delays (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6832 (iv).
Judges of the Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9740 ; in Com., 9793 ; on Amt., 9798 (v).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6662 (iv).
McKenzie, Mr. D. D., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill, on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. Johnston) 8478 (v).
Martineau Defalcations, Collection of Guarantee Bonds (remarks) 114 (i).
Moncton Harbour Master, Appnmt. of Mr. D. Robertson (Ques.) 2329 (ii).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 23 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2057 (ii).

Stockton, Mr .A. A.—*Con.*
N.W.T. Govt. Officials, Interference in Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9729 (v).
Opposition Leader, Indemnity to : *See* 'Senate and House of Commons.'
Ry Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 563 (i).
Robertson, Mr. D., Appnmt. as Harbour Master at Moncton (Ques.) 2329 (ii).
St. John Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 775 (i).
Seamen's Act (shipping masters) Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 9031 (v).
Senate and House of Commons Indemnity B. 202 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9728 (v).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 1830 ; (Archives) 1825 (i).
Immigration (agents' salaries) 9317 (v).
Indians—N.B. (supt's. salary) 9336 ; Ont. and Que. (legal expenses) 9336 (v).
Justice—Exchequer Court (salaries) 125 ; Yukon (living allowances) 127 (i).
Militia (Canadian garrisons) 9114 (v).
Penitentiaries (parole system) 470 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Dipper harbour) 9588 ; (St. John harbour) 9589 ; (St. John tidal waters) 9590 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (harbour improvements) 775 (i) ; (Maskinongé River dredging) 6844 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (revenue collections) 2222 (ii).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 4683 (iii).
Trading Stamps, Legislation *re* Suppression (Ques.) 5426 (iii).
Transportation Commission and St. John Harbour, Reps. to Govt., &c. (M. for copies*) 9698 (v).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) on M. for 3°, 9048 (v).

Talbot, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 2425 (ii).
Demers, Mr. L. J., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 5140 (iii).
Franking Privileges, Abuse of, *re* Jacques Cartier Club (remarks) 9798 (v).
I.C.R., 'Maritime Express,' &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6832 (iv).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 65) 1°*, 1336 (i).
Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Ry. Co.'s (B. 191) 1°*, 9072 (v).
Man. Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 4070 (ii).
Military School at Quebec, Improvement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9162 (v).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses *re*, Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9322

Talbot, Mr. O. E.—*Con.*
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3196 (ii).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7348, 7369 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Militia (permanent force) 9127, 9162 (v).
Trans-Canada Ry. Co., Claims for Surveys, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9494 (v).

Talbot, Mr. P., *Strathcona.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4176 (iii).
——— in Com. (distribution of seats) 7734 (iv) ; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8040 (v) ; on Amt. (Mr. S. McCarthy) 7830, 7877 (iv).
——— (lands vested in Crown) 6040 (iv).
——— (subsidy to provs.) in Com., 6089 (iv).
——— in Com. on Schedules (Gleichen) 8154 (v).
Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 74) 1°*, 1671 (i).
SUPPLY:
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (provisions, &c.) 6551 (iv).

Taylor, Mr. G., *Leeds.*
Acetylene Gas System, Saving in Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
See 'Scout.'
Agricultural Statistics, Expenditure (remarks) 990 (iv).
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 2426 ; in Com., 2849 (ii).
Atlantic SS. Service, Shipping Space and American Shippers (remarks) 5428 (iii).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4896 (iii).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8362 (v).
——— on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Scott) *re* C.P.R. Land Taxes, 8787 (v).
Autonomy B. 69, Attack on 'Orangeism' (remarks) in Com., 5897 (iii).
——— School Clauses, Min. of Justice quoted, in Com., 5898 (iii).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) on Amt. (Mr. Scott) to M. for 3°, 8879 (v).
See 'Edmonton.'
Binder Twine Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7222 (iv).
Campaign Literature and Franking Privilege, &c. (remarks) 1815 (i).
Canadian Shippers *re* Atlantic SS. Contract with Armours, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 45, 4235 (iii).
Cement, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8986 (v).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 990 ; in Com., 666 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) 660 (i).
Census, Total Expenditure for Completion, Dismissal of Staff, &c. (Ques.) 588 (i).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9428 (v).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 4551 (iii).
——— on M. to conc. in 7th Rep of Com., 9809 (v).
Dredging, System of Hiring Dredges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6846 (iv).
Edmonton Election, Date of Contest, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5891 (iii).
Electoral Atlas, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6722 (iv).
Estimates, Criticism of and Obstruction, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9273 (v).
Estimates of the Interior Dept., Obstruction by Minister (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9265 (v).
Freight Rates : *See* 'I.C.R.,' 'Ry. Com.,' 'Tariff.'
Fruit Marks Act, Inspectors appointed, Names, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 736 (i).
Fruit Inspectors, Number, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 588 (i).
Fitz-Simons, Jane Marie Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6377 (iv).
Gananoque Armoury Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1656 (i).
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale to Mr. F. W. Grant) on M. for Sup., 6486 (iv).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 3°, 4235 (iii).
House of Commons, Rooms for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 254 (i).
Hurley, J. M., Fishery Inspector, Duties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2895 (ii).
I.C.R., Advertising Expenditures *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2244 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1961 (i).
——— Freight Rates and Traffic Arrangements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2242 (ii).
——— Freight Rates, Ref. to Gananoque and Fredericton, Reply to Min. of Railways, 6585 (iv).
——— Freight Rates, Increases, &c., on Explanation of Min. of Rys., 6120 (iv).
——— and G.T.R. Arbitration *re* Traffic Arrangement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1929 (i).
——— Supplies, Purchase of Oil, &c (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2249 (ii).
Interior Dept., Dep. Minister, Resignation, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 4370 (iii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*
Leverette, Geo. Milton, Postmaster, Kitley, Dep. Ret. Officer *re* Election, Partisan Conduct *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6240 (iv.)
Logberg Printing Co., Payments to, (remarks) *re* Question, 4374 (iii),
Manufacturers' Association, Commercial Literature as Campaign Literature, Franked by M.P.'s (remarks) 1815 (i).
Metric System, Letter from Gananoque Teacher (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1695 (i).
Military Accountant of Militia Council (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 434 (i).
Miltimore, Lt. J. M., Application for Permission to attend Cavalry School, Toronto (Ques.) 6383 (iv).
Murray Harbour Branch Ry. and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2159 (ii).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5704 (iii).
Orangemen, Attack *re* 'Yellow Dog' in Quebec Papers (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 8362 (v).
Ottawa Public Buildings, Rentals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6818 (iv).
Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5802 (iii).
Port Arthur Dredging Contract, Time for Tenders (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6876 (iv).
Portland Cement bought at Quebec, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 435 (i).
Postmaster acting as Dep. Returning Officer, Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6240 (iv).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Works Employees, Political Partisans (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6861 (iv).
Railway Commission, Freight and Passenger Rates, Advancement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1544 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Com., 4996 (iii).
Resignations of Conservative Ministers in 1896 (personal explanation) 845 (i).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7365 (iv).
Rideau Canal Extension (remarks) in Com. of Sup.. 1523 (i).
Riviere Ouelle Spur Line (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1982 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Expenditures *re* (remarks) 2455 (ii).
'Scout,' Str., Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2700 (ii).
——— Investigation *re* Explosion of Acetylene Gas, &c. (remarks) 4842 (iii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*
Seeds Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 361, 1214 (i).
Sifton, Hon. C., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill (remarks) 1862 (i).
Smart, Jas. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iv).
——— Resignation, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4370 (iii).
Starkey, W. W., Duties *re* Cattle Diseases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6718 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Year Book) 1476 (i).
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1275 (i).
Charges of Management (bank notes) 6261 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 103 (i); Post Office (contingencies) 6240 (iv).
Dom. Lands (Banff, pamphlets *re*) 6424 (iv); (homestead inspectors) 9265 (v); (maps, printing, &c.) 6425 (iv).
Fisheries (inspectors' salaries) 2892; (protection service) 2907 (ii).
Immigration (agents, G.B., &c., salaries) 7685 ; (agencies, salaries) 6384 (iv) ; (bonuses to SS. Cos.) 9329 (v); (contingencies) 7710; (printing, &c.) 7710 (iv).
Indians—B.C. (travelling expenses) 6556 (iv); Man. and N.W.T. (provisions) 9338 (v); Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6521; N.B. (medical attendance) 6516 (iv); Ont. and Que. (park improvements) 9335 (v).
Interior—Miscellaneous (litigation expenses) 7720 (iv).
Legislation—Debates (expenditure) 6594 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (keepers' salaries) 2697 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 979 (i).
Militia (Accountant of Board) 434 (i).
Miscellaneous (Alaska boundaries) 7719; (legal expenses, *re* Martineau case) 6723; (legal service, Mr. Patterson) 6723 ; (maps, *re* N.W.T.) 7721; (printing, &c.) 6723 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Arctic expedition) 6472; (Harrison, Capt., allowance, &c.) 6466 (iv).
Penitentiaries (Archibald, W. T., Parole Officer) 6721 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (engineers, firemen, &c.) 6822; (fuel) 6822; (furniture) 6817; (rents) 6818 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—General (armouries) 1656 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Richibucto) 6732 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (London drill hall) 6732 (iv); (military college) 1561 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (elevator attendants) 1667 (i); (grounds) 6817 (iv); (lighting) 1667 (i) ; (repairs, &c.) 6815 ; (Rideau Hall) 6824 (iv); (steel shelving) 1564 (i); (telephones) 6814 (iv).
Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (new plant) 7578; Dom. (repairs to vessels) 6890 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Dauphin) 7571; (Lake St. Francis) 7572; (Narrows Lake) 7572; (Selkirk) 7573 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. Clifton breakwater) 7497 ; (Dipper harbour) 7498; (Mud Cove) 7500; N.B. (Quaco harbour) 7501 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Inverness Mines) 7405; (Margaree harbour) 7411; (Port Hawkesbury) 6837 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Barry's Bay wharf) 6873; (Blind River dredging) 6871; (Fort William and Port Arthur) 6900 ; (general vote) 6729 ; (Grand River dredging) 6873 ; (Haileybury wharf) 6887 ; (Honora wharf) 6887 ; (Little Current channel) 6886 ; (Otonabee River) 6886 ; (Owen Sound harbour) 6886 ; (Point Edward dredging) 6869 ; (Whitby harbour) 6880 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Grand Machins) 7304 ; (harbour works) 6728 ; (Lake St. Peter pier) 6459 ; (Little Rapids dam) 6839; (Montmorency wharf) 6853 (iv); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 2455 (ii); (St. Louis Feeders) 7386; (Yamaska Lock) 6868 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (Deep Waterways Commission) 6895 ; (engineers, &c.) 6895 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Ottawa (bridges) 6889 (iv).
Public Works—Telegrams—Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 6896 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Drummondville improvements) 1961 (i) ; (Halifax terminals) 2032 (ii) ; (St. Fabien subway) 1982 ; (Sydney accommodation) 1912 (i).
Railways—P.E.I. (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2159 (ii) ; (working expenses) 6901 (iv).
Yukon Govt. (salaries, &c.) 7716 (iv).
Tariff *re* Freight Rates, Advancement of remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1544 (i).
Trading Stamps : *See* 'Criminal.'
Ventilation in Chamber of Commons (remarks) 7812 (iv), 8695 (v).
Veterinary Surgeons, Emplymt. by Govt., &c., in Man. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6710 (iv).
Water Meters Inspection B. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8676 (v).
Wire Fencing : *See* 'N.W.T.'

Telford, Mr. W. P., *North Grey.*
Cement in Com. on Ways and Means, 8990 (v).
Fessenden Wireless Telegraph Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 144) 1°*, 4644 (iii).
Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 143) 1°*, 4644 (iii).

Thompson, Mr. A., *Yukon Territory.*
Congdon, F. T., Appnmt. as Legal Adviser to Yukon (Ques.) 7020 (iv).
Gold of the Yukon purchased by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6264 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Miscellaneous (assay office, B.C.) 7720 (iv).
N.W. Mounted Police (Yukon force) 8662 (v).
Yukon Govt. (local Govt. grant) 7719 (iv).

Thompson, Mr. A. —*Con.*

Yukon Ter., Annexation to Provinces (remarks) 6509 (iv).

——— Legal Adviser, Appnmt. of F. T. Congdon (Ques.) 7020 (iv).

——— Reforms, &c., Necessary, on M. for Sup., 7021 (iv).

Tisdale, Hon. David, *Norfolk.*

Autonomy Bill, Official Report of Division (remarks) 5432 (iii).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 179 (Mr. Turriff) on M. to ref. back to Com., 8655 (v).

Citizens' Bank of Canada B. 133 (Mr. Barr) in Com., 5973 (iv).

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4204 (iii).

London Militia and London Elections (remarks) 7255 (iv).

Militia Act (permanent force) Amt. B. 170, on prop. Res. (Sir Frederick Borden) 6905; in Com. on Res., 6985; on M. for 2°, 7272 (iv).

Militia Estimates, Reply to General Statement, in Com. of Sup., 9136 (v).

Militia Force, Reduction of, on Explanation (Sir Frederick Borden) 6995 (iv).

Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5743 (iii).

Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Conmee & Bowman's Tender, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4478 (iii).

Postmasters as Political Partisans (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6246 (iv).

Provident Savings Association B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5974 (iv).

Railways and Canals Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1675 (i).

Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 169 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6967; in Com., 7262 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.—Post Office (contingencies) 6246 (iv).

Militia (Military college) 9170; (permanent force) 9111; (reply to general statement) 9136 (v).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8638 (v).

Tobin, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 103) 1°*, 2184; 2° m., 2296; in Com., 3669 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings—Que—(Sherbrooke drill hall) 1141 (i).

Turgeon, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4155 (iii); in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8377 (v).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Miscou harbour) 7499 (iv).

Turriff, Mr. J. G., *East Assiniboia.*

Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co. (B. 83) 1°*, 1788 (i).

Athabaska Northern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 88) 1°*, 1933 (i).

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5457, 5482 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3813 (ii).

——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5625 (iii).

——— (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7941 (iv).

——— (election of members) 5772 (iii).

——— (seat of govt.) 8255 (v).

Autonomy Bill, Pets. *re* Genuineness (remarks) 2260, 2320 (ii).

See 'Pet.,' 'Separate.'

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 179) in Com. (M.) to ref. back to Ry. Committee 8652 (v).

Calgary and Battleford Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 50) 1°*, 817 (i).

Doukhobors Homestead Entries *re* Village Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6414 (iv).

Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9404 (v).

Macleod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co.'s (B. 78) 1°*, 1671 (i).

Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. (B. 28) 1°*, 493; in Com., 1890 (i), 2047, 2050, 2323 (ii); 3° m., 2714 (ii), 6346; on Sen. Amts., 7683 (iv).

Petitions *re* Autonomy Bill (remarks) 2260, 2320 (ii).

Schukin, Ivan, Cancellation of Homestead Rights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6414 (iv).

Separate Schools, Pets. *re* (remarks) 2412 (ii).

Walsh, Mr. R. N., *Huntingdon.*

Beauharnois Canal, Opening Waterways: in Com. of Sup., 7380 (iv).

Butter and Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Grievances *re*, &c. (Ques.) 8886 (v).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 675 (i).

Census in Eastern Townships, Par. in Huntingdon 'Gleaner' (read) 675 (i).

Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8221 (v).

Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5028 (iii).

Walsh, Mr. R. N.—*Con.*
St. Lawrence Islands, Govt. Control, Cor. *re* Sale, &c. (Ques.) 6477 (iv).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 334, 373, 1192, 1801 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (St. Louis Feeders) 7380 (iv).

Ward, Mr. H. A., *Durham.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4951 (iii).
Otonabee River, Damages by Floods, Claim of Mr. Clark (M. for cor.) 1396 (i).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1166 (i).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Trent (construction) 1476 ; (surveys) 1471 (i).
Trent Canal—Surveys *re*, Letter of Sir Wilfrid Laurier to Mr. Aylesworth (read) 1476 (i).
——— Claims for Damages *re*, Mr. Clark, Cor., &c. (M. for copy) 1396 (i).
——— Surveys, Rice Lake, &c. (Ques.) 153 (i).

Wilson, Mr. U., *Lennox and Addington.*
Autonomy Bill, Distribution of Printed Copies *re* (remarks) 2046 (ii).
Campaign Literature Franked by Minister of Crown (remarks) 1809 (i).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 631 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) *re* Resolutions, 631 (i).
Franking Privilege *re* Campaign Literature (remarks) 1809 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal Survey, Instructions *re*, Inquiry for Copies, 822 (i).
I.C.R., Expenditures (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2215 (ii).
——— Traffic Arrangements and Freight Diversion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2214 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Memorandum *re* Separate Schools from M'gr. Sbarretti (remarks) 3871 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order *re* Political Debts, 3858 (ii).
Messengers, House of Commons (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 240 (i).
Military Training Tramp, Central, Site, &c. (Ques.) 268 (i).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3198 (ii).
Port Arthur and Fort William Dredging Contract, Tender of Conmee & Bowman, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4480 (iii).
Railway Commission B. 36, on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1628 (i).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1798; on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1868 (i).

White, Hon. P.—*Con.*
Steward for Speaker's Rooms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 240 (i).
SUPPLY :
Civil Govt.—Labour Dept. (salaries, &c.) 101 (i).
House of Commons (messengers) 240; (salaries) 238 ; (Sergeant-at-Arms) 240 ; (sessional clerks) 239 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives) 605 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (revenue collections) 2214 (ii).
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 1697; (inspections, &c.) 1694 (i).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) on M. for 3°, 1779 (i).

Wilmot, Mr. R. D., *Sunbury and Queen's, N.B.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5309 (iii).
Fisheries Hatcheries, N.B., Salmon Pond at Carleton, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 590 (i).
Hay, Free Transportation on I.C.R. O.C., &c., (Ques.) 108 (i).
St. John River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6893 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Dredging (new plant) 6893 ; Mar. Provs. (new plant) 7578; Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John tributaries) 7501; Que. (St. Jean, Orleans) 7393 (iv).
Wharfs in Tidal Waters, Contribution, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).

Wilson, Mr. U., *Lennox and Addington.*
Agriculture Committee, Meetings, &c. (remarks) 404 (i).
——— Number of Witnesses, Payments to, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1398 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Distribution (remarks) 2262 (ii).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5470 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3893 (ii).
Autonomy Bill, Official Report of Division (remarks) 5432 (iii).
——— Saskatchewan B. No. 70, in Com. on Res., 8702 (v).
Brothers Light, Keeper, Appnmt., Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).
Child Immigration, Mrs. Close's Scheme (Ques.) 1936 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2125 (ii).
——— Assistance by Govt. (Ques.) 1341 (i).
Dams across Rivers, Govt. Policy *re* Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6839 (iv.).
Doukhobor Homestead Entries *re* Village Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6417 (iv).
Dredging, System of Hiring Dredges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6845 (iv).
Free Mail Delivery, Total Cost (Ques.) 729 (i).

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7622 (iv).
Haggard, H. Rider, Inquiry for Rep., 9523 (v). *See* 'Salvation.'
Immigrants, deported from Can. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv).
Immigrants deported from Can., &c. (Ques.) 1847 (i).
——— Examination *re* Qualifications, &c. (Ques.) 2187 (ii).
Immigrants from English Workhouses, Proposal of Mr. Neill, &c. (Ques.) 6188 (iv).
——— Importation, 1904, &c., Number, Nationality, &c. (Ques.) 1592 (i).
Immigration, Bonus paid to Transportation or Booking Cos. (Ques.) 7811 (i). *See* 'North Atlantic.'
——— Cost of Criminal Law (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6721 (iv).
——— Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7710 (iv).
Immigration of Children to Canada, Assistance by Govt. (Ques.) 1341 (i).
Immigration of State Children, Cor. with Mr. C. Kinloch Cooke *re* (Ques.) 5478 (iii).
Immigration of Skilled Labour, and Toronto Labour Council, on M. (Mr. Foster) 7509 (iv).
Mail Delivery, Free, System, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 729 (i).
'Maisonneuve,' Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2745 (ii).
Mineral Specimens *re* Exhibitions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6271 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Inquiry for Copy of Contract, 8145 (v).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9455 (v).
——— (remarks) 7907 (iv).
Parole System for Convicts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 472 (i).
Preston, W. T. R., Visit to Canada (Ques.) 451 (i).
Private Bills, Extension of Time, on M. (Mr. Grant) 449 (i).
Public Works under Contract, Supervision Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7588 (iv).
Ry. Act (crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 3246 (ii).
Ry. Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 576 (i).
Rouse, Mr. David, Appnmt. as Customs Collector, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 452 (i).
Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 169 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6976 (iv).
Salvation Army Colonies, R. Haggard's Rep. (Ques.) 6188 (iv). *See* 'Haggard.'

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*
Schukin, Ivan, Homestead Entries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6417 (iv).
Smart, Jas. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6419 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6932 ; (creameries) 6939; (experimental farms) 6172 ; (experimental farms bulletins) 6930; (exhibitions) 1834 (i), 6271 (iv).
Canals—Trent (surveys) 6293 (iv).
Charges of Management (Receiver Gen.'s office) 6249 (iv).
Chinese Immigration (salaries) 981 (i).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 9058; (patent branch) 9057; (private secretary) 9054; (salaries) 9057 (v).
Civil Govt.—Finance (Private Secretary) 6268 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 6266 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 9058 (v).
Civil Govt.—Railways and Canals (private) sec., 9062 ; (salary increases) 9062 (v).
Civil Govt.—Sec. of State (salaries) 9071 (v).
Culling Timber (salaries) 7236 (iv).
Dom. Lands (Banff, pamphlets *re*) 6424 ; (maps, printing, &c.) 6425 (iv).
Immigration (agents, G.B., salaries) 7685 ; (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6385 ; (contingencies, &c.) 7709 ; (interpreters, &c.) 7701 (iv).
Legislation (H. of Commons) 6268 ; (voters' lists) 6722, 6954 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse repairs) 9036 (v) ; (salaries) 2702 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 979 (i).
Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 9050 (v).
Militia (Royal Military college) 7003 (iv).
Miscellaneous (consolidation of statutes) 7244 ; (Keewatin lunatics) 7720 ; (legal expenses *re* Martineau case) 6723 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers, repairs) 9034 (v).
Pensions (compensations) 6956 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Lloydminster immigrant sheds) 6724 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (grounds) 6817 (iv) ; (new deptl. buildings, site, &c.) 9608 (v) ; (Rideau Hall) 6823 (iv) ; (Rideau Hall, repairs) 9550 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Grand River dredging) 6873 ; (Ottawa locks) 7561 ; (Penetanguishene) 7563 ; (Point Edward dredging) 6869 (iv) ; (Stokes Bay) 9599 ; (Trenton dredging) 9600 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Canton Fabre) 7289 ; Que. (harbour works) 6727 ; (Maskinongé River dredging) 6845 ; (Montmorency wharf) 6853 ; (Ottawa River) 7375 ; (Little Rapids dam) 6839 ; (Saguenay dredging) 7379 ; (Sorel ice piers) 6841 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (Academy of Arts) 7238 ; (architects, &c.) 7619 ; 'Canada Gazette') 6723 ; (cement testing) 7614 (iv) ; (Ottawa river works) 7612 ; (Pacific cable grant) 7240 ; (printing, &c.) 6957 ; (surveys) 7611 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Dom. (traffic bridges) 7592 ; N.W.T. (Battle River) 7588 ; (colonization roads) 7597 ; (Shellmouth) 7592 (iv).

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Slides and Booms (working expenses) 7632 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—P.E.I. (Anglo-American Co.) 7632; Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 7635 (iv).
Quarantine (organized districts, salaries) 2303 (ii); (Winnipeg hospitals) 1846 (i).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, plans, &c.) 9490, 9497 (v).
Trade and Commerce (commercial agents) 9037 (v).
Water Meters Inspection B. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8675 (v).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals Govt. Grant *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2318 (ii).

Worthington, Mr. A. N., *Sherbrooke.*
Ammunition, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Ammunition, Small Arms, &c., Control of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Agricultural Meetings in Eastern Townships, Purposes, &c. (Ques.) 268 (i).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5290 (iii).
Autonomy Bill, Pets. *re*, presented (remarks) 2321 (ii).
Camps for Militia Drill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 442 (i).
Camps of Instruction, Indemnity *re* Casualties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9147 (v).
Inspector General of Militia (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 437 (i).
Lennoxville Post Office, Construction of (Ques.) 4373 (iii).
Magog Post Office, Erection of (Ques.) 5784 (iii).
Melbourne and Upper Melbourne Mail Contract, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 4372 (iii).
Military Sites, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 427 (i).
Militia, Col. Drury, Duties *re* Command (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9130 (v).
Militia Medical Officer, Allowances and Independence of Parlt. Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9148 (v).
Sherbrooke Armouries, Provision for Militia (Ques.) 266 (i).
——— Immediate Erection (Ques.) 5784 (iii).
——— Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 191 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 427, 1139 (i).
Sherbrooke Postal Rate and Delivery (Ques.) 378 (i).
Sherbrooke Post Office, Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 191 (i).
S. A. Veterans and King's Medal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9159 (v).
S. A. War, King's Medal to Canadians, Cor., Telegrams, &c. (M. for copies*) 3204 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Militia (annual drill) 442; (military council) 424 (i); (quick-firing guns) 9124 (v).

Worthington, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brantford drill hall) 1550; (Chatham armoury) 1553; (Cobourg armoury) 1555; (Guelph armoury) 1556; (Kingston barracks) 1560 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Sherbrooke drill hall) 1139 (i).

Wright, Mr. A. A., *South Renfrew.*
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 682 (i), 2422 (ii).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4960, 4978 (iii); (lands vested in Crown) in Com., 6002 (iv).
Autonomy Bills, Pets. *re* (remarks) 2321 (ii).
Budget, on The, 8949 (v).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9428 (v).
Gillies Bros., Limited (B. 95) 1°*, 2005; in Com., 2763 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4220 (iii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3191 (ii).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. of Sup., 334, 375 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms bulletins) 6927 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and W. Indies) 7186 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bracebridge) 7547 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (general vote) 7494 (iv).

Wright, Mr. W., *Muskoka.*
Animal Diseases, Provincial and Dom. Jurisdiction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6714 (iv).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5511, 5543 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4349 (iii).
——— in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8063 (v).
Autonomy Bill, Census *re* Town and Rural Population (remarks) 8094 (v).
Bank Notes, Printing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6260 (iv).
Bracebridge Dry Dock, Supt. *re* Construction (Ques.) 6654 (iv).
Cement, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9766 (v).
Census *re* Urban and Rural Populations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6274 (iv).
Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 190, in Com., 9766 (v).
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale, Jurisdiction, &c. (remarks) 6477 (iv).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 371, 1195; on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) to M. for 3°, 1880 (i).

Wright, Mr. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock records) 6688 (iv); (quinquennial census, N.W.T.) 9609 (v); (statistics) 6274 (iv).

Canals—Trent (Holland River) 9372 (v).

Customs (expenses) 261 (i).

Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (live stock) 6545; Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6521 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 978 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 1019; Ottawa (lighting) 1669 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Depot Harbour) 7552 (iv); (Honora wharf) 9597 (v); (Lake Temiskaming) 7559 (iv); (Rosseau wharf) 9600; (Severn River) 9602 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Lake St. Peter piers) 6462 (iv).

Quarantine (cattle) 6714 (iv).

Zimmerman, Mr. A., *West Hamilton.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5554 (iii).

Cadet Corps in Dom. (remarks) 7815 (iv).

Campaign Literature franked by Ministers of Crown (remarks) 1821 (i).

Zimmerman, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Cement, in Com. of Ways and Means, 8996 (v).

Grand River and Western Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 122) 1°*, 2681 (ii).

Hamilton Patronage *re* Postal Service (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6229 (iv).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 2959 (ii).

Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Forms of Oath, on Ques. of Order, 7361 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Hamilton) 7557 ; Miscellaneous (cement testing) 7615 (iv).

Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, plans, &c.) 9496 (v).

Telephone Grievances and Telephone Com., Discussion out of Order (remarks) 9535 (v).

Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Ry. Co.'s (B. 79) in Com., 4259 (iii).

Vibert, Philip, Relief B. 172 (Mr. Campbell) 2° m., 7218; on M. for 2° (remarks) 7261 (iv).

Yukon, Reform *re* Govt. of Country (remarks) on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com of Sup., 7072 (iv).

INDEX---PART II

SUBJECTS

'Aberdeen' Boilers, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6464 (iv).

Academy of Arts : in Com. of Sup., 6959, 7238 (iv).

Acadian Historical Data, Compilation of : in Com. of Sup., 1830 (i).

'Acadia' Str., Disposition of Fittings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1849 (i).

Accountant of Militia Board : in Com. of Sup., 434 (i).

Acetylene Gas Contracts with Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 1053 (i).

——— Invention of Mr. Painchaud *re* Safety Appliances : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6308 (iv).

——— Lights, Annual Saving, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1592 (i).

——— Plant, St. John Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 1052 (i).

——— System, Saving in Expenditure, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).

Acreage in Provisional District Alberta, Saskatchewan, &c., disposed of, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 601 (i).

See 'Autonomy,' &c.

Acres of undisposed Lands, N. W. Ters.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 601 (i).

Actonvale Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1101 (i).

Additional Sidings, I.C.R., Spur Lines, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1970 (i), 6431 (iv).

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech from Throne : moved (Mr. Macdonald) 9 (i).

——— seconded (Mr. Parent) 17 (i).

——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to present, 50 (i)

——— Reply to from His Ex.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1340 (i).

ADJOURNMENTS :

Ascension Day : Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 6825 (iv).

Ash Wednesday, M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2112 (ii).

ADJOURNMENTS—*Con.*

Easter : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4750 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4375 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4458 (iii).

24th May, Adjournment for : M. (Mr. Fielding) 6384 (iv).

Admiralty Court Registrars, Fees, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 125 (i).

Administration of Justice, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6721 (iv).

See 'Justice.'

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1°*, *pro forma*, 5 (i).

Adulteration Act Amt. B. No. 197 (Mr. Bergeron) 1°*, 9179 (v).

Adulteration of Food, Centralization of Camples : Remarks (Mr. Black) in Com. of Sup., 1717 (i).

——— Violations of Act, Prosecutions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1699, 1710 (i).

See 'Inland Revenue,' &c.

Advances by O.C., Total Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 267 (i).

Advertising Car, I.C.R., Expenditure *re* : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 2257 (ii).

Advertising, I.C.R., in Newspapers, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2236 (ii).

Advisory Board *re* Militia, Constitution of, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 415 (i).

Agents, I.C.R., Dwelling Houses, Policy of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).

Agents' Houses, P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 2180 (ii).

See 'I.C.R.', &c.

'Agnes Donahoe,' Schr., Seizure by Uruguayan Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6106 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) 1507 (i).

——— Telegram read (Mr. Wm. Roche) 6137 (iv).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS :

Acadian Historical Data, Compilation of : in Com. of Sup., 1830 (i).

Academy of Arts : in Com. of Sup., 6959 (iv).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

Agricultural Meetings in Eastern Townships, Purposes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 268 (i).

Agriculture Committee, Meetings, &c.: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 404 (i).

——— Number of Witnesses, Payments, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 1398 (i).

——— 2nd Rep. of Com.: (Mr. Greenway) to conc., 4081 (iii).

——— 4th Rep.: Presented (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) 4984 (iii).

——— M. (Mr. Greenway) to conc., 6310 (iv).

——— 6th Rep.: Presented (Mr. McIntyre) 8097 (v).

——— M. (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) to conc., 8998 (v).

Agriculture, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 321 (i).

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 91 (i), 9053 (v).

See 'Arts.' &c.

Agricultural Exports and Imports, Duties paid, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Clements) 3203 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Clements) 909 (i).

See 'Customs,' &c.

Agricultural Statistics, Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. on B. 5, 990 (i).

Aids to Agricultural Societies: in Com. of Sup., 1829 (i).

Allan SS. Contracts *re* Cold Storage, Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. Paterson) in Com. of Sup., 865 (i).

See 'Cold Storage.'

Animals slaughtered under Diseases Act: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on conc., 6911 (iv).

Archives, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 6826 (iv).

See 'Doughty.'

——— Reconstruction of, &c. in Com. of Sup., 1823 (i).

Archives, on conc., 6918 (iv).

Buffalo Specimens for Exhibitions: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 6272 (iv).

Butter in Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 881 (i).

Canadian Cattle, Embargo in G. B.: on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Ag. Com., 8998 (v).

Canadian Exhibit, Imperial Institute: in Com. of Sup., 1836 (i).

Canadian Shippers *re* Atlantic SS. Contract with Armours', &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 4235 (iii).

Cattle Quarantine: in Com. of Sup., 2309 (ii), 6690, 6911 (iv).

Census in Eastern Townships, Incorrect Rets.: Remarks (Mr. Walsh) 675 (i).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

Census, Quinquennial, *re* Alberta, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 9608 (v).

Census, Total Expenditure for Completion, Dismissal of Staff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 588 (i).

Cold Storage *re* Atlantic Steamers, and Thermograph Records: M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8183 (v).

——— Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2774 (ii).

See 'Thermograph.'

Cold Storage *re* Atlantic SS. Service: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 868 (i).

Cold Storage, Bait Freezers, Mar. Canada, Number, Location, &c.: M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Ret., 1769 (i).

See 'Trade and Commerce.'

Creameries: in Com. of Sup., 6938, 7014 (iv).

Criminal Statistics, Compilation of: in Com. of Sup., 1473 (i).

Dairying, Live Stock, and Fruit Industries: in Com. of Sup., 6932 (iv).

Dairy Products, Classification for Export, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 7810 (iv).

Doughty, Mr. A. G., Dom. Archivist, Salary: in Com. of Sup., 9053 (v).

Embargo on Canadian Cattle: *See* 'Canadian Cattle.'

Exhibition (Dom.) at New Westminster, B.C., Grant: in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).

Exhibitions, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 6269 (iv).

——— Liege, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1831 (i).

See 'Liege,' 'New Westminster,' 'St. Louis.'

Experimental Farms: in Com. of Sup., 6165 (iv).

Freight Rates: *See* 'Holstein.'

Fruit Growers' Association, P.E.I., Res. *re* Maintenance of Industry: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 381 (i).

Fumigating Stations: in Com. of Sup., 1831 (i).

Gillis, N. J., Emplymt. by Govt. at St. Louis Exhibition: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3361 (ii).

Glanders, Spread among Horses, Prevention of by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6690 (iv).

Grimsby, Establishment of Experimental Farm: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6165 (iv).

Holstein Breeders, Complaints *re* Freight Handling: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6680 (iv).

See 'Agricultural Com.,' &c.

Imperial Institute, Can. Exhibition: in Com. of Sup., 1836 (i).

Liege Exhibition: in Com. of Sup., 1831 (i).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

Liege Exhibition, Cor. between Govt. of Quebec and Dom. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Lavergne) 9698 (v).

Live Stock Record Associations, Delay to Farmers, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5577 (iii).

——— Nationalization, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1848 (i).

Lumpjaw in Cattle, Prevention of: Remarks (Mr. Barr) on conc., 6917 (iv).

Maladie du Coit, Horse Disease: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 6702 (iv).

New Westminster, B.C., Dom. Exhibition Grant: in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).

Patent Examiners, Salary Increases: in Com. of Sup., 9056 (v).

Patent Record: in Com. of Sup., 1472 (i).

Patent Record supplied to Members: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1827 (i).

Poultry Raising on Experimental Farm: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6183 (iv).

Quarantine, Cattle: in Com. of Sup., 1838, 6690; conc., 6911 (iv).

——— Organized Districts, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2302 (ii).

Quinquennial Census, Alberta and Saskatchewan: in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).

St. Louis Exhibition: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 1832 (i).

Smith, Mr. E. D., Charges by Min. of Ag.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 874 (i).

——— Statements *re* Cold Storage: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 874 (i).

Temiscamingue, Establishment of Experimental Farm: in Com. of Sup. (remarks) (Mr. Barr) 6167 (iv).

Thermograph Record, *re* Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 2778 (ii).

Thermograph Records *re* Atlantic Steamers: M. (Mr. Henderson) for Copies, 1767 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 868 (i).

——— Ret. laid on Table (Mr. Fisher) 7016 (iv).

See 'Cold Storage.'

Veterinary Inspectors employed by Govt., *re* Hog, &c., Diseases: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1933 (i).

Williams Head Quarantine Station: in Com. of Sup., 1841 (i).

Year Book: in Com. of Sup., 1474 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) 997 (i).

Aids to Agricultural Societies: in Com. of Sup., 1829 (i).

Aids to Navigation, Repairs to Lighthouses, &c.: in Com of Sup., 6636 (iv).

Aids to Navigation, Programme *re* Boards of Trade: Read (Mr Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 6641 (iv).

Aids to Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 2758 (ii).

——— *re* St. Lawrence Channel: in Com. of Sup., 2850 (ii).

——— (remarks) 2891 (ii).

See 'Marine,' &c.

Alaska Boundary Demarcation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7719 (iv).

Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 118 (Mr. Oliver) 1°*, 2185; 2°*, 2298; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 51.)

Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. No. 83 (Mr. Turriff) 1°*, 1788; 2°*, 1891 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 5132 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 52.)

Alberta, Creation of Province: *See* 'Autonomy Bill.'

Alberta District Postal Business, &c.: M. for Ret., (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 599 (i).

Alberta, Provisional District, Acreage disposed of: M. for Ret.*, (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 601 (i).

Alberta Steamer Service, Navigable Mileage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 6904 (iv).

Alexandra Bridge, Ottawa, Lighting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 7586 (iv).

Alexandria P.O., Contract *re*, Delay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1760 (i).

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 116 (Mr. Dyment) 1°*, 2185; 2°*, 3400 (ii); in Com. and 3°*, 6610 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 53.)

Algoma Copper Range Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 60 (Mr. Dyment) 1°*, 1241; 2°*, 1338 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3598 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 54.)

Aliens employed on Govt. Works at Sault Ste. Marie: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 1412 (i).

Alien Labour Act, Appeal against Judge Anglin's Declaration: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 8147 (v).

Alien Labour Investigation *re* G. T. P. Surveys: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Sproule) 821 (i).

Alien Labour Laws, Legislation *re* Amts.: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) 6232 (iv).

Aliens: *See* 'Naturalization,' 'Telegraph,' &c.

Allandale Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 9595 (v).

Allan SS. Contracts *re* Cold Storage, Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. Paterson) in Com. of Sup., 865 (i).

Allan Steamers, List of Sailings: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 885 (i).

See 'Agriculture,' 'Trade and Commerce.'

American Currency, Circulated in Canada, Prevention *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 3010 (ii).

American Fishermen on N. S. Coasts, Protection *re* by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 7907 (iv).
See 'Fisheries.'
Amherstburg Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7546 (iv).
Amherst Pier, N.S., Contract *re* Construction : Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4371 (iii).
Amherst Station Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 1983 (i).
Ammunition, Small Arms, Inspection of : in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Anderson and Kennedy's Lake Outlets : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Anglo-American Convention respecting Property : Remarks *re* Cor. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1068 (i).
Anglo-American Tel. Co., Agreement *re* Charges : Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 7606 (iv).
——— P.E.I., Charges, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).
——— Subsidy Increases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 108 (i).
Animals slaughtered under Diseases Act : Remarks (Mr. Foster) on conc., 6911 (iv).
Annapolis Basin SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup. 966 (i).
Annapolis and G. B. SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
Annapolis and London Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 9622 (v).
Annapolis, Queen's Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 9576 (v).
Annual Drill for Militia : in Com. of Sup., 441 (i), 6512 (iv).
See 'Militia.'
Annual Statement, I.C.R., on M. for Sup. (Mr. Emmerson) 1888, 1891 (i).
See 'I.C.R.'
Anse à Beaufils, Pier Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7285 (iv).
Anse aux Gris Fonds Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7285 (iv).
Anse à L'Ilot Landing Piers : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
Anse St. Jean Pier Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).
Anthracite Coal Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 136 (Mr. Galliher) M. to receive Pet., 4550 ; Pet. ref. back to Sel. Com., 4644 ; 1°*, 4807 ; 2°*, 4978 (iii) ; in Com., 5976 ; 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 56.)
Anthracite Coal (Scotch) Imported, Commercial Value, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonald) 9697 (v).
Anthracite Coal used by Govt. in each Province, Quantity, Amount paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1398 (i).
Anticosti Lightships, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 1850 (i).
Antigonish Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 846, 1015 (i).
Antigonish Station Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 1967 (i).
Apples, Packing of, &c.: *See* 'Staple Commodities.'
Apple River Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1727 (i), 7395 (iv).
Arbitrations and Awards *re* Canals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1508 (i).
Arbitration and Awards *re* Public Works : in Com. of Sup., 7611 (iv).
Architects for Military Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Architects, Public Works, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7618 (iv).
See 'Public Works.'
Archives Building, Erection of : in Com. of Sup., 603 (i).
Archives, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 6826 (iv).
——— F. W. Grey's Salary : in Com. of Sup., 6679 (iv).
——— Reconstruction of, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1823 (i).
Archives, on conc., 6918 (iv).
Arctic Expedition, Fitting of Boats, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6468 (iv).
——— Capt. Peary's Voyage : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4753 (iii).
'Arctic,' Hudson Bay Exploration, Provision for : in Com. of Sup., 9177 (v).
Arichat (west) Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Armouries, Generally, Construction of : in Com. of Sup., 1649 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 423, 1547 (i).
Armoury at Woodstock, N.B., Ownership of Land by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 4920 (iii).
Arsenals, Dominion, Establishment of : in Com. of Sup., 445 (i).
See 'Militia,' 'Dom.', &c.
'Arthur Binney,' Fishing Schooner, Small-pox Quarantine : Remarks (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 2307 (ii).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics : in Com. of Sup., 1472 1823 (i), 6165, 6269 (iv).
See 'Agriculture.'
Art Gallery, Ottawa : in Com. of Sup., 7618 (iv).
Ascension Day Adjournment : Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 6825 (iv).
Ashcroft and Cariboo Mail Service, Tenders *re* Mail Contract : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3670 (ii).
Ashcroft and Dawson Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 6896 (iv).
Ashcroft Water and Light Co., Condition of Lease *re* Lands : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2492 (ii).

Ash-Wednesday, Adjournment : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2112 (ii).
Assay Apparatus for Geological Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 8671 (v).
Assay Office, Vancouver, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7720 (iv).
Assent to Bills : *See* 'Bills.'
Assistant Receiver General's Office : in Com. of Sup., 9052 (v).
Associated British Canadian Society, Charges against Graeme Hunter : Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2188 (ii).
Astronomical Observatory, Ottawa, Fittings, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
——— Technical Officers and Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 9248 (v).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Athabaska Northern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 88 (Mr. Turriff) 1°*, 1933 (i) ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 57.)
Athabaska Ry. and Oil Co.'s incorp. B. No. 117 (Mr. Oliver) 1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 2298 ; in Com., 3135 ; 3°*, 3135 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c 58.)
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s Claims for Damages, Amounts paid, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2063 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) 7021 (iv), 9382 (v).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 892 (i).
See 'Trade and Commerce,' Allan's,' &c.
Atlantic Fisheries Investigation, Rep. *re* : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 270 (i).
See 'Fisheries.'
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 13 (Mr. Gauvreau) 1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 404 ; in Com., and 3°*, 864 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 59.)
Atlantic SS. Service, Shipping Space for American Shippers : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5428 (iii).
Atlin, B.C., Living Allowance to Judge : in Com of Sup., 9683 (v).
Atwater Bridge over Lachine Canal, Contract *re*, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7261, 7422 (iv).
Atwater Avenue Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 1240 (i).
Audit Act Amts., Govtl. Intention : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6112 (iv).
Audit Act and Aud. Gen.'s Resignation : on M. for Sup. (Mr. Lennox) 9623 (v).
Audit Act, Legislation *re* : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2190 (ii).
Audit Act and Treasury Board, Legislation *re* : Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1935 (i).
Auditor General's Office : in Com. of Sup., 77, 91 (i) ; 6721 (iv).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Part I. : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 109 (i).
——— Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 271 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Additional Copies, Letter from Aud. Gen. to Sec. of State : Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4271 (iii).
——— Distribution *re* : Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 2262 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1151 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 51, 97 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Resignation, Acceptance by Govt., and Audit Act Amts. : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6522 (iv).
Aud. Gen.'s Resignation and Legislation *re* Audit Act : Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 590 (i).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. Foster) 9541 (v).
Autonomy (Alberta) for N.W Ter., B. No. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1°, m., 1421 (i) ; Res. prop., 2913 ; 2° m., 2915, 2963, 3010, 3091, 3136, 3252, 3363, 3400, 3450, 3591, 3598, 3672, 3745, 3893 (ii), 4078, 4086, 4136, 4273, 4375, 4414, 4480, 4552, 4598, 4703, 4753, 4811, 4846, 4922, 4978, 5037, 5083, 5113, 5140, 5211, 5317, Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Neg. (Y. 59, N. 140) 5401 ; 2 m., 5423 ; in Com., 5423 ; in Com., on Res., *re* Subsidy, 5434 ; Amt. (Mr. Fielding) *re* Subsidy, 5470, 5479 ; Res. ref. to Com. on Bill, 5575 ; in Com., on B., 5601, 5719, 5749, 5808, 5927 (iii) ; Explanation (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5983, 6048, 6086, 7103 ; Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Dual Language, 7583 (iv) ; 8530 (v) ; in Com., 7724, 7817, 7864, 7916, (iv), 8004 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Distribution of Seats, 8004 ; in Com., 8148 ; Amt. (Mr. Barker) *re* Preamble, 8173 ; in Com., 8240 ; Amt. (Mr. Lake) 8259 ; in Com., 8268 ; Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier *re* School Clause, No. 2, 8269; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Amended School Clause, 8292 ; in Com., 8317 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) *re* School Clause, 8341 ; Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) *re* School Clause, 8387 ; Amt. (Mr. Lamont) *re* School Clause, 8493 ; in Com., 8530 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) to Amt. (Mr. Monk) 8593 ; 3° m., 8777 ; Amt. (Mr. Scott) *re* C.P.R. Taxes, 8792 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Schools, 8804 ; Neg. (Y. 41, N. 109) 8816 ; Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) *re* Schools, 8831 ; Neg. (Y. 7, N. 138) 8832 ; Amt. (Mr. Sam. Hughes) *re* Schools, 8833, Neg. (Y. 37, N. 106) 8834 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) *re* Schools, 8835, Neg, (Y. 7, N. 132) 8837 ; Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Dual Language, 8839 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) to Amt., 8852, Neg. (Y. 7, N. 140) 8854 ; Amt. Neg. (Y. 7, N. 140) 8855 ; Amt. (Mr. Leonard) 8857 ; Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) *re* Distribution of Seats, 8858 ; Neg. (Y. 42, N. 97) 8859 ; Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) *re* Distribution of Seats, 8860 ; Amt. (Mr. Lake) *re* Crown Lands, &c., 8863 ; Amt. (Mr. Barker) *re* Preamble, 8864 ; 3° agreed to on division, 8866 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 3.)

Autonomy B. 69, 2° m., 2915 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2979 ; Neg., (Y. 59, N. 140) 5400.

Debate :

(Mr. R. L. Borden) 2963 ; Amt., 2979 ; (Mr. Fielding) 2979 ; (Mr. Sproule) 3010 ; (Mr. Paterson) 3045 ; (Mr. Monk) 3064 ; (Mr. Sifton) 3092 ; (Mr. Northrup) 3121 ; 3136 ; (Mr. Oliver) 3152 ; (Mr. Bourassa) 3252 ; (Mr. Blain) 3284 ; (Mr. Lemieux) 3304 ; (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 3332 ; (Mr. Foster) 3363 ; (Sir Wm. Mulock) 3400 ; (Mr. Lancaster) 3424 ; (Mr. L. P. Demers) 3450 ; (Mr. Bergeron) 3462 ; (Mr. Belcourt) 3498 ; (Mr. Lake) 3532 ; (Mr. Scott) 3591 ; (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3672 ; (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) 3713 ; (Mr. Perley) 3739 ; (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3745 ; (Mr. S. Hughes) 3766 ; (Mr. Turriff) 3813 ; Mr. U. Wilson) 3893 ; (Mr. Béland) 3906 ; (Mr. Barr) 3921 ; (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 4086 ; (Mr. Lennox) 4112, 4136 ; (Mr. Turgeon) 4155 ; (Mr. P. Talbot) 4176 ; (Mr. Pringle) 4273 ; (Mr. Miller) 4292 ; (Mr. Staples) 4312 ; (Mr. Lamont) 4329 ; (Mr. W. Wright) 4349 ; (Mr. Bickerdike) 4360 ; (Mr. Alcorn) 4375 ; (Mr. Beauparlant) 4395 ; (Mr. Osler) 4404 ; (Mr. Hall) 4409, 4415 ; (Mr. Boyce) 4433 ; (Mr. Fisher) 4481 ; (Mr. Ames) 4504 ; (Mr. Crocket) 4532 ; (Mr. Bruneau) 4552 ; (Mr. Cockshutt) 4580 ; (Mr. Crawford) 4607 ; (Mr. Schaffner) 4622 ; (Mr. Grant) 4703 ; (Mr. Porter) 4726 ; (Mr. Laurence) 4745, 4753 ; (Mr. Armstrong) 4767 ; (Mr. Bole) 4784 ; (Mr. Paquet) 4798 ; (Mr. Henderson) 4811 ; (Mr. Cash) 4833 ; (Mr. Broder) 4846 ; (Mr. Bureau) 4861 ; (Mr. Herron) 4878 ; (Mr. Parmelee) 4886 ; (Mr. Taylor) 4896 ; (Mr. Kemp) 4922 ; (Mr. German) 4944 ; (Mr. Ward) 4951 ; (Mr. A. A. Wright) 4960, 4978 ; (Mr. Campbell) 5037 ; (Mr. Lalor) 5055 ; (Mr. T. Martin) 5083 ; (Mr. Elson) 5100 ; (Mr. Black) 5109 ; (Mr. Adamson) 5114 ; (Mr. Sinclair) 5121 ; (Mr. Bristol) 5140 ; (Mr. Guthrie) 5153 ; (Mr. Boyer) 5189 ; (Mr. McIntyre) 5179 ; (Mr. Derbyshire) 5197 ; (Mr. Forget) 5206 ; (Mr. Brodeur) 5211 ; (Mr. Macdonell) 5240 ; (Mr. Kennedy) 5256 ; (Mr. Bennett) 5262 ; (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 5276 ; (Mr. Worthington) 5290 ; (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5301 ; (Mr. Wilmot) 5309 ; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5317 ; (Mr. Barker) 5354 ; (Mr. Stockton) 5380 ; (Mr. Leonard) 5393 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) negatived (Y. 59, N. 140) 5400; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5401 ; 2°, 5423 (iii).

Autonomy (Saskatchewan) for N.W.Ters. B. No. 70 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1°*, 1467 (i) ; Res. prop., 2914 (ii) ; 2° m., 5424 (iii) ; 2° M. of B., 8698 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8698, Neg. (Y. 37 ; N. 90) 8699 ; in Com. on Res., *re* Financial Subsidy, 8701 ; in Com., 8702, 8718; 3° m., 8866 ; Amt. (Mr. Scott) *re* C.P.R. Taxes, 8873 ; Neg. (Y. 11, N. 126) 8881; Amt. (Mr. Leonard) *re* Schools, 8882 ; Neg. (Y. 6 ; N. 124) 8882 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Schools, 8884 ; Amt. (Mr. Sproule) *re* Schools, 8884; 3° agreed to, on division, 8885 (v) (5 Edward VII, c., 42).

Autonomy B. 69, in Com. (Alberta Boundaries) 5601 (iii).

Autonomy B. 69 (Arbitration *re* Assets) 5946 (iii).

——— (B.N.A. Act, s. 2) 5719, 5750 (iii).

——— (B.N.A. Act, s. 2) 5719, 5750 (iii), 8526 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8526 (v) ; Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8530, 8613 (v).

——— (C.P.R. Taxes) 6049 (iv).

——— (compensation for lands) 5817 (iii).

——— (date of Act) 8634 (v).

——— (distribution of seats) 7724 ; Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to ref. to Judges, 7770 ; Newspaper Rumors, Quotation : Read (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 7744 ; Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7817, 7864, 7917 (iv) ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8004, Neg., 8092 (v).

——— (election of members), 5766, 5809 (iii).

——— (Executive Council), 5781 (iii).

——— (House of Commons representation), 5685 (iii).

——— (Hudson Bay Co. Rights) 5947 (iii), 6049 (iv), 8166 (v).

——— (Joint Stock Companies) Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick), 6083 (iv).

——— (lands vested in Crown), 5918, 5946 (iii), 5986 (iv), 8171 ; Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8171, 8256-7 (v).

——— (laws, courts, &c.) 5783, 5812 · Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5927 (iii), 6101 (iv), 8170, 8240 ; Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8244 (v).

——— (Legislative Assembly) 5815 (iii).

——— (Lt. Gov.'s Powers) 5781 (iii).

——— (readjustment *re* census) Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5753 (iii).

——— (school clause Amt.) 7103 (iv) ; Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8387 ; Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8269 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8292 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8341 ; Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8491 (v).

——— (seat of government) 5781 (iii), 8244 (v).

——— (Senate representation) 5674 (iii).

Autonomy B. 69, in Com., on Schedules (Athabaska) 8163 ; (Cardston) 8140 ; (Edmonton city) 8160 ; (Gleichen) 8153, 8166 ; (High River) 8155 ; (Lacombe) 8156 ; (Leduc) 8157; (Lethbridge) 8150 ; (Macleod) 8150 ; (Medicine Hat) 8148 ; (Peace River) 8163 ; (Pincher Creek) 8153 ; (Ponoka) 8156 ; (Red Deer) 8155 ; (St. Albert) 8163 ; (Saskatchewan) 8161 ; (Stony Plain) 8157 ; (Strathcona) 8157 ; (Sturgeon) 8162 ; (Vermilion) 8155 ; (Wetaskiwin) 8157 (v).

Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) on 3°, Amt. (Mr. S. Hughes) B.N.A. Act, sec. 2, Neg. (Y. 37 ; N. 106) 8834 (v).

——— Amt. (Mr. Scott), C.P.R. Land Taxes, 8777.

——— Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Schools, 8804 ; Neg. (Y. 41 ; N. 109) 8817 (v).

——— Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) Distribution of Seats, 8858, Neg. (Y. 42 ; N. 97) 8859 (v).

Autonomy B. 69, on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche). Distribution of Seats, 8860.
——— Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) Dual Language (Neg. Y. 7, N. 140) 8854 (v).
——— Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8839, Neg. (Y. 7, N. 140) 8855 (v).
——— Amt. (Mr. Barker) Rupert's Land, 8864 (v).
——— Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) Schools (Neg. Y. 7 ; N. 138) 8831 (v).
——— Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) School Fund, 8835, Neg. (Y. 7, N. 132) 8837 (v).
——— Amt. *re* Separate Schools (Mr. Léonard) 8857 (v).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) in Com. (annual subsidy), Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8760 (v).
——— (B.N.A. Act) Amt. (Mr. Monk) 8702 (v).
——— Amt. *re* C. P. R. (Mr. Scott) 8873, Neg. (Y. 11, N. 126) 8881 (v).
——— (Crown lands) 8760 (v).
——— (distribution of seats) : Remarks (Mr. Lake) 8704 (v).
——— (H. of C. Representation), Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8703 (v).
——— (law courts, &c.) Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8758 (v).
——— (Rupert's Lands) Amt. (Mr. Barker) 8761 (v).
——— (schools), Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8759 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8759 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8759 (v).
——— (Senate representation), Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8703 (v).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) in Com. on Schedules (Grenfell) 8757 ; (Lumsden) 8757 ; (Moosejaw) 8757 (v).
Autonomy (Saskatchewan) B. 70, 3° m., 8866 ; Amt. (Mr. Scott) *re* C.P.R. Exemption, 8873; Neg. (Y. 11; N. 126) 8881 ; Amt. (Mr. Léonard) *re* Schools, Neg. (Y. 6 ; N. 124) 8882 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Schools, 8884 ; Amt. (Mr. Sproule) Schools, 8884 (v).
Autonomy Bills, Amendments : Presented (Mr. Fielding) 2840 (ii).
——— Approval of Cabinet, Resignation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 2263 (ii).
——— Alberta Boundaries, Letter *re* Naming of Prov.: Read (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5637 (iii).
——— Changes since First Reading, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2046 (ii).
——— Circulars, &c., Denial (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2570 (ii).
——— Circular signed by T. Brown, Sec. of Public Instruction, N.W.T., Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 3009 (ii).
——— Constitutionality of, Changes *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2192 (ii).
——— Cor. referred to by Prime Minister : Inquiry for (Mr. Sproule) 2593 (ii).
Autonomy Bills, Delay in Printing : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1671 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Haggart) 1754 (i).
——— Discussion, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6736, 6836 (iv).
——— Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister: on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2493 (ii).
——— Information asked for in Rets.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3091 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2594 (ii).
——— Letter from Hon. G. W. Ross to Min. of Fin. (Mr. Henderson) 6092 (iv).
——— Meridian Divisional Line : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8634 (v).
——— Notice of Amendment, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2761 (ii).
——— Official Record of Division : Remarks (Mr. McIntyre) 5428 (iii).
——— Papers *re* : Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3008 (ii).
——— Par. in 'Le Soleil' : M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn., 1745 (i).
——— Personal Explanation, Debate and Absence : (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2043 (ii).
——— Personal Explanations (Mr. Bourassa and Mr. A. Lavergne) 8865-6 (v).
——— Personal Explanation *re* Draft Bill of 1902 (Mr. Lake) 4348 (iii).
——— Petitions *re* : Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 2260, 2319 (ii).
——— Pets. *re* : Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Macpherson) 2681 (ii).
——— 'Political Pay,' Charge by Mr. Belcourt *re* Mr. Foster's Speech : Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 3517 ; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 3520 (ii).
——— Population *re* Saskatchewan : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5919 (iii).
——— Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 1788 (i).
——— Printing, &c., for 3° : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 8762 (v).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Circular sent by Jacques Cartier Club, 2569, 2590 (ii).
——— Ry. Subsidies by Dom. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4202 (iii).
——— Ref. to Speech on 'Doukhobors and Englishmen' (Mr. Black) 5901 (iii).
——— Resignation of Hon. C. Sifton : Personal Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1851 (i).
——— Res. *re* : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1594 (i).
——— Schedules *re* Constituencies : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com., 5815 (ii).
——— Schedules, Population and Votes cast : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5575 (iii).
——— Schedules, Preparation of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4375, 4750 (iii).

Autonomy Bills, Schedules *re* Saskatchewan, Preparation of Maps, &c.: Ramarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5475 (iii).

—— School Clause Amt.: Remarks *re* Explanation (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5673 (iii).

—— School Clauses, Attack on Orangeism: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 5873 (iii).

—— School Clause, Explanation *re* Amended clause 16: Read in Com. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5983 (iv).

—— School Clause Amts., Explanation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com., 5818 (i); Quotations from Regina 'Leader' (read) 5851 (iii).

—— School Clause in Com.: Remarks (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5817-18 (iii).

—— School Clause: Personal Explanation (Mr. Bourassa) 7175 (iv).

—— School Clause 16: Statement (Mr. Fitzpatrick *re* Drafting, 4829 (iii).

—— Second Reading *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2022 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2112 (ii).

—— School Pets.: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) in Com. of Sup., 2319 (ii).

—— personal explanation (Mr. Sproule) 2320 (ii).

—— in Com. on Res. (subsidy clause), 5479; Statement *re* Net Rev. of Public Lands: read (Mr. Scott) 5505 (iii).

—— 'Yellow Dog,' Quotation from Halifax Chronicle: Read (Mr. Sproule) in Com., 5879, 5901 (iii).

See 'Mackenzie,' 'Keewatin,' 'Controverted Elections,' 'Northwest Territories,' 'Land Titles Act,' 'Northwest Irrigation,' 'Census and Statistics,' 'N. W. Territories B. 160,' 'Northwest Territories Representation Act. Amt. B. 156,' 'Census and Statistics B. 163' 'Northwest Irrigation B. 161,' 'Manitoba Boundaries'.

Baddeck and East SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 934 (i).

Baddeck Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7396 (iv), 9585 (v).

Badgley Island Timber Cutting, Licenses Granted: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 452 (i).

Bait Freezers Deep Sea Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 9620 (v).

—— Establishment in Canso, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1146 (i).

—— Mar. Canada, Number, Location, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Martin) 2067 (ii).

Ballots, Bank, Method of Issuing, Complains *re* S. Lanark and Ottawa: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 1342 (i).

—— Printing, Procedure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 911 (i).

—— Printing, &c., for Carleton, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 587 (i).

Ballot Box Frauds in Dom. Elections, Demonstration *re* Fraudulent Box: (Mr. Porter) on M. for Sup., 9199 (v).

Ballot Boxes, Payment to Mr. Cayouette: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 1337 (i).

—— Letter read (Mr. Morin) 989 (i).

See 'House of Commons,' 'Voters' Lists,' &c.

Balsam Lake Waterways, Agreeement *re*: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 1524 (i).

Bank Act Amt. B. No. 181 (Mr. Fielding) 1° m., 7642 (iv); 2°*, 8688; in Com., 8688; 3°*, 8689 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 4).

Banking Act Amts., Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6112 (iv).

—— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2441 (ii).

Bank Notes, Supervision *re* Printing and Circulation, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6251 (iv).

See 'Finance, &c.'

Banff Hot Spring Roads and Bridges; in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iv).

Banff, N.W.T. Water Works and Sewage Construction: in Com. of Sup., 9306 (v).

Banff Pamphlets, Printing and Distribution; in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).

Barachois Boat Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 7396 (iv).

Barachois de Malbaie Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).

Barrie (Allandale) Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 9595 (v).

Barrington Passage Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).

Barry's Wharf, Madawaska River: in Com. of Sup., 6873 (iv).

Bass River Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).

Batiscan Channel Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7322 (iv).

Battery Point Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 9552 (v).

Battleford and Lake Lenore Ry. Co.'s B. No. 75 (Mr. Lamont) 1° m., 1671; 2°*, 1758 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 60.)

Battleford Bridge, N.W.T., Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 7587 (iv).

Bayfield Pier, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7546 (iv).

Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s B. No. 85 (Mr. Harty) 1°*, 1788; 2°*, 1891 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 81.)

Bay St. Lawrence, Boat Harbour: in Com. of Sup. 7397 (iv).

—— Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).

Bear Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).

Beauharnois Canal, Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6307 (iv).
——— Water Power, Utilization : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6307 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1504 (i).
Beaverton Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7546 (iv).
Beaujeu Bank Pier : in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Beckerton Public Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).
Beet Sugar Industry, Encouragement of &c.: M. for Copies of Cor* (Mr. Clements) 3204 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Bickerdike) to place on Order Paper, 9278 (v).
Belle River Dredging Channel : in Com. of Sup., 7546 (iv).
Belle River Wharf, P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 9585 (v).
Bell, Dr., Director of Geological Survey : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9303 (v).
Belleville Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1547 (i).
Beloeil Guide Piers and Booms : in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).
Benrier, Mr. J. P., Postmaster at St. Claud, Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re* : M. (Mr. Staples) for Cor.*, 1397 (i).
Bersimis to Godbout Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 7608 (iv).
Bic Harbour Wharf at Pointe à Cote : in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).
——— Land purchased from P. Ross : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1850 (i).
Bicquet Lighthouse Keeper, Name, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3202 (ii).
Bills from Senate (M.) to place on Order Paper amongst Private Bils (Mr. R. G. Macpherson) 8001 (v).
——— M. (Mr. A. Johnston) to place on Order Paper, 8096 (v).
——— Amendments *re*, Correction of Clerical Error (Mr. Fielding) 8383 (v).
——— M. (Mr. Bickerdike) to place on Order Paper, 9278 (v).
Bills, Royal Assent.: Mess. from Dep. Governor (Mr. Speaker) 6084 (iv).
——— Com. from Gov. Gen's Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 6991 (iv).
Bills, Royal Assent to in Senate, 9820 (v).

BILLS :

Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)
1°*, pro forma, 5 (i).

Bill (No. 2) To amend the Railway Act, 1903.—(Mr. Lancaster.)
1°*, 9 ; 2° m., 281 ; M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 312 ; agreed to (Y. 85, N. 45) 315 ; in Com., 1780 (i), 3223 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 3) To amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships.—(Mr. Lancaster.)
1°*, 9 ; on Order for 2°, 733 (i).

Bill (No. 4) To amend the Railway Act, 1903.—(Mr. Maclean, York.)
1°*, 9 ; on Order for 2°, 109 (i) ; Remarks, 3246 ; withdn., 3743 (ii).

Bill (No. 5) Respecting the Census and Statistics.—(Mr. Fisher.)
1°*, 52 ; 2°* 625 ; in Com., 625 ; Res. prop., 820 ; in Com. on Res., 989 ; M. for Com. on B., 1013 ; in Com., 1069, 1467 ; 3°*, 1506 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 5.)

Bill (No. 6) To amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.—(Mr. McCarthy, North Simcoe.)
1°*, 58 ; 2° m., 315 ; ref. to Sel. Com., 316 (i).

Bill (No. 7) Respecting the Inspection and Sale of Seeds.—(Mr. Fisher.)
M. for Com. on Res., 52 ; in Com., 54 ; 1°*, 66 ; 2°, 322 ; in Com., 322, 1155, 1788 ; 3° m., 1868 ; 3°*, 1886 (i) ; Sen. Amts., 7583 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 41.)

Bill (No. 8) To amend the Mounted Police Act, 1894.—(Sir Wilfrid Laruier.)
Res. prop., 59 ; in Com., 98 ; 1°*, 109 ; 2°*, 459 ; in Com., 459 ; 3°*, 465 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 24.)

Bill (No. 9) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Guthrie.)
1°, 263 (i).

Bill (No. 10) Respecting Labour Union Labels.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo.)
In Com. on Res., 272 ; 1°*, 279 ; 2°*, 601 ; in Com., 918, 1770 ; 3°, 1780 (i).

Bill (No. 11) Respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)
1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 404 ; in Com., and 3°*, 864 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 82.)

Bill (No. 12) Respecting the Ottawa Electric Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)
1° m., 316 ; 2°*, 404 ; in Com., 1283 ; on Order for Com., 1338 ; in Com., 1888; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1890 (i), 2532 ; on Order for House again in Com., 2714 ; in Com., 2950, 3170 ; 3° m., 3393 ; Amt. (Mr. Stewart) Neg. (Y. 56, N. 80) 3398 ; 3°*, 3399 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 40.)

Bill (No. 13) Respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Gauvreau.)
1°, 317 ; 2°*, 404 ; in Com., and 3°*, 864 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 59.)

Bill (No. 14) Respecting the Molsons Bank.—(Mr. Ames.)
1°, 317 ; 2°*, 415 ; in Com., 1755 ; 3°*, 1755 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 124.)

Bill (No. 15) To incorporate the St. Mary's and Western Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre.)
1°* 317 ; 2°*, 415 ; in Com., and 3°*, 864 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 155.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 16) Respecting certain patents of the Canada Car Company, Limited.—(Mr. Bickerdike.)
1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 415 (i).

Bill (No. 17) Respecting certain patents of the Goodwin Car Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike.)
1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 415 (i).

Bill (No. 18) Respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)
1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 415 ; in Com., and 3°*, 864 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 142.)

Bill (No. 19) To incorporate the Calgary, Red Deer and Battleford Railway Company.—(Mr. Scott.)
1°, 318 ; 2°*, 415 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2325 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 67.)

Bill (No. 20) To incorporate the Moosejaw and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. Scott.)
1°*, 318 ; 2°*, 415 (i) ; in Com., 2715, 2762, (iii) ; 3°*, 2763 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 130.)

Bill (No. 21) To amend the Act respecting the Safety of Ships.—(Mr. Sinclair.)
1°, 319 ; 2°*, 601 ; in Com., 731 (i).

Bill (No. 22) Respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°*, 378 ; 2°*, 534 ; in Com., 1100 ; 3°*, 1100 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 66.)

Bill (No. 23) To amend the provisions of the Criminal Code, 1892, with respect to common bawdy houses.—(Mr. Bole.)
1°, 450 ; on Order for 2°, 733 (i).

Bill (No. 24) Respecting the Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Railway Company—(Mr. Galliher.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 115.)

Bill (No. 25) Respecting the Walkerton and Lucknow Railway Company.—(Mr. McKenzie, Bruce.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583, in Com., and 3°*, 1101 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 175.)

Bill (No. 26) To incorporate the Sovereign Fire Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Clarke.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., 1755 ; 3°*, 1757 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 159.)

Bill (No. 27) Respecting certain patents of the Facer Solid Steel Car Wheel Company, of Perth, Limited.—(Mr. Caldwell.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., 1285, 1339 ; 3°*, 1340 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 91.)

Bill (No. 28) To incorporate the North-west Telephone Company.—(Mr. Turriff.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., 1890 (i), 2047, 2323 ; 3° m., 2325 ; on Order for 3°, 2714 (ii) ; 3° m., 6346 ; Sen. Amts., 7683 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 136.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 29) Respecting the Canada Southern Bridge Company.—(Mr. German.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°, 583 ; in Com., 1286 ; 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 70.)

Bill (No. 30) Respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. German.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 71.)

Bill (No. 31) Respecting the Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. German.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 69.)

Bill (No. 32) To incorporate the London and St. Clair Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 118.)

Bill (No. 33) Respecting certain patents of Jean Effront.—(Mr. Demers, St. John and Iberville.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°, 1755 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 89.)

Bill (No. 34) Respecting the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., 1706 ; 3°*, 1755 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 134.)

Bill (No. 35) To incorporate the Georgian Bay and Seaboard Railway Company.—(Mr. Grant.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1288 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 95.)

Bill (No. 36) To amend the Railway Act 1903.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)
Res. prop., 319 ; M. for Com., 493, 535 ; in Com., 563 ; 1°* of B., 582 ; 2°, 745 ; in Com., 1596 ; 3° m., 1802 ; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) Neg., (Y. 47, N. 93) 1806 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 35.)

Bill (No. 37) To amend the Quebec Harbour Commissioners' Act, 1899.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)
1°, 582 ; 2° m., 1242 ; in Com., 1243 ; 3°*, 1244 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 33.)

Bill (No. 38) To amend the Seamen's Act.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)
1°, 583 (i) ; 2°*, 2114 ; in Com., 2115 (ii) ; wthdn., 4749 (iii).

Bill (No. 39) Respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 132.)

Bill (No. 40) Respecting the Niagara-Welland Power Company.—(Mr. Guthrie.)
1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1710 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 133.)

Bill (No. 41) Respecting the Regina and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Scott.)
1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2325 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 153.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 42) Respecting the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)

1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1541 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 173.)

Bill (No. 43) Respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company. —(Mr. Gervais.)

1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2042 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 116.)

Bill (No. 44) To amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships.—(Mr. Lancaster.)

1°, 684 ; on Order for 2°, 918, 1399 (i).

Bill (No. 45) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company.—(Mr. E. M. Macdonald.)

1°, 727 ; 2°*, 909 (i) ; on Order for Com., 2765 ; in Com., 3649, 3879 (ii), 4123, 4202 ; 3° m., 4228 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 75.)

Bill (No. 46) Respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. E. M. Macdonald.)

1*, 728 ; 2°*, 909 (i) ; M. for Com., 4236 ; in Com., 4240 ; 3° m., 4412 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 50.)

Bill (No. 47) Respecting the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion.)

1°*, 728 ; 2°*, 1101 (i).

Bill (No. 48) Respecting the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)

1°, 817 ; 2°*, 909 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1541 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 163.)

Bill (No. 49) Respecting the Century Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)

1°*, 817 ; 2°*, 909 (i) ; in Com., 2765 ; 3°*, 2767 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 80.)

Bill (No. 50) To incorporate the Calgary and Battleford Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff.)

1°*, 817 ; 2°*, 909 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2325 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 65.)

Bill (No. 51) Respecting Contracts for Government Works.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick)

1°, 818 ; 2°*, 1672 ; in Com., 1672 ; 3°*, 1806 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 7.)

Bill (No. 52) To amend the Franchise Act, 1898.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick).

1°, 818 (i) ; 2°*, 2112 ; in Com., 2112 (ii), 9198 ; 3°*, 9199 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 13.)

Bill (No. 53) To amend the Act respecting the Department of Railways and Canals. —(Mr. Emmerson.)

1°*, 817 ; 2°*, 1673 ; in Com., 1673 ; 3°*, 1806 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 37.)

Bill (No. 54) To amend the Public Works Act.—(Mr. Hyman.)

1°, 819 ; 2°*, 1679 ; 3°*, 1806 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 32.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 55) To incorporate the Canada-Middlesex Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)

1°*, 908 ; 2°*, 1101 (i).

Bill (No. 56) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Bole.)

1°*, 985 ; 2°*, 1101 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2042 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 73.)

Bill (No. 57) To incorporate the Three Rivers, St. Maurice and Champlain Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. Bureau.)

1°, 986 ; 2°*, 1101 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 167.)

Bill (No. 58) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Lamont.)

1°*, 986 ; 2°*, 1101 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii) ; Sen. Amts., 9078 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 72.)

Bill (No. 59) To amend the Act respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to Railway Debts.—(Mr. Geoffrion.)

1° m., 986 ; 2°*, 1399 ; in Com., 1400 (i), 2105, 3205 (ii).

Bill (No. 60) To incorporate the Algoma Copper Range Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)

1°*, 1241 ; 2°*, 1338 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3598 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c. 54.)

Bill (No. 61) To incorporate the Lebonk and Thunder Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Bole.)

1°, 1241 ; 2°*, 1338 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 117.)

Bill (No. 62) Respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Lamont.)

1°*, 1241 ; 2°*, 1339 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII, c., 88.)

Bill (No. 63) To incorporate the Brantford and Woodstock Railway Company.—(Mr. Schell, Oxford.)

1°*, 1241 ; 2°*, 1339 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 63.)

Bill (No. 64) Respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. Stewart.)

1°*, 1336 ; 2°*, 1541 (i) ; in Com., 3598 ; 3°*, 3598 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 78.)

Bill (No. 65) Respecting the James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Watson.)

1°*, 1336 ; 2°*, 1541 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII, c., 110.)

Bill (No. 66) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, with respect to appeals from certain summary convictions.—(Mr. Porter.)

1°*, 1336 (i) ; 2°, 4260 ; in Com., 4260, 5137 (iii) ; 3°, 9699 (v). (5 Edward VII, c. 10.)

Bill (No. 67) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. Guthrie.)

1°*, 1421 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 68) Respecting a patent of the Paper Goods Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonell.)
1°*, 1421 ; 2°*, 1541 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 146.)

Bill (No. 69) To establish and provide for the Government of the Province of Alberta.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)
1° m., 1421 (i) ; Res. prop., 2913 ; 2° m., 2915, on M. for 2°, 2963, 3010, 3091, 3136, 3252, 3363, 3400, 3450, 3591, 3598, 3672, 3745, 3893, 4078, 4086, 4136, 4273, 4375, 4414, 4480, 4552, 4598, 4703, 4753, 4811, 4846, 4922, 4978, 5037, 5083, 5113, 5140, 5211, 5317, Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Neg. Y. 59 ; N. 140) 5401 ; 2°, 5423 ; in Com., 5423, in Com. on Res. *re* Subsidy, 5434 ; Amt. (Mr. Fielding) *re* Subsidy, 5470 ; 5479 ; Res. ref. to Com. on Bill, 5575 ; in Com. on Bill, 5601, 5719, 5749, 5808, 5927 (iii) ; Explanation (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5983 ; in Com. on B., 6048, 6086, 7103 ; Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Dual Language, 7583 (iv), 8530 (v); in Com., 7724, 7817, 7864, 7916 (iv), 8004 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Distribution of Seats, 8004 ; in Com., 8148 ; Amt. (Mr. Barker) *re* Preamble, 8173 ; in Com., 8240 ; Amt. (Mr. Lake) 8259 ; in Com., 8268 ; Amt. (Sir W. Laurier) *re* School Clause No. 2, 8269 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Amended School Clause, 8292 ; in Com., 8317 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) *re* School Clause, 8341 ; Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) *re* School Clause, 8387 ; Amt. (Mr. Lamont) *re* School Clause, 8493 ; in Com., 8530 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) to Mr. Monk's Amt., 8593 ; 3° m., 8777 ; Amt. (Mr. Scott) *re* C.P.R. Taxes, 8792; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Schools, 8804, Neg. (Y. 41 ; N. 109) 8816 ; Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) *re* Schools, 8831, Neg. (Y. 7 ; N. 138) 8832 ; Amt. (Mr. Sam. Hughes) *re* Schools, 8833, Neg. (Y. 37 ; N. 106), 8834 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) *re* Schools, 8835, Neg. (Y. 7 ; N. 132) 8837; Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Dual Language, 8839 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) to Amt., 8852, Neg. (Y. 7 ; N. 140) 8854 ; Amt. Neg. (Y. 7 ; N. 140) 8855 ; Amt. (Mr. Leonard) 8857 ; Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) *re* Distribution of Seats, 8858 ; Neg. (Y. 42 ; N. 97) 8859 ; Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) *re* Distribution of Seats, 8860 ; Amt. (Mr. Lake) *re* Lands, &c., 8863 ; Amt. (Mr. Barker) *re* Preamble, 8864 ; 3°, agreed to on division, 8866 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 3.)

Bill (No. 70) To establish and provide for the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)
1°*, 1467 (i) ; Res. prop., 2914 (ii) ; 2° m., 5424 (iii), 8698 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8698, Neg. (Y. 37 ; N. 90) 8699; in Com. on Res. *re* Financial Subsidy, 8701 ; in Com., 8702, 8718 ; 3° m., 8866 ; Amt. (Mr. Scott) *re* C.P.R. Taxes, 8873, Neg. (Y. 11, N. 126) 8881 ; Amt. (Mr. Leonard) *re* Schools, 8882, Neg. (Y. 6, N. 124) 8882 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Schools, 8884 ; Amt. (Mr. Sproule) *re* Schools, 8884 ; 3°, agreed to, on division, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 42.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 71) Respecting the Great Northern Railway of Canada.—(Mr. Schell, Oxford.)
1°*, 1504 ; 2°*, 1710 (i) ; in Com., 4258 ; 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII, c., 99.)

Bill (No. 72) To incorporate the Canadian Canals Corporation.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 1592 ; 2°, 1757 (i).

Bill (No. 73) To incorporate the Montreal, Quebec and Southern Railway Company. —(Mr. Gervais.)
1°*, 1592 ; 2°, 1757 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 128.)

Bill (No. 74) Respecting the Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Railway Company. (Mr. Talbot, Strathcona.)
1°*, 1671 ; 2°, 1758 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 122.)

Bill (No. 75) Respecting the Battleford and Lake Lenore Railway Company.—(Mr. Lamont.)
1°*, 1671: 2°*, 1758 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 60.)

Bill (No. 76) Respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Campbell.)
1°*, 1671 ; 2°, 1757 (i) ; in Com., 2325 ; 3°*, 2325 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 152.)

Bill (No. 77) Respecting the Canadian Agency.—(Mr. Bickerdike.)
1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; on Order for Com., 9049 ; in Com., 9077 (v).

Bill (No. 78) Respecting the Macleod, Cardston and Montana Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff.)
1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 119.)

Bill (No. 79) Respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. Zimmerman.)
1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; in Com., 4259 ; 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 165.)

Bill (No. 80) To incorporate the Woodstock and Lake Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex.)
1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i).

Bill (No. 81) Respecting the Ottawa River Railway Company, and to change its name to the 'Central Trunk Railway Company.'—(Mr. Piché.)
1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 79.)

Bill (No. 82) To incorporate the Dominion Annuity Company.—(Mr. Bole.)
1°*, 1745 ; 2°*, 1891 (i) ; in Com., 2767 ; 3° m., 2768 ; 3°*, 2950 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 55.)

Bill (No. 83) Respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company.—(Mr. Turriff.)
1°*, 1788 ; 2°*, 1891 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5132 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 52.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 84) Respecting the Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)

1°*, 1788 ; 2°*, 1891 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 105.)

Bill (No. 85) Respecting the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. Harty).

1°*, 1788 ; 2°*, 1891 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 81.)

Bill (No. 86) Respecting the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, Limited.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 1933 (i) ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 2715, 2763, 3134 ; 3°*, 3135 (iii) ; Sen. Amts., 9817 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 139.)

Bill (No. 87) To incorporate the International Terminal and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Johnston, Lambton.)

1°*, 1933 (i) ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 3135 ; 3°, 3135 (ii) ; Sen. Amts., 9695 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 108.)

Bill (No. 88) To incorporate the Athabaska Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff.)

1°*, 193 (i); 2°*, 2060 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 57.)

Bill (No. 89) Respecting Monterey Electric and Gas Company, Limited, and to change its name to 'Monterey Railway, Light and Power Company.'—(Mr. Macdonell.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c., 126.)

Bill (No. 90) Respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company. — (Mr. Smith.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2297 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 90.)

Bill (No. 91) Respecting the Timagami Railway Company.—(Mr. McCool.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 3135 ; 3°, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 161.)

Bill (No. 92) Respecting the Ottawa and New York Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 (ii) ; in Com., 4965, 5736 (iii), 5963 ; 3°*, 5973 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 141.)

Bill (No. 93) Respecting the Grand Council of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association of Canada.—(Mr. Hughes, Kings.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 2769 ; 3°*, 2770 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 77.)

Bill (No. 94) Respecting the Brockville, Westport and North-western Railway.—(Mr. Derbyshire.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 64.)

Bill (No. 95) Respecting Gillies Brothers, Limited.—(Mr. Wright, Renfrew.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 2763 ; 3°*, 2765 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 96.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 96) Respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 129.)

Bill (No. 97) Respecting the Kingston and Dominion Central Railway, and to change its name to 'The Montreal, Ottawa Kingston and Georgian Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Harty.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2325 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5113 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 86.)

Bill (No. 98) To incorporate the Imperial Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

1°*, 2043 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com., 2770 ; 3°*, 2772 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 107.)

Bill (No. 99) To incorporate the Title Guarantee and Trust Company.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 2108 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com., 3651 (ii), 4680 ; 3° m., 4964 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 162.)

Bill (No. 100) Respecting the Guelph and Georgian Bay Railway Company.— (Mr. Guthrie.)

1°*, 2108 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 101.)

Bill (No. 101) To incorporate the Winding Ledges Power and Boom Company.—(Mr. Costigan.)

1°*, 2108 ; 2°*, 2297 (ii).

Bill (No. 102) Respecting a certain patent of the Gold Medal Furniture Manufacturing Company, Limited.— (Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com., 3399 ; 3°*, 3400 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 97.)

Bill (No. 103) Respecting the Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Tobin.)

1°*, 2184 ; on Order for 2°, 2296 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com., 3669 ; 3°*, 3669 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 154.)

Bill (No. 104) Respecting the Northern Bank.—(Mr. Bole.)

1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 135.)

Bill (No. 105) To incorporate the Ontario Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Boyce.)

1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 ; in Com., 2772 ; 3°*, 2950 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 137.)

Bill (No. 106) Respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Black.)

1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., 4971, 5113 ; 3°*, 5113 (iii) ; Sen. Amts., 7625 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 85.)

Bill (No. 107) Respecting a certain patent of Celeste Joly.—(Mr. Smith.)

1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 112.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 108) To incorporate the Western Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Adamson.)
1°*, 2184 ; 2°* 2298 (ii) ; in Com., 4684 ; 3°*, 4700 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 74.)

Bill (No. 109) Respecting the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 104.)

Bill (No. 110) Respecting the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 164.)

Bill (No. 111) To incorporate the Saskatchewan Bridge Company.—(Mr. Scott).
1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2773 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 157.)

Bill (No. 112) Respecting the Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Railway Company.—(Mr. Guthrie.)
1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4700 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 102.)

Bill (No. 113) Respecting the Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)
1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5132 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 138.)

Bill (No. 114) Respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)
1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 2773 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 6610 ; Sen. Amts., 7625 (iv). (5 Edward VII,. c. 120.)

Bill (No. 115) Respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy.)
1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 3400 (ii) ; on Order for Com., 7621, 7625; in Com., 7622, 7677; 3°, 7853 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 98.)

Bill (No. 116) Respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)
1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 3400 ; in Com., and 3°*, 6610 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 53.)

Bill (No. 117) To incorporate the Athabaska Railway and Oil Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°*, 2185 ; 2°* 2298 ; in Com., 3135 ; 3°*, 3135 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 58.)

Bill (No. 118) Respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 2298 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 51.)

Bill (No. 119) To incorporate D. R. Fraser and Company, Limited.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 2773 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 7625 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 87.)

Bill (No. 120) Respecting False Representations to Induce Immigration.—(Mr. Logan.)
1°*, 2323 (ii) ; 2°*, 9699 ; in Com., 9699 ; 3°*, 9700 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 16.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 121) To amend the Act respecting the Packing and Sale of Staple Commodities.—(Mr. Fisher.)
M. for Com. on Res., 676 ; in Com. on Res., 681, 736 (i), 2413 ; 1°* of B., 2441; 2°, and in Com., 2841 ; 3°*, 2850 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 44.)

Bill (No. 122) To incorporate the Grand River and Western Power Company.—(Mr. Zimmerman.)
1°*, 2681 ; 2°*, 3136 (ii).

Bill (No. 123) Respecting the Board of the Presbyterian College, Halifax.—(Mr. Sinclair.)
1°*, 2681 ; 2°*, 3136 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 149.)

Bill (No. 124) Respecting the Farmers' Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Martin, Wellington.)
1°*, 2681 ; 2°*, 3136 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4700 (ii); Sen. Amts., 6609 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 92.)

Bill (No. 125) To incorporate the Crown Casualty Company of Canada.—(Mr. Gervais.)
M. to receive Pet., 2203, 2322, 2593 ; 1°*, 2593 ; 2°*, 3136 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3669 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 83.)

Bill (No. 126, from the Senate) For the relief of Edward Albert Murphy.—(Mr. Galliher.)
1°*, 3091 ; 2°*, 3400 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 121.)

Bill (No. 127, from the Senate) For the relief of James Arthur Pryor.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 3091 ; 2°*, 3400 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 150.)

Bill (No. 128) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. Gervais.)
1°, 3359 (ii).

Bill (No. 129, from the Senate) Respecting certain patents of William A. Damen.—(Mr. Campbell.)
1°*, 3834 (ii) ; 2°*, 4700 (iii) ; ref. back to Sel. Com., 6379 ; in Com., and 3°*, 7624 (iv) ; M. *re* Amts., 8383 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 84.)

Bill (No. 130, from the Senate) For the relief of Jane Marie Fitz-Simons.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 4081 ; 2°*, 4414 (iii) ; in Com., 6377 ; 3° m., 6378 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 94.)

Bill (No. 131) Respecting the Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Railway Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)
1°*, 4081 ; 2°*, 4414 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 171.)

Bill (No. 132) To amend the Government Railways Act.—(Mr. Emmerson.)
1° m., 4186 (iii) ; 2°*, and in Com., 6139, 7583 ; 3°, 7584 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 36.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 133, from the Senate) Respecting the Citizens' Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Barr.)

1°*, 4271 ; 2°*, 4700 (iii) ; in Com., 5973 ; 3°*, 5973 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 81.)

Bill (No. 134) To incorporate the Provident Savings Association, Limited. — (Mr. Gervais.)

1°*, 4370 ; 2°*, 4598 (iii) ; in Com., 5974 ; 3°*, 5976 (iv) ; Sen. Amts., 9078 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 151.)

Bill (No. 135, from the Senate) Respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company. —(Mr. Galliher.)

1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 4700 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 176.)

Bill (No. 136, from the Senate) To incorporate the Anthracite Coal Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)

M. to receive Pet., 4550 ; Pet. ref. back to Sel. Com., 4644 ; 1°*, 4807 ; 2°*, 4978 (iii) ; in Com., 5976 ; 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 56.)

Bill (No. 137, from the Senate) Respecting the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)

1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 4978 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 6383 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 114.)

Bill (No. 138, from the Senate) Respecting the Montreal Bridge Company, and to change its name to the Montreal Bridge and Terminal Company.—(Mr. Piché.)

1°*, 4550 ; 2°, 4703 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 6275 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 127.)

Bill (No. 139) Respecting the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Duncan Ross.)

M. to receive Pet., 3743 ; 1°*, 4550 ; 2° m., 4700 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii) ; in Com., 8315, 8637 ; 3° m., 8818, 9040 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 172.)

Bill (No. 140) Respecting the Northwest Coal and Coke Railway Company, and to change its name to the Great West Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)

1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 100.)

Bill (No. 141) Respecting the Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)

M. to receive Pet., 3744 (ii), 4375 ; 1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 113.)

Bill (No. 142) For the relief of Edward Norman Lewis, a Member of the House of Commons.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 5136 ; in Com., 5136 ; 3°*, 5137 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 19.)

Bill (No. 143, from the Senate) To incorporate the Owen Sound and Meaford Railway Company.—(Mr. Telford.)

1°*, 4644 ; 2°*, 4978 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 144.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 144, from the Senate) To incorporate the Fessenden Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada.—(Mr. Telford.)

1°*, 4644 ; 2°*, 4978 (iii) ; in Com., 6380, 6607 ; 3°*, 6609 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 93.)

Bill (No. 145 from the Senate) Respecting a Patent, No. 69772, of the Underwood Typewriter Company.—(Mr. Grant.)

1°*, 4644 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 6383 (iv). (5 Edward VII, c., 168.)

Bill (No. 146 from the Senate) Respecting certain Patents of the Underwood Typewriter Company (Mr. Grant.)

1°*, 4644 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 6383 (iv). (5 Edward VII, c., 169.)

Bill (No. 147) To amend the Seamen's Act.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

1°*, 4750 (iii) ; 2°*, 7424 ; in Com., 7424 (iv), 9029 ; 3°*, 9031 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 40.)

Bill (No. 148) Respecting the incorporation of Live Stock Record Associations.—(Mr. Fisher.)

1° m., 5076 ; Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5577 ; 2°*, 5922 ; in Com., 5922 ; 3°*, 5927 (iii). (5 Edward VII, c., 21.)

Bill (No. 149) Respecting the South Shore Railway Company and the Quebec Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Brown.)

1°*, 5783 (iii) ; 2°*, 6868 (iv) ; M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 9072 ; M. to place on Orders for Com., 9278 ; in Com., 9340, 9586 ; 3°*, 9587 ; Sen. Amts., 9815 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 158.)

Bill (No. 150 from the Senate) Respecting the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Devlin.)

1°*, 5783 (iii) ; 2°*, 6868 ; in Com., and 3°*, 7060 (iv). (5 Edward VII, c., 109.)

Bill (No. 151) To incorporate L'Union Saint Joseph du Canada.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

M. to present Pet., 2490 ; M. to rec. Pet., 2491 (ii) ; 1°*, 5783 (iii) ; 2°*, 5976 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8146 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 170.)

Bill (No. 152 from the Senate) For the relief of Clara Bidwell McDermot.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 5919 (iii) ; 2°*, 5976 ; in Com., 6275, 6347 ; 3° m., 6376 ; Agreed to (Y. 38 ; N. 13) 6377 (iv). (5 Edward VII, c., 121.)

Bill (No. 153, from the Senate) For the Relief of George Pearson.—(Mr. Calvert.)

1°*, 5919 (iii) ; 2°*, 6868 ; in Com., 7623 ; 3°, 7624 (iv). (5 Edward VII, c., 147.)

Bill (No. 154, from the Senate) For the relief of George Dance Harper.—(Mr. Johnston, Lambton.)

1°*, 5919 (iii) ; 2°*, 5976 ; in Com., 6377 ; 3°*, 6377 (iv). (5 Edward VII, c., 103.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 155, from the Senate) Respecting the Administration of an Act respecting the Packing and Sale of Certain Staple Commodities.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

1°*, 5960 (iii) ; 2°*, 5979 ; in Com., 5979 ; 3°*, 5983 (iv). (5 Edward VII, c., 45.)

Bill (No. 156) To amend the North-west Territories Representation Act.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°, 6046 (iv) ; 2°*, 8769 ; in Com., 8769 ; 3°*, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 23.)

Bill (No. 157) Respecting the District of Mackenzie.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°, 6103 (iv) ; Order dschgd., 8176 (v).

Bill (No. 158) To amend the Keewatin Act. —(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°, 6103-4 (iv) ; Order dschgd., 8176 (v).

Bill (No. 159) To amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°, 6103-4 (iv) ; 2°*, and in Com., 8769 ; 3°*, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 8.)

Bill (No. 160) With respect to the North-west Territories.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°, 6104 (iv) ; 2°, 8763 ; in Com., 8764 ; 3°*, 9408 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 27.)

Bill (No. 161) To amend the North-west Irrigation Act, 1898.—(Mr. Oliver.)

1°, 6104 (iv) ; 2°*, 8775 ; in Com., 8775 ; 3°*, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 28.)

Bill (No. 162) To amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.—(Mr. Oliver.)

1°*, 6104 (iv) ; 2°*, 9082 ; in Com., 9082 ; 3°*, 9085 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 18.)

Bill (No. 163) To amend the Census and Statistics Act.—(Mr. Fisher.)

1°, 6105 (iv) ; 2° 8774 ; in Com., 8775 ; 3°*, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 6.)

Bill (No. 164, from the Senate) To incorporate the Monarch Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Gordon.)

1°*, 6232 ; 2°*, 6868 (iv) ; in Com., and 3°*, 8655 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 125.)

Bill (No. 165) Respecting the Canadian Yukon Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 6232 ; 2°*, 7218 (iv) ; in Com., and 3°*, 8655 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 76.)

Bill (No. 166, from the Senate) Respecting certain Patents of the Ideal Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 6232 ; 2°*, 6868 ; in Com., and 3°*, 7625 (iv) ; M. *re* Amts., 8383 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 106.)

Bill (No. 167, from the Senate) For the relief of Arthur Howe Hersey.—(Mr. Johnston, Lambton.)

1°*, 6232 ; 2°*, 6868 ; M. for Com., 7624 ; On Order for Com., 7682 ; M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 7682 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 168) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the Financial Years ending respectively the 30th June, 1905, and the 30th June, 1906 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

Res. prop., 6966 ; 1°* ; 2°* ; in Com., and 3°*, 6966 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 1.)

Bill (No. 169) To amend the Act respecting the Royal Military College.—(Sir Frederick Borden.)

Res. prop., 6904 ; in Com. on Res., 6966 ; 1°* of B., 6984 ; 2°*, 7262 ; in Com., 7262; 3°*, 7262 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 39.)

Bill (No. 170) To amend the Militia Act.—(Sir Frederick Borden.)

Res. prop., 6905 ; in Com. on Res., 6984 ; 1°* of B., 6991 ; On Order for 2°, 7263; 2° m., 9179 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9198 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 22.)

Bill (No. 171) Respecting the Fort and Pilotage District of Quebec.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

1°, 7018 ; 2°*, 7440 ; in Com., 7440 ; 3°*, 7444 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 34.)

Bill (No. 172, from the Senate) For the relief of Philip Vibert.—(Mr.Zimmerman.)

1°*, 7095 ; On Order for 2°, 7218 ; 2°, 7261; in Com., and 3°*, 7624 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 174.)

Bill (No. 173) Respecting the St. Maurice Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Bureau.)

Pet. presented, 6826 ; M. to receive Pet., 7017 ; 1°*, 7175 ; 2°*, 7261 (iv) ; in Com., and 3°*, 8655 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 156.)

Bill (No. 174, from the Senate) To amend the Grain Inspection Act as regards the Selection of Commercial Grades and Samples.—(Mr. Fisher.)

1°*, 7420 (iv) ; 2°*, 9395 ; in Com., 9395 ; 3°*. 9408 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 14.)

Bill (No. 175) Respecting the Pacific Bank.—(Mr. Galliher.)

1°, 7420 ; 2°, 7625 (iv) ; in Com., and 3°*, 8146 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 145.)

Bill (No. 176) To amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. Brodeur.)

1°, 7421 (iv) ; 2°*, 8676 ; in Com., 8676 ; 3°*, 8685 ; Sen. Amts., 9411 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 17.)

Bill (No. 177, from the Senate) Respecting certain Patents of David Thomas Owen. —(Mr. Stewart.)

1°*, 7642 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com., 8652 ; 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 143.)

Bill (No. 178, from the Senate) Respecting the Canada Central Railway Company. —(Mr. Dyment.)

1°*, 7642 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 68.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 179, from the Senate) Respecting the Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff.)

1°*, 7642 (iv) : M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146; in Com., 8652; M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 8655 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 62.)

Bill (No. 180, from the Senate) Further to amend the Act of 1899 respecting the City of Ottawa.—(Mr. Fielding.)

1°*, 7642 (iv) ; 2°*, 8686 ; in Com., 8686 ; 3°*, 8688 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 29.)

Bill (No. 181) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Fielding.)

1°, 7642 (iv) ; 2°*, 8688 ; in Com., 8688 ; 3°*, 8689 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 4.)

Bill (No. 182, from the Senate) Respecting the Sterling Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 7810 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°*, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com. and 3°*, 8655 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 160.)

Bill (No. 183, from the Senate) Respecting a certain patent of the Metal Volatilization Company.—(Mr. McCool.)

1°*, 7810 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096; 2°*, 8146; in Coc., and 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 123.)

Bill (No. 184, from the Senate) To amend the Acts respecting Naturalization and Aliens.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°*, 7906 (iv) ; 2°*, 8685 ; in Com., 8685, 8689 ; 3°*, 8690 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 25.)

Bill (No. 185, from the Senate) For the relief of Isaac Pitblado.—(Mr. Bole.)

1°*, 7906 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 148.)

Bill (No. 186) For the regulation of Wireless Telegraphy in Canada.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

1° m., 8177 ; 2°*, 9031 ; in Com., 9031; 3°*, 9032 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 49.)

Bill (No. 187. from the Senate) To amend the Companies Act.

(This Bill was not read the first time in the House of Commons.)

Bill (No. 188) Respecting the Inspection of Water Meters.—(Mr. Brodeur.)

Res. prop., 8385 : in Com. on Res., 8674 ; 1°* of B., 8676 ; 2°*, 9409 ; in Com., 9409 ; 3°*, 9524 ; Sen. Amts., 9816 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 48.)

Bill (No. 189) Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—(Mr. Borden, Carleton.)

1° m., 8775 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 190) To amend the Customs Tariff, 1897.—(Mr. Fielding.)

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 8888 ; in Com., 8983; 1°*, of B., 8997; 2°*, 9760 ; in Com., 9760 ; 3°*, 9769 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 11.)

Bill (No. 191) Respecting the Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. O. E. Talbot.)

1°*, 9072 ; 2°*, 9179 ; M. to place on Orders for Com., 9278 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9340 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 111.)

Bill (No. 192) Respecting the Powers of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

1°, 9028 ; 2°*, 9288 ; in Com., 9288 ; 3°*, 9288 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 23.)

Bill (No. 193) To amend the Revised Statute respecting the salaries of certain public functionaries and other annual charges on the Consolidated Revenue.—(Mr. Fielding.)

Res. prop., 8693 ; in Com. on Res., 9033 ; 1°*, 2°*, 9033 ; in Com., 9033 ; 3°*, 9033 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 20.)

Bill (No. 194) To amend the Revised Statute respecting the House of Commons, and the Dominion Elections Act, 1900. —(Mr. Borden, Carleton.)

1° m., 9073 (v).

Bill (No. 195) Respecting Roads and Road Allowances in the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 9075 ; 2°, 9525 ; in Com., 9526 ; 3°*, 9529 ; Sen. Amts., 9819 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 38.)

Bill (No. 196) In amendment of the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°, 9075 ; 2°*, 9411 ; in Com., 9411 ; 3°, 9524 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 9.)

Bill (No. 197) To amend the Adulteration Act.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

1°*, 9179 (v).

Bill (No. 198, from the Senate) For the relief of Agnes Hedewig Helga Salusbury Trelawney.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 9278 ; 2°*, 9587 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9760 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 166.)

Bill (No. 199) To amend an Act respecting an Arbitration between His Majesty and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°, 9279 ; 2°*, 9280 ; in Com., 9529 ; 3°*, 9529 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 15.)

Bill (No. 200) Respecting the Inspector of Insurance and the Director General of Public Health.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°, 9688 ; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 9690 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 46.)

Bill (No. 201) Respecting the Salary of the First Minister.—(Mr. Fielding.)

Res. prop., 9700 ; in Com. on Res., 9725 ; 1°* of B., 9726 ; 2°*, 9790 ; in Com., 9790 ; 3°, 9790 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 12.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 202) To amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

Res. prop., 9701 ; in Com. on Res., 9726 ; 1°* of B., 9733 ; 2°*, 9791 ; in Com., 9791 ; 3°*, 9792 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 43.)

Bill (No. 203) Respecting Annuities for certain Privy Councillors.—(Mr. Fielding.)

Res. prop., 9702 ; in Com. on Res., 9733 ; 1°* of B., 9739 ; 2°*, 9792 ; in Com., 9792, 9796 ; 3°*, 9797 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 30.)

Bill (No. 204) To amend the Act respecting Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

Res. prop., 9702 ; in Com. on Res., 9740, 9797 ; 1°* of B., 9760 ; 2°*, 9792 ; in Com., 9792, 9798 ; 3°*, 9798 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 31.)

Bill (No. 205) To amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

Res. prop., 9705; in Com. on Res., 9760; 1°* of B., 9760 ; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 9796 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 47.)

Bill (No. 206) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1905, and the 30th June, 1906.—(Mr. Fielding.)

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9798 ; in Com., 9800 ; 1°*; 2°*, 9801 ; in Com., 9801 ; 3°*, 9801 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 2.)

Binder Twine Bounties, &c. : Statement Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. of Sup., 7221 (iv).

Binder Twine, Home Consumption Manufactured in Can., Quantity, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1759 (i).

Binder Twine Industry, Kingston, Output, Distribution, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 482 (i).

Binder Twine, Raw Material imported from Mexico : Remarks (Sir William Mulock) in Com. of Sup., 897 (i).

See ' Cordage.'

Bissonnette vs. Crown, Illegal Stamping of Letters in Montreal, P. O., Cor. read : in Com. of Sup., 194 (i).

See ' Post Office,' &c.

Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Conspiracy, Cor., Tels., &c. : Read (Mr. Bennett) 541-6 (i).

——— Denials of Ministers, Ques. of Order : Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 546 (i).

——— Irrelevancy of Debate : Ques. of Order (Mr. Henderson) 558 (i).

——— Letter *re* Resignation : M. for Copy* (Mr. Monk) 601 (i).

——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Foster) 697 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Maclean, York) 55 ; on M. for Com. or B. 36, 511 (i).

Blanche River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7547 (iv).

Blind River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6870 (iv).

Boisdale Wharf, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9585 (v).

Boissevain Postmaster, Mr. A. McKnight, Dismissal, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2327 (ii).

See ' Post Office,' &c.

Bonusing SS. Cos. for Cold Storage, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 1101-4 (i).

Book-keeping Methods I.C.R., &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1928 (i).

Boots and Shoes, Imports and Exports, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 7216 (iv).

Books purchased for Library, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 75 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L., Notification of Election (Mr. Speaker) 583 (i).

——— Introduced, 624 (i).

Boundary Line Fence : *See* ' Wire Fencing.'

Bourgeois Inlet Wharf, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).

Bout de L'Isle Ferry Service Inspection, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 9696 (v).

Bowmanville Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1549 (i).

Boyd, Geo. A., Emplymt. at Sault Ste. Marie, Harbour Improvements : Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 6881 (iv).

Bracebridge Dry Dock, Local Supt., Remuneration, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 6654 (iv).

Bracebridge Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7547 (iv).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 179 (Mr. Turriff) 1°*, 7642 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com., 8652 ; M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 8655 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 62.)

Brantford and Woodstock Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 63 (Mr. M. S. Schell) 1°*, 1241; 2°*, 1339 (i); in Com., and 3°, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 63.)

Brandon Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1550, 1633 (i).

Brantford Letter Carriers : Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) in Com. of Sup., 217 (i).

Brantford Parade Grounds : Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) in Com of Sup. 860, 1553 (i).

Bredt, Mr. P. M., Emplymt. by Govt.: (Mr. Lake) 189, 265 (i).

Breton Cove Boat Landing : in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).

Bridgeburg Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1550 (i).

Bridges, Dr., Resignation as Medical Officer of No. 8 District : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 417 (i).

Bridges, Strengthening of I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1912 (i), 9384 (v).
Bridgewater Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
British American Fish Co., Contract *re* Fishing Rights in Western Lakes : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).
B. C. Canning Industries : *See* 'Salmon Canning.'
B. C. Customs Collector, Victoria, Appnmt. of : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 270 (i).
B. C. Dom. Lands, Sale to Mr. T. W. Patterson, Prices paid, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4371 (iii).
B. C. Indian Industrial Schools : in Com. of Sup., 6556 (iv).
——— Travelling Expenses *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6557 (iv).
See 'Indians.'
B. C. Judgeship, Appnmt. of W. W. B. McInnes: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 382 (i).
B. C. Legislation *re* Immigration, Disallowance of : Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 189 (i), 6474 (iv).
Britton, Judge, Rep. *re* Alien Investigation : Inquiry for (Mr. Sproule) 1152 (i).
Broad Cove Harbour Works : in Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
Broad Cove Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Brockville, Westport and North-western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 94 (Mr. Derbyshire) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 64).
Bronte Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7548 (iv).
Bronte Pier Lighthouse : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., (2868 ii).
——— Statement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 9176 (v).
Brothers' Light, Salary of Keeper : Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).
Bruce County Armouries : Remarks (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 1658 (i).
Brunet, Mr., G.T.P. Ry. Commissioner, Resignation, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5036 (iii).
Bryce, Dr., Payments to *re* Indians : in Com. of Sup., 6558 (iv).
Bryson Bridge Reconstruction : in Com. of Sup., 7585 (iv).
Budget, The, Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 8888 ; Res. moved, 8914 (v).
Debate :
(Mr. Foster) 8915 ; (Mr. Cockshutt) 8936 ; (Mr. Clements) 8957 ; (Mr. Paterson) 8934 ; (Mr. Campbell) 8938 ; (Mr. A. A. Wright) 8949 ; (Mr. Caldwell) 8965 ; (Mr. Galliher) 8971 ; (Mr. Daniel) 8978 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2685 (ii).
——— Date of Delivery : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4920 (iii).
Budget, The, Statement *re* Delivery (Mr. Fielding) 8763 (v).
——— Inquiry *re* (Mr. Foster) 2006, 2441, 2762 (ii) ; 7100 (iv).
Buffaloes, Specimens for Exhibitions : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 6272 (iv).
Buildings, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 1641 (i), 6735 (iv).
——— Renewals, Repairs, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1641 (i).
Buildings, Govt. : in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
Buildings, Govt., Inspection by Architects, Clerks, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1642 (i).
——— Manitoba : in Com. of Sup., 1633 (i) ; 9549.
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i), 7284 (iv).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 1637 (i), 9550 (v).
——— N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 846, 1015 (i).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 1547 (i), 9547 (v).
——— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 1101 (i).
See 'Public Works,' &c.
Buoys, Construction and Maintenance : in Com. of Sup., 2729 (ii).
——— Tenders, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2742 (ii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Burford Armoury : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com., 1649 (i).
Burritt's Rapids Locks, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Reid) 8384 (v).
Business of the House, Cold Storage Discussion : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8181 (v).
——— Procedure *re* Supply Motions : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1241 (i).
See 'Govt. Business,' &c.
Butter and Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Grievance *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Walsh) 8886 (v).
Butter in Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 881 (i).
See 'Agriculture.'
By-Elections, Resignations, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7423 (iv).
Cabinet Changes from 1904 : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1336 (i).
Cabinet Ministers-ex, Annuities B. No. 203 (Mr. Fielding) Res. prop., 9702 ; in Com., on Res., 9733 ; 1°* of B., 9739 ; 2°*, 9792 ; in Com., 9792, 9796 ; 3°*, 9797 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 30.)
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers : Remarks (Mr. Borden) on Orders of the Day, 3555 (ii).
——— Interior Dept., Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3362 (ii), 4085 (iii).

Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3450 (ii).

——— Representation *re* : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 3252 (ii).

——— Minister of Public Works : M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn., 5471 (iii).

Cables of the Empire, Cor. with Govt.: M. (Mr. Logan) for Cor.*, 1397 (i).

Cacouna Wharf, Expenditure *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7096 (iv).

Cadet Corps, Ammunition supplied : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) 7815 (iv).
See 'Militia.'

Cairns, A. W., Salary as P. O. Inspector : in Com. of Sup., 6629 (iv).

Calgary and Battleford Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 50 (Mr. Turriff) 1°*, 817 ; 2°*, 909 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2325 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 65.)

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. No. 22 (Mr. Oliver) 1°*, 378 ; 2°*, 534 ; in Com., 1100 ; 3°*, 1100 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 66.)

Calgary, Land Titles Office : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).

——— Post Office Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).

Calgary, Red Deer and Battleford Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 19 (Mr. Scott) 1° m., 318 ; 2°*, 415 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2325 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 67.)

Campaign Literature and Franking Privileges: Remarks (Mr. White) 1809 (i).
See 'Franking.'

Campbellton and Gaspé Basin Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 9616 (v).

Campbellton, Public Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1048 (i).

——— I.C.R. Station Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1968 (i).

——— Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 1744 (i).

Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. No. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) 1° m., 728 ; 2°*, 909 (i) ; M. for Com., 4236 ; in Com., 4240 ; 3° m., 4412 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 50.)

Canada Atlantic Ry., Purchase : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Haggart) 2685 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Haggart) 69 (i).

——— Running Rights : *See* 'I.C.R. and C.A.R.', 'Govt. Rys. B. 132,' 'Transportation.'

Canada Car Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 16 (Mr. Bickerdike) 1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 415 (i).

Canada Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 178 (Mr. Dyment) 1°*, 7642 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 68.)

'Canada-Cape Breton' Accident, 'Statement of Case' : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 2067 (ii).

——— Capt. Salmon's Resignation, Cor., &c. : M. for Copies (Mr. Ames) 384 (i).

'Canada-Cape Breton' Accident, Report *re* Investigation, Instructions, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2625 (ii).
See 'Marine.'

Canada Eastern Ry., Improvements of Roadbed : Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 1978 (i).

——— Cor., Names of Officials, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 734 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 4811 (iii).

——— Purchase, Expenditure *re* Litigation : Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 1523 (i).

——— Total Expenditure *re* : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1922 (i).
See 'I.C.R.', &c.

Canada and France SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7094 (iv).

'Canada Gazette' Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 6723 (iv).

Canada and G. B. Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 864 (i).
See 'Post Office,' 'Trade and Commerce,' &c.

Canada Life Assurance Co., Ref. to in Com. on B. 108, 4684 (iii).

Canada and Mexico Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 895 (i), 9622, 9680 (v) ; conc., 6909 (iv).

Canada and Mexico SS. Communication : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 66 (i).

Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s B. No. 31 (Mr. German) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 69.)

Canada-Middlesex Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 55 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 908 ; 2°*, 1101 (i).

Canada and New Zealand SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 7094 (iv).

Canada and S. Africa SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).

Canada Southern Bridge Co.'s B. No. 29 (Mr. German) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., 1286 ; 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 70.)

Canada Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 30 (Mr. German) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 71.)

'Canada' Str., Expenditure *re* Equipment, Names of Employees, Payments to, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 1399 (i).
See 'Marine,' &c.

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 128 (Mr. Gervais) 1° m., 3359 (ii).

Can. Temperance Act, Expenditure *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6957 (iv).

Canadian Agency B. No. 77 (Mr. Bickerdike) 1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; on Order for Com., 9049 ; in Com., 9077 (v).

Canadians arrested by U.S.: *See* 'Walton, R. M.'

Canadian Bank of Commerce, Yukon, Compensation *re* : in Com. of Sup., 9615 (v).

Canadian Canals Corporation incorp. B. No. 72 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 1592 ; 2° m., 1757 (i).

Canadian Cattle, Embargo in G.B.: on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Agr. Com., 8998 (iv).

——— Par. in Montreal 'Star': Read (Mr. Lennox) 454 (i).

'Canadian Citizenship,' Political Speech by Min. of Rys.: Remarks (Mr. Crockett) 2214 (ii).

Canadians detained at U. S. Borders: Letter read (Mr. Barker) 5920 (iii).

Canadians, Distressed, Relief to: in Com. of Sup., 7247 (iv).

Canadian Exhibit, Imperial Institute: in Com. of Sup., 1836 (i).

Canadian Fast Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) 9773 (v).

——— Tel. read (Mr. Emmerson) 9279 (v).

See 'Trade and Commerce.'

Canadian Hard Wheat, Drawbacks by U. S., &c.: M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 746 (i).

Canadians in S. Africa, Claims *re* Mining Rights: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Macdonnell) 9530 (v).

Canadian Mining Institute: in Com. of Sup., 7247 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 58 (Mr. Lamont) 1°*, 986 ; 2°*, 1101 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii) ; Sen. Amts., 9078 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 72).

Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 56 (Mr. Bole) 1°*, 985 ; 2°, 1101 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2042 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 73).

C.P.R. Land Tax Exemption, Interpretation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 730 (i).

——— Taxation, *re* Municipalities, Judgment of Sup. Court: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup.. 2022 (ii).

C.P.R. Lands Taxation *re* Autonomy B. 69: 6049 (iv).

See 'Autonomy,' &c.

Canadian Products sent to Mexico, &c.: Remarks (William Mulock) in Com. of Sup., 897 (i).

Canadian Shippers, and Atlantic SS. Contracts with Armours, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 4235 (iii).

Canadian Yukon Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 165 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 6232 ; 2°*, 7218 (iv) ; in Com., and 3°*, 8655 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 76).

CANALS:

Arbitrations and Awards *re* Canals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1508 (i).

Atwater Bridge over Lachine Canal, Contract *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7261 (iv).

——— Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7422 (iv).

CANALS—*Con.*

Beauharnois Canal Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 6307 (iv).

——— Water Power, Utilization: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6307 (iv).

——— Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1504 (i).

Burrit's Rapids Locks, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Reid) 8384 (v).

Canal Tools, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 1546.

Cardinal Canal, Claims for Damages *re* Contractors: in Com. of Sup., 1220 (i).

——— Swing Bridge and Wharf: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 1418 (i).

Carillon and Grenville Canals, Guide Piers: in Com. of Sup., 6305 (iv).

Chambly Canal, Macadamizing Road: in Com. of Sup., 9378 (v).

——— Ste. Therese Island Culvert: in Com. of Sup., 6301 (iv).

Cornwall Canal, Concreting Apparatus: in Com. of Sup., 6298 (iv).

——— Dredging, Contract *re* Advertising, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 588, 686 (i).

——— Employees for Oct. and Nov., 1904: Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 107 (i).

——— Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 1219 (i).

——— Lock Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 1494 (i).

——— Stone Facing between Locks: in Com. of Sup., 9381 (v).

Cote. St. Paul, Bridge, Lachine Canal: in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).

——— Water Power, Lease to J. Frothingham: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3360 (ii).

Culbute Canal, Litigation *re* Flooding, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 1522 (i).

Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1219 (i) ; 9061 (v).

Dep. Minister. Appnmt. of Mr. Butler and Superannuation of Mr. Schreiber, Duties assigned to, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9678 (v).

Farran's Point Gas Plant: in Com. of Sup., 6308 (iv).

Galops Channel, Completion: in Com. of Sup., 1230 (i).

——— Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 1220 (i).

——— Removing Shoals: in Com. of Sup., 9354 (v).

——— Repairs *re* Leakage: in Com. of Sup., 1492 (i).

Gamebridge Mason Inspector, Dismissal, Imperfect Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4750, 5600 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 8004 (v).

See 'Ritchie.'

CANALS—*Con.*

Grenville Canal, Appnmt. of Inspector : Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1509 (i).

——— Guide Piers : in Com. of Sup., 1499 (i).

Hanault, L. O., Payments *re* Lachine Canal : in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).

Holland River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9359 (v).

Inspection and Surveys : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1509 (i).

Lachine Canal, Cote St. Paul, Water-power used for Manufacturers : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 1515 (i).

——— Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).

——— Installation of Electrical Appliances : in Com. of Sup., 9354 (v).

——— Lock Gates, Suspension : in Com. of Sup., 6300 (iv).

——— Machinery for Shops : in Com. of Sup., 1240 (i).

——— Mill Street Paving : in Com. of Sup., 6301 (iv).

——— Power House Flumes : in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).

——— Rebuilding Wall Basin, Lock No. 2 : in Com. of Sup., 1421 (i).

——— Rebuilding Wharf below Dock : in Com. of Sup., 1421 (i).

——— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6306 (iv).

——— St. Gabriel's Basin Walls : in Com. of Sup., 9378 (v).

——— Tail Race Widening : in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).

——— Wall Underpinning : in Com. of Sup., 6298 (iv).

——— Water Privilege, Lease to Wm. Parkyn, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5132 (iii).

See 'Atwater,' 'Cote St. Paul,' 'Hanault.'

Magann & Finn, Payments to *re* Port Colborne Contract : in Com. of Sup., 1232 (i).

Matthews, Geo. Co., Claims *re* Damages by Flooding : in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).

Murray Canal, Inspector : Remarks (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).

——— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 1495 (i).

Payne, J. L., Salary Increase : in Com. of Sup., 9062 (v).

Port Colborne, Breakwater, Elevator, &c., Cor., Papers, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 2067 (ii).

——— Deepening Summit Level : in Com. of Sup., 1232 (i).

——— Eastern Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 815 (i).

——— Elevator : in Com. of Sup., 1263, 1266, 1288 (i).

——— Entrance Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1230 (i).

See 'Welland.'

CANALS—*Con.*

Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Emmerson) 908 (i).

——— Delay in bringing down : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 601 (i).

Rideau Canal Extension : in Com. of Sup., 1333 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1523 (i).

Ritchie, James, Inspection of Masonry *re* Trent Canal, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Foster) 2777 (ii).

See 'Gamebridge.'

St. Lawrence Canals, Deepening Shoals : in Com. of Sup., 6289 (iv).

St. Peters Canal, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).

——— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6308 (iv).

St. Ours Canal, Booms and Piers : in Com. of Sup., 1499 (i).

——— Landing Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6302 (iv).

Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Contracts *re* Construction : in Com. of Sup., 1406 (i).

——— Construction : in Com. of Sup., 1334 (i).

——— Dredging, U.S. and Canadian Contractors, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 589 (i).

Soulanges Canal Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 6290 (iv).

Sunday Work : in Com. of Sup., 1547 (i), 9383 (v).

Tay Canal, Ref. to in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Haggart) 1301 (i).

Tools, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1546 (i).

Trent Canal, Claims for Damages, Mr. Jas. Clark, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Ward) for copy, 1395, (i).

——— Dismissal of J. Ritchie, &c.: M. for copy* (Mr. Foster) 2777 (ii).

——— incomplete return : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4750 (iii).

See 'Gamebridge.'

——— Geo. Matthews Co., Claim *re* Damages by Flood : in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).

——— Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1499 (i).

——— Lowering Floor of Lock : in Com. of Sup., 6302 (iv).

——— McLaren's Creek Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 9379 (v).

——— Peterborough Dam : in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).

——— Staff on Dams, taken by Dom. Govt.: in Com. of Sup., 9383 (v).

——— Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 1471, 1476 (i), 6291 (iv), 9354 (v).

——— letter from Sir Wilfrid Laurier to Mr. Aylesworth : Read (Mr. Ward) 1476 (i).

——— Surveys of Dams taken by Dom.: in Com. of Sup., 9376 (v).

CANALS—*Con.*
Trent Canal, Surveys, Rice Lake, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ward) 153 (i).
See 'Holland.'
Vanderburg, Stephen, Claims *re* Injuries on Welland Canal : in Com. of Sup., 6305 (iv).
Welland Canal, Deepening, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 588 (i).
——— Deepening Long Level : in Com. of Sup., 6290 (iv).
——— Deepening Summit Level at Port Colborne, 1263 (i).
——— Electric Plant : in Com. of Sup., 1231 (i), 9377 (v).
——— Employees during Oct., Nov.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 453 (i).
——— Emplymt. of Labour, Political Influence : Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 6855 (iv).
——— Lowering Head of Lock No. 1 : in Com. of Sup., 6309 (iv).
——— Port Colborne Elevator : in Com. of Sup., 1263, 1266, 1288 (i).
——— Removal of Obstructions : in Com. of Sup., 1231 (i).
——— Removal of Piers and Bridge Building : in Com. of Sup., 1234 (i).
——— Stone Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 1496 (i).
——— Survey : in Com. of Sup., 1234 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1520 (i).
——— Water Power Leases, Names, Quantity, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. German) 2097 (ii).
See 'Magann,' 'Port Colborne.'
Williamsburg Canal, Steam Hoist : in Com. of Sup., 1494 (i).
Williamsburg and Cornwall Canals, Water Power Leases, Dates, Rentals, Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 4809 (ii).
Yamaska Lock : in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
Canning Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Canso Herring Industry, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1146 (i).
Canso Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1023 (i).
Canton Fabre Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7288 (iv).
Cape Road Crossing, I.C.R., Elimination of : in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).
Cape Tormentine Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7497 (iv).
Capital Account, I.C.R., Total Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Chisholm) 2064 (ii).
See 'I.C.R.', &c.
Caplin and Paspebiac Ry., Payments *re* Subsidy : M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 3203 (ii)
Carbide for Acetylene Gas Purposes, Quantity purchased : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 914 (i).
Carbide purchased, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 1055 (i).
Carbide purchased for Lighthouses : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2710, 2743 (ii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Cardigan and Montague Bridge Branch, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 2171 (ii).
See 'I.C.R.-P.E.I.' &c.
Cardinal Canal, Claims for Damages *re* Contractors : in Com. of Sup., 1220 (i).
——— Swing Bridge and Wharf : Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 1418 (i).
Carillon Canal, Fishway, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2064 (ii).
——— remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 2910 (ii).
——— Guide Piers : in Com. of Sup., 6305 (iv).
——— Works, Emplymt. of Labourers, Affidavit read *re* Political Influence : Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 6856 (iv).
Carleton Co., Electoral District, Certificate *re* Election : Notification (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 583 (i).
——— Vacancy : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 98 (i).
See 'Borden, R. L.'
Carlos Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Carpets purchased by Govt. for House of Parlt., Quantity, Value, Duty paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Osler) 8266 (v).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa,' &c.
Carter, C. J., Gratuity to : in Com. of Sup., 2183 (ii).
Cascumpec Sandhills Channel, P.E.I., Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2773 (ii).
Cast-Iron, Quantity furnished to Marine Dept. at Sorel : Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 2328 (ii).
Castonguay, Dismissal and Emplymt. by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 5688 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. O. E. Talbot) 6653 (iv).
Catholic Mutual Benefit Association of Canada B. No. 93 (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 2769 ; 3°*, 2770 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 77.)
Cattle, Canadian Embargo, 6th Rep. of Agriculture Com.: Presented (Mr. McIntyre) 8097 (v).
Cattle Quarantine : in Com. of Sup., 2309 (ii), 6690, 6911 (iv).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
Caughnawaga Indians, Medical Attendance : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Bergeron) 225 (i).
Celeste Joly Patent Relief B. No. 107 (Mr. Smith) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii), in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 112.)
Cement : in Com. on Ways and Means, 8985 (v).
——— Tariff Changes *re* : in Com. on Customs Bill, 9765 (v).

Cement, Testing Laboratory, Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7613 (iv).
Census and Statistics B. No. 5 (Mr. Fisher) 1°*, 52 ; 2°*, 625 ; in Com., 625; Res. prop., 820; in Com. on Res., 989 ; M. for Com. on B., 1013 ; in Com., 1069, 1467 ; 3°*, 1506 (i). (5 Edward VII, c., 5).
—— Order, Ques. of (Mr. Monk) *re* Resolution, 629 (i).
—— Ruling Reserved (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 632 (i).
Census and Statistics Act Amt. B. No. 163 (Mr. Fisher) 1° m., 6105 (iv) ; 2° m., 8774 ; in Com., 8775; 3°*, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 6).
Census in Eastern Townships, Incorrect Rets.: Remarks (Mr. Walsh) 675 (i).
Census Enumerators, Appnmt. of : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. on B. 5, 1073 (i).
—— (1901) Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 50 (i).
—— Quinquennial, *re* Alberta, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).
—— Total Expenditure for Completion, Dismissal of Staff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 588 (i).
—— *re* Urban and Rural Population : Remarks (Mr. W. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 6274 (iv).
Central Counties Ry. Co.'s B. No. 64 (Mr. Stewart) 1°*, 1336 ; 2°*, 1541 (i) ; in Com., 3598 ; 3°*, 3598 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 78.)
Central Trunk Ry. Co.; *See* 'Ottawa River Ry.', &c.
Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. No. 49 (Mr. Macpherson) 1°*, 817 ; 2°*, 909 (i) ; in Com., 2765 ; 3°*, 2767 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 80.)
Certificates of Masters and Mates B. No. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) 1°*, 9 (i).
See 'Masters and Mates,' 'Seamen's Act,' &c.
Chambly Canal, Macadamizing Road : in Com. of Sup., 9378 (v).
—— Ste. Therese Island Culvert : in Com. of Sup., 6301 (iv).
Chambord Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7289 (iv).
Champlain's Monument, Erection, Grant to : in Com. of Sup., 9340 (v).
'Champlain' Str., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 149 (i).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Champlain Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7290 (iv).
Chance Harbour Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7497 (iv).
Chance Harbour Breakwater : Remarks (Mr. Stockton) in Com. of Sup., 9588 (v).
Chapman, F. B., Emplymt. by Govt. on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1342 (i).
Charges of Management : in Com. of Sup., 69 (i), 6249 (iv), 8691, 9052 (v).
Charlottetown Station Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 2025 (ii).
—— Cor. and Reps. *re* Construction : M. for copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 194 (i).
—— inquiry for ret. (Mr. A. Martin) 4810 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Martin) 60 (i).
—— Track Extension, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 6433 (iv).
Chatham Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1551 (i).
—— Contract, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 587 (i).
Chateauguay River Dredging and Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 6847, 7322 (iv).
See 'St. Louis,' &c.
Chateau Richer, Expenditure by Govt. for Public Works : M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Morin) 109 (i).
Chateau Richer, Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7290 (iv).
—— Montmorency Wharf, Expenditure by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 1015 (i).
—— Public Works, Dates of Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3202 (ii).
—— Removal of Obstruction : Remarks (Mr. Morin) 1154 (i).
Chesley Postmaster, Vacancy, Appnmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 9081 (v).
Chezzetcook (east) Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Chicoutimi, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7377 (iv).
—— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1106 (i).
Child Immigration to Can., Assistance by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1341 (i).
—— Par. in 'Citizen' *re* Mrs. Close's Scheme (remarks) 1936 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) on M. for Sup., 2125 (ii).
See 'Immigration.'
Chilliwack Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Chinese Immigration Act, Administration of : in Com. of Sup., 7204 (iv).
—— Salaries to Customs Officers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 981 (i).
Choquette, Judge, Date of Resignation and Appnmt. to Senate : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1344 (i).
See 'Political Crisis.'
Circulars, Addressed to and distributed by Orange Lodges *re* Separate Schools : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2405 (ii).
—— Issued by Jacques Cartier Club : Remarks (Mr. Monk) 2408, 2410 (ii).
Circulars issued by Political Associations *re* Census, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. on B. 5, 1097 (i).
Citizen's Bank of Canada B. No. 133 (Mr. Barr) 1°*, 4271 ; 2°*, 4700 (iii) ; in Com., 5973 ; 3°*, 5973 (iv). (5 Edward VII, c., 81.)

Civil Govt., Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 70, 120 (i), 6240, 6721 (iv), 9034 (v).
Civil Service Appointments since 1896, Inside Services, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 2333 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 585 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 5808 (iii), 6232 (iv), 8002 (v).
Civil Service Examiners : in Com. of Sup., 6249 (iv).
——— Report : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5428 (iii).
Civil Servants' Guarantees *re* P. O. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Chisholm) 1758 (i).
Civil Service Insurance Act, Statement : Presented (Mr. Paterson) 54 (i).
Civil Service List : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 51 (i).
Clarke, Mr. E. F., Late M.P., Decease of : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2042 (ii), 2108 (ii).
——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2108 (ii).
Clark's Harbour, Removal of Rocks from Channel : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Clifton Breakwater Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7497 (iv).
Clinton Post Office Buildings : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 852 (i).
Clerks of Works, Salaries, &c., Dom. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1642 (i).
See 'Pub. Works,' &c.
Coal, Anthracite, Quantity used by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. A. McLean) 192 (i).
See 'Pub. Works,' &c.
Coal carried Free on I.C.R. to Ottawa, 1902-3 ; Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 2065, 2192 (ii).
Coal Contracts and Supplies for Penitentiaries : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 478 (i).
Coal for Govt. Railways, Quantity accepted from N.S. Mines : Ques. (Mr. Barker) 2191 (ii).
——— Quantity : Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 910 (i).
Coal Supply for Govt. Steamers, Handling, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2613 (ii).
Coatsworth Customs Collector, Salary, Revenue, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 263 (i).
Cobourg Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1554 (i).
Cobourg Piers, Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7548 (iv).
Colborne Armoury : Remarks (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. of Sup., 1655 (i).
Cold Storage *re* Atlantic Steamers, and Thermograph Records : M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup.. 8183 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2774 (ii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 868 (i).
See 'Thermograph,' &c.
Cold Storage, Bait Freezers, Mar. Canada, Number, Location, &c. : M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Ret., 1769 (i).
Cold Storage Plant for Bait, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 1505 (i).
Coldwater and Lovering Mail Contracts, &c., Remuneration : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1848 (i), 2594 (ii).
Collingwood Customs Collector Watson, Superannuation, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 408 (i).
Collingwood Dock, Conroy Bros., Cheque : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) on M. for Sup., 6572 (iv).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Payments by Govt., *re* Bounty, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6653 (iv).
——— Mr. Conroy's Cheque, Retention by Govt.: Statement (Mr. Fielding) 6654 (iv).
See 'Port Arthur,' &c.
Collingwood Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 6849, 7549 (iv).
Colonial Conference and Tariff Revision : Par. in Montreal 'Star' : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7098 (iv).
Colonial Stock Act, and Investment of Funds in G. B. : M. for Copies of Cor.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9698 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 9540 (v).
Colonization Roads, Man. and N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 7594 (iv).
Colson, Mr. F., Duties and Salary : Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 8146 (v).
Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 11 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 404 ; in Com., and 3°*, 864 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 82.)
Columbia River, General Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Commercial Agencies in Can. Location, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Martin) 403 (i).
Commercial Agencies : in Com. of Sup., 7208 (iv), 9037 (v).
——— Letter *re* Mr. Jackson's Ability (read) in Com. of Sup., 7210 (iv).
Commercial and Manufacturing Industries, Statistics *re* : Remarks (Mr. Macdonnell) in Com. on B. 5, 1085 (i).
Commercial Travellers' Tax in Quebec : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9811 (v).
Committees, Sel. Standing : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7 (i).
——— Lists : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 60 (i).
——— Addition of Mr. Bristol's Name : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5210 (iii).
——— Change of Names : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 227 (i).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Names, 110, 624 (i), 3090 (ii), 5576 (iii).
Commodities, Packing, &c. : *See* 'Apples.'
Companies Act Amt. B. No. 187 (from the Senate) this Bill was not read the first time in the House of Commons.
Congdon, F. T., Appnmt. as Legal Adviser to Yukon, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 7020 (iv).

Congdon, F. T., Appnmt. as Legal Adviser to Yukon, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7717 (iv).
Conmee & Bowman : *See* 'Port Arthur,' &c.
Conroy Bros. Cheque : *See* 'Collingwood Dock.'
Consolidation of Statutes : in Com. of Sup., 7244 (iv).
Contagious Diseases, Prevention in Man. : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 1843 (i).
Contracts for Govt. Works : *See* 'Govt. Contracts.'
Controverted Elections, Lisgar, Judges' Certificate : Presented (Mr. Speaker) 9 (i).
See 'Dom. Election Bills,' &c.
Conventions between United Kingdom and U.S. *re* Personal Property : Remarks *re* Cor. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1068 (i).
Copyright Act *re* Photographs, Legislation *re* Amt. : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1849 (i).
Cordage at Kingston Penitentiary, Sale of 58 Tons, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Clare) 6827 (iv).
—— Plant established at Kingston : Ques. (Mr. Clare) 2329 (ii).
See 'Binder Twine.'
Cornwall Armoury : Remarks (Mr. Pringle) in Com. of Sup., 1552, 1659 (i).
Cornwall Canal, Basin Dredging Contract, Amount, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 588 (i).
—— Concreting Apparatus : in Com. of Sup., 6298 (iv).
—— Dredging, Contract *re*, Advertising, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 686 (i).
—— Employees for Oct. and Nov., 1904 : Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 107 (i).
—— Employees, Payment to *re* Election Campaign : Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 1224 (i).
—— Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 1219 (i).
—— Lock Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 1494 (i).
—— Stone Facing between Locks : in Com. of Sup., 9381 (v).
Corporation, Trusts, &c. : Remarks in Deb. on Address (Mr. Maclean) 42 (i).
Corry Block, Rental, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6818 (iv).
Cote St. Paul, Bridge, Lachine Canal : in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).
—— Water Power, Lease to J. Frothingham : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3360 (ii).
See 'Canals.'
County Harbour, Removal of Obstructions : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Country Postmasters, Increases in Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 143 (i).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Court Houses, &c., N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
Court Room, Prince Albert : in Com. of Sup., 124 (i).
Cow Bay, Port Morien Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7399 (iv).
Cow Bay Run Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7401 (iv).
Cowie, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. *re* Herring Experiments : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5425 (iii).
Creameries : in Com. of Sup., 7014 (iv).
Creameries, Butter and Cheese, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6938 (iv).
Creosoted Timber for Piers and Breakwaters, P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 1737 (i).
Criminal Code (bawdy houses) Amt. B. No. 23 (Mr. Bole) 1°, 450 ; on Order for 2°, 733 (i).
—— (summary appeals) B. No. 66 (Mr. Porter) 1°*, 1336 (i) ; 2° m., 4260 ; in Com., 4260, 5137 (iii) ; 3° m., 9699 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 10.)
—— B. No. 67 (Mr. Guthrie) 1°*, 1421 (i).
—— (trading stamps) Amt. B. No. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 9075 ; 2°*, 9411 ; in Com., 9411 ; 3° m., 9524 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 9.)
Criminal Statistics, Compilation of : in Com. of Sup., 1473 (i).
Crowe's Landing Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).
Crown Casualty Co.'s incorp. B. No. 125 (Mr. Gervais) M. to receive Pet., 2203, 2322, 2593; 1°*, 2593 ; 2°*, 3136 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3669 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 83).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Co., Passenger Rates, Ref. to Ry. Commission : Remarks (Mr. Herron) 6836 (iv).
Culbute Canal, Litigation *re* Flooding, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 1522 (i).
Culling Timber, Inspectors, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7236 (iv).
See 'Inland Revenue,' &c.
Culloden Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7401 (iv).
Cunningham Point Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Cu[illegible]nd Sorel Bridge Scandals, Ref. to in Debate : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 8142 (v).
Customs Tariff (1897) Act Amt. B. No. 190 (Mr. Fielding) M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 8888 ; in Com., 8983 ; 1°* of B., 8997 ; 2°, 9760 ; in Com., 9760 ; 3°*. 9769 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 11.)
CUSTOMS :
Agricultural Exports and Imports, Duties paid, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Clements) 3203 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Clements) 909 (i).
Anthracite Coal (Scotch) imported, Commercial Value &c : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonald) 9697 (v).
Boots and Shoes, Imports and Exports, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 7216 (iv).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

B. C. Customs Collector, Victoria, Appnmt. of : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 270 (i).

Chinese Immigration, Salaries to Customs Officers, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 981 (i).

Coatsworth Customs Collector, Salary, Revenue, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 261 (i).

Collector at Victoria, B.C., Appnmt. of : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 270 (i).

Collectors' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 407 (i).

Collections on Sundays : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 413 (i).

Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 256 (i).

Deptl. Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 78 (i), 9069 (v).

Dredging Plant, &c., imported into Canada, Valuation, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5425 (iii).

——— Remarks *re* Answer to Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5591 (iii).

Dumping Clause, Customs Instructions *re*, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Kemp) 695 (i).

Duties, Remission *re* Army and Navy Articles: in Com. of Sup., 6724, 6812 (iv).

Gratuities : in Com. of Sup., 6434 (iv).

Harvey, N. B., Customs Collector, Appnmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 9696 (v).

Hay exported from Quebec to Boston, Number of Tons : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 689 (i).

Hay Imports from U.S., Quantity, Duties collected, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1064 (i).

Imports and Exports, Agriculture Products, Duties paid, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Clements) 3203 (ii).

Imports and Exports for Home Consumption, Total Amount : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 380 (i).

Imports from United Kingdom, Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 267 (i).

Imports under Preferential Tariff, Amounts paid, Value, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 152 (i).

Inspectors of Customs, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 405 (i).

Martin, Eli, Emplymt. in Customs Dept. : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7097 (iv).

Montreal Customs, Dep. Collector, Appnmt. of : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 256 (i).

Montreal Free Port, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 7317 (iv).

Morrison, Hector D., Customs Officer at Pinette, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2330 (ii).

——— Officers' Uniforms : in Com. of Sup., 413 (i).

——— Ports, Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 256, 405 (i).

Preferential Tariff, Value of Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 152 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

Remission of Customs Duties on Army and Navy Articles : Explanation (Mr. Paterson) in Com. of Sup., 6724, 6812 (iv).

Revenue collected in N.W. Ters., Customs and Inland Rev.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 600 (i).

Revenue Cruisers for Customs : in Com. of Sup., 409 (i).

Rouse, Mr. David, Appnmt. as Customs Collector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 452 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie Bonded Warehouse *re* Soft Coal, Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5688 (iii).

Sawlogs, Export Duty, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Sup., 752 (i).

Thompson, Capt. Thos., Preventive Officer at Port Bruce, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 1763 (i).

Tobacco and Cigars imported from U.S., Duties paid, &c.: (Mr. Clements) 5687 (iii).

U.S. Tariff Drawbacks on Raw Materials, &c.: M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 746 (i).

Vegetables, Canned, Preserved, &c., Value of Imports: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Monk) 279 (i).

Yukon Customs, Living Allowance : in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).

Dairying, Live Stock, and Fruit Industries : in Com. of Sup., 6932 (iv).

Dairy Products, Classification for Export, &c: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 7810 (iv).

Damen, Wm. A., Patent Relief B. No. 129 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 3834 (iii) ; 2°*, 4700 (iii) ; ref. back to Sel. Com., 6379 ; in Com., and 3*°, 7624 (iv) ; M. *re* Amts., 8383 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 84.)

Dams across River, Govt. Policy *re* : Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 6839 (iv).

David Thomas Owens Patent Relief B. No. 177 (Mr. Stewart) 1°*, 7642 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com., 8652 ; 3°*, 9049. (5 Edward VII, c., 143.)

Davie. Geo. T., Co., Wrecking Plant *re* Ship Channel : Remarks (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. of Sup., 2479 (ii).

See 'Trade and Commerce,' &c.

Debates, Official, Sel. Com. : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 111 (i).

——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Name, 3090 (ii).

——— 1st. Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 493 (i).

——— M. to conc. (Mr. Gervais) 683 (i).

——— 2nd Rep. of Com.: (presented) 4457.

——— M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 4550 (iii).

——— 3rd Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 4549 (iii).

——— M. to conc. (Mr. Gervais) 4551 (iii).

Debates Committee, 4th Rep. of Com. : Presented (Mr. Gervais) 4983 (iii).

——— M. to conc., 5034 (iii).

——— 5th Rep.: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 7096 (iv).

——— 6th Rep.: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 9392 (v).

——— 7th Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 9773 (v).

——— M. (Mr. Ethier) to conc., 9801 (v).

Debates, Delay in French Edition : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 239 (i).

Debates, Official : in Com. of Sup., 239 (i), 6592 (iv).

Deep Water Ways Commission: in Com. of Sup., 6894 (iv).

See 'International Water,' &c.

'De Levis,' Str., for Hydrographic Survey, Total Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 914 (i).

Demers, Mr. L. J., Late M.P., Decease of : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5139 (iii).

Dental Institute Circulars : *See* 'Franking Privilege.'

Depot Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7552 (iv).

Descente des Femmes, Tel. Lines : in Com. of Sup. 9604 (v).

——— Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7307 (iv).

Desjardins Wharf, Allumette Island : in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).

Desks in House of Commons, Improvement in : Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) in Com. of Sup., 1566 (i).

See 'House of Commons,' &c.

Detective Service P. O. Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 209 (i).

Devil's Island Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv), 9551 (v).

Digby Pier Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).

Dipper Harbour Breakwater, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7498 (iv), 9588 (v).

——— Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 912 (i).

Director of Operations *re* Militia Council : Remarks (Mr Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 418 (i).

See 'Militia,' &c.

Disallowance of B. C. Legislation : Ques. (Mr. Smith, B.C.) 189 (i).

Discrimination in Freight Rates *re* Atlantic Steamers : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 888 (i).

See 'Trade and Commerce.'

Dismissals from Public Office : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).

Disraeli Wharf, Que. : in Com. of Sup., 9593 (v).

——— Expenditure *re* : Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 1729 (i).

Divorce Bill : Personal Explanation (Mr. Bergeron) *re* Vote, 6405, 6571 (iv).

See 'Fitz-Simmons, Jean Marie,' 'Harper Geo. Dance,' 'Hersey, Arthur Howe,' 'McDermot, Clara Bidwell,' 'Murphy, E. A.,' 'Pearson,' 'Pitblado, Isaac,' Pryor, J. A.,' 'Vibert, Philip.'

Dobie, W. J. B., Dismissal as Postmaster at Thessalon : M. for Com. (Mr. Boyce) 3202 (ii).

See 'Thessalon Postmaster.'

Dodd, Judge, N.S., Salary : in Com. of Sup., 124 (i).

Dog-Fish Experimental Works, Construction of: in Com. of Sup., 9173 (v).

Dominion Annuity Co.'s incorp. B. No. 82 (Mr. Bole) 1°*, 1745 ; 2°*, 1891 (i) ; in Com., 2767; 3° m., 2768 ; 3°*, 2950 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 55.)

Dominion Arsenal : in Com. of Sup., 9170 (v).

——— Ammunition, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7012 (iv).

——— Col. Gaudet's Salary : in Com. of Sup., 6513 (iv).

——— Establishment of : in Com. of Sup., 445 (i).

Dominion Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. No. 106 (Mr. Black) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., 4971, 5113 ; 3°*, 5113 (iii) ; Sen. Amts., 7625 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 85.)

Dom. Buildings, Engineers, Firemen, Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6822 (iv).

——— Fuel, &c : in Com. of Sup., 6822 (iv).

——— Furniture, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6817 (iv).

——— Heating, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1670 (i).

——— Rentals, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1663 (i), 6818 (iv).

——— Que., Renewals, Repairs, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1107 (i).

See 'Pub. Works,' &c.

Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. No. 159 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 6103-4 (iv); 2°*, and in Com., 8769 ; 3°*, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 8.)

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 9 (Mr. Guthrie) 1° m., 263 (i).

——— B. No. 189 (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1° m., 8775 (v).

——— B. No. 194 (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1° m., 9073 (v).

Dom. Election Law, Amt. Bills : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9812 (v).

Dom. Lands, Homestead Inspectors' Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6407 (iv).

——— Inspectors' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).

——— Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9251, 9289 (v).

Dom. Lands, in N.W.T., Open to Applicants for Sale, &c. : Ques (Mr. Lake) 1935 (i).

Dom. Lands, N.W.T. Sales, &c. : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2006 (ii).
——— Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 8671 (v).
——— Surveys, Maps, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6406, 6424 (iv).
See 'Interior,' &c.
Dom. Lighthouse Depot, Kingston, Establishment of : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 914.
——— Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 915 (i).
Dom. Notes, Printing in English and French : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 6826 (iv).
Dom. Police, Commissioner's Report : Presented (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 54 (i).
Dom. Police, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 138 (i).
Dom. and Provincial Accounts : in Com. of Sup., 6959, 7241 (iv).
Dom. and Provincial Legislation, Compilation of Reps., &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9685 (v).
Dom. Steamers, Maintenance, Purchase of Supplies, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6464 (iv).
Dom. Traffic Bridges, Generally : in Com. of Sup., 7592 (iv).
Doncaster Indian Reserve, Abolition of : Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 7812 (iv).
Dorchester Co., Returning Officers, Appnmt. of, Cor., &c. : M. (Mr. Morin) for Copies*, 916 (i).
Dorchester Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 480 (i).
Double Tracking I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1933 (i), 2027 (ii), 9390 (v).
Doucet's Landing Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6849, 7298 (iv).
Doughty, Mr. A. G., Dom. Archivist, Salary : in Com. of Sup., 9053 (v).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
Douglastown Isolated Block : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Doukhobors Homestead Entries *re* Village Lots: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6414 (iv).
Doutre, Mr., Dismissal as Postmaster from Beauharnois : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 142 (i), 6247 (iv).
Dredging Contracts, Govt. Policy *re* : Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 1419 (i).
Dredging Contract, Conmee & Bowman : *See* 'Port Arthur.'
Dredges employed at Port Arthur, Expenditure, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 790 (i).
Dredges, Govt., Built at Toronto : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 2456 (ii).
Dredging Plant, &c., Imported into Canada, Valuation, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5425 (iii).
——— Remarks *re* Answer to Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5591 (iii).
Dredging, B.C., New Plant : in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).
——— Generally : in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv), 9604 (v).
Dredging, Man., New Plant : in Com. of Sup., 7577 (iv).
Dredging in Mar. Provinces, Number of Vessels, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6890, 7578 (iv).
Dredging, Ont. and Que., New Plant : in Com. of Sup., 7577 (iv).
——— Working Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).
Dredging, P.E.I., New Plant : in Com. of Sup., 6891, 7576 (iv).
Dredging, System of Hiring Dredges : Remarks (Mr. Barr) in Com. of Sup., 6842 iv).
Dredges used in Govt. Works, Expenditure *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 795 (i).
Dredging Vessels, Dom., Repairs, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6890, 7576 (iv).
See 'Pub. Works.'
Dress Regulation for Military Officers : in Com. of Sup., 438 (i).
D. R. Fraser and Company, Limited, Co.'s incorp. B. No. 119 (Mr. Oliver) 1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 2773 (ii), in Com., and 3°*, 7625 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 87.)
Drill Hall, Fredericton, Tenders *re* Construction : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 729 (i).
'Druid' Str., Expenditure *re* Maintenance : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 2703 (ii).
Drummond County Ry., Expenditure on Capital Account, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2334 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 1941 (i).
Drummondville Improvements *re* I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1960 (i).
See 'I.C.R.' &c.
Dukis Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3202 (ii).
Dumping Clause. Amts. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. on Customs Bill, 9767 (v).
——— Customs Instructions *re*, &c. : M. for Copies (Mr. Kemp) 695 (i).
——— Ref. to in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Paterson) 81 (i).
Dundas, Ry. Mail Clerk, Reinstatement : in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).
Dundonald, Earl of, Cor., O.C.'s, &c., *re* Dismissal : M. for Copies* (Mr. Belcourt) 3205 (ii).
Dundonald Park and Ottawa Improvement Commission : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. on B. 180, 8686 (v).
Durham Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7498 (iv).
Earnings per Train Mile, I.C.R., Stmnt. : Read in Com. of Sup., 9503 (v).
Easter Adjournment : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4750 (iii)
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4375 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4458 (iii).

Eastern Channel, St. Maurice River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7326 (iv).
East Templeton Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7300 (iv).
Echo Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9598 (v).
Economy Pile Wharf Extension : in Com. of Sup., 9579 (v).
Educational Clauses : *See* 'Autonomy Bill.'
Edmonton, Dom. Lands Office : in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
Edmonton Election, and Toronto Election, Tests *re* Feeling of Country : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com., 5886 (iii).
——— date of nomination of Min. of Int.: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com., 5890 (iii).
——— Certificate of Election ; Notification (Mr. Speaker) 5131 (iii).
——— Printing of Voters Lists, Refusal to Conservatives, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. on B. 69, 5852 ; Names of Voters (read) 5855 (iii).
——— Vacancy : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 4200 (iii).
Edmonton Jail : in Com. of Sup., 481, 1638 (i).
——— Extension of Building : in Com. of Sup. 9684 (v).
Edmonton Public Building : in Com. of Sup. 9550 (v).
Edmonton and Qu'Appelle Tel. Lines : in Com of Sup., 7633 (iv).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 62 (Mr. Lamont) 1°*, 1241 ; 2°*, 1339 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII, c., 88.)
Eel Cove Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Effront : *See* 'Jean.'
Election General, 10th Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8001 (v).
See 'Dom. Election Bills,' &c.
Electoral Atlas, Distribution to Members : Remarks (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup., 6897 (iv).
——— New Edition : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).
Electoral Lists in N.W.T., Names of Qualified Electors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7422 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 7684 (iv).
Electric Lighting, Geological Museum, Contract *re* : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 760 (i).
Electric Light Inspectors : in Com. of Sup., 1696 (i).
Elevator at Port Colborne : in Com. of Sup., 1263, 1266, 1288 (i).
Elevators in Ottawa Buildings, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 6816 (iv).
See 'Pub. Works,' &c.
Embargo on Canadian Cattle : *See* 'Canadian Cattle.'
'Emigration of State Children,' Cor. with Mr. C. Kinloch Cooke : Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 5478 (iii).
See 'Immigration,' &c.
Employees, I.C.R., Messrs. Weldon, McDougall, &c., Political Partisans : Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 1146 (i).
——— Pensions, Legislation *re* : Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) 9029, 9288 (v).
Engine House, Rivière du Loup : in Com. of Sup., 9389 (v).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Engineers, Draughtsmen, &c., Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 9382 (v).
——— Public Works : in Com. of Sup., 6895 (iv).
——— Railway Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 1521 (i).
English River, Removal of Obstructions : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
Entennier, Mr. Henry, Entries for Homestead Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 190 (i).
Escoumain Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7303 (iv).
Esquimalt and Halifax Garrisons, Situation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9128 (v).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s B. No. 90 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2297 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII, c., 90.)
Esquimalt Defences : in Com. of Sup., 9170 (v).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Abandonment by Imp. Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 188 (i).
See 'Halifax,' 'Militia,' &c.
Estimates, Delay in Suppl., Criticism *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 9085 (v).
Estimates, (1905-6) : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 58 (i).
——— (1905) Suppl.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6165 (iv).
——— (1906) Suppl.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 8718, 9392 (v).
Exchequer Court (railway debts.) Act Amt. B. No. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) 1° m., 986 ; 2°*, 1399; in Com., 1400 (i), 2105, 3205 (ii).
Exchequer Court, Admiralty Jurisdiction, Number of Actions, &c.: M. (Mr. A. H. Clark) for Ret.*, 1770 (i).
Exchequer Court Judgeship in Ont., Appnmt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5209 (iii).
Exchequer Court Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 125 (i).
Excise, Additional Remuneration for Extra Works : in Com. of Sup., 1688 (i).
——— Allowance to Customs Collectors : in Com. of Sup., 1689 (i).
——— Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 6724 (iv).
——— Inspectors' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 1679 (i).
——— Inspectors, Travelling Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 1689 (i).
——— Officers, B.C., Provisional Allowance : in Com. of Sup., 1690 (i).

Exhibitions, (Dom.) at New Wesminster, B.C., Grant : in Com. of Sup., 9339, 9608 (v).
——— Generally : in Com. of Sup., 6269 (iv).
——— Liege, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1832 (i).
Expenditure *re* Capital, I.C.R., &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1940 (i).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Experimental Farms : in Com. of Sup., 6165 (iv), 9608 (v).
——— Distribution of Reps.: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iv).
——— Establishment of in Alberta : Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) in Com. of Sup., 6170 (iv).
Experimental Station in Niagara District, Cor., &c.: Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 7677 (iv).
Exports and Imports, Returns, Issue of Monthly Rep., and Indexing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 7214 (iv).
See 'Customs,' &c.
Express Cos.: *See* 'Ry. Bill 36.'
Extradiction Cases by U.S., before Commissioners at Montreal : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3937 (ii).
Facer Solid Steel Car Wheel Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 27 (Mr. Caldwell) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., 1285, 1339 ; 3°*, 1340 (i). (5 Edward VII, c., 91.)
Facilities, I.C.R., Increased : in Com. of Sup., 9482 (v).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Fairford River Bed Outlet : in Com. of Sup., 7569 (iv).
Farmers' Bank of Canada B. No. 124 (Mr. T. Martin) 1°*, 2681 ; 2°*, 3136 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4700 (iii) ; Sen. Amts., 6609 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 92.)
Farmington and Wilmot Mail Contractor, Guarantee, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 2330 (ii).
Farran's Point Gas Plant : in Com. of Sup., 6308 (iv).
Fencing Wire, Inspection by Govt., &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 585 (i).
See 'N.W.T., Boundary,' &c.
Fenian Raid Pensions : in Com. of Sup., 6956 ; conc., 6961 (iv).
Fernie, B.C., Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1641 (i).
Fertilizers, Inspection of : Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 1726 (i).
Fessenden Wireless Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. No. 144 (Mr. Telford) 1°*, 4644 ; 2°*, 4978 (iii) ; in Com., 6380, 6607 ; 3°*, 6609 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 93.)

FINANCE :
American Currency, Circulated in Canada, Prevention *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 3010 (ii).
See 'Foreign,' 'Silver.'

FINANCE—*Con.*
Assistant Receiver General's Office : in Com. of Sup., 9052 (v).
Audit Act and Treasury Board, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1935 (i).
See 'Auditor General,' &c.
Banking Act Amts., Legislation *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6112 (iv).
Bank Notes, Supervision *re* Printing and Circulation, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6251 (iv).
See 'Dom. Notes.'
Binder Twine Bounties, &c. : Statement read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. of Sup., 7221 (iv).
Canadian Bank of Commerce-Yukon, Compensation *re* : in Com. of Sup., 9615 (v).
Charges of Management : in Com. of Sup., 69 (i), 6249 (iv), 8691, 9052 (v).
Dom. and Provincial Accounts : in Com. of Sup., 6959, 7241 (iv).
Dom. Notes, Printing in English and French : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 6826 (iv).
Estimates, (1905-6) : Presented Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 58 (i).
——— (1905) Suppl. : Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6165 (iv).
——— (1906) Suppl. : Presented (Mr. Fielding) 8718, 9392 (v).
Finance Dept., Private Sec. Allowance : in Com. of Sup., 6268 (iv).
——— Deptl. Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 78, 118 (i). 9060 (v).
Foreign Coin Circulation, Prevention *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 8776 (v).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Payments *re* : in Com. of Sup., 7216 (iv).
Lead Bounties, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 7222 (iv).
Life Insurance Companies Funds, Total Amount, Par Value, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 3204 (ii).
Loans by Govt., Temporary or Permanent, Total Amount, Rate of Interest, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 4921 (iii).
Manitoba School Fund, Amt. paid to Man. Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Bole) 379 (i).
Mint, Royal, Establishment of in Can., Cor. with Imp. Govt. : M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies*, 916 (i).
——— inquiry for cor. (Mr. Monk) 2595 (ii), 7424 (iv), 8387 (v).
——— Estimated Cost of Equipment, Capacity, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2185 , 2326 (ii).
See 'Pub. Works—Ottawa,' &c.
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness, Collections, &c. : M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 402 (i).
Ontario Subsidies, Letter from G. W. Ross to Fin. Min. : Read (Mr. Henderson) 6092 (iv).

FINANCE—*Con.*

Penny Banks, Charters, Stmnt. *re* Business, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 687 (i).

Petroleum Bounties, Payments, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).

P.E.I. Subsidy, Additional Grant, Cor., &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 3205 (ii).

See 'Marine,' &c.

Provincial Subsidies, Readjustment *re* Memoranda, &c. : M. for Copies (Mr. Carvell) 2100 (ii).

Receiver General's Office : in Com. of Sup., 6249 (iv).

Silver Coins, Worn, &c., Redemption of: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 688 (i).

Yarmouth Bank of N.S., Investigation, Punishment of Offenders : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9690 (v).

First Minister (Increase of Salary) B. No. 201 (Mr. Fielding) Res. prop., 9700 ; in Com., on Res., 9725 ; 1°* of B., 9726 ; 2°*, 9790; in Com., 9790 ; 3° m., 9790 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 12.)

Fiscal Year, Change in Ending of, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 9096 (v).

Fisher, Mr. P. G., Retirement, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lake) 264 (i).

FISHERIES :

American Fishermen on N. S. Coasts, Protection *re* by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 7907 (iv).

Atlantic Fisheries Investigation, Rep. *re* : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 270 (i).

Bait Freezers, Deep Sea Fisheries : in Com. of Sup., 9620 (v).

——— Establishment in Canso, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1146 (i).

——— Mar. Canada, Number, Location, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Martin) 2067 (ii).

British American Fish Co., Contract *re* Fishing Rights in Western Lakes : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).

B. C. Canning Industries : *See* 'Salmon Canning.'

Canso Herring Industry, &c. : Ques (Mr. Lefurgey) 1146 (i).

Carillon Canal Fishway, Construction, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2064 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 2910 (ii).

Cowie, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. *re* Herring Experiments : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5425 (iii).

Dog-fish Experimental Works, Construction of : in Com. of Sup., 9173 (v).

Fish-breeding Establishments, Maintenance, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6635 (iv).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

Fishing Bounty Distribution, Expenditure *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6636 (iv).

——— Fraud *re* Payment, Rep. of Mr. Matheson : M. (Mr. Ganong) for Copy*, 1770 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2911 (ii).

Fish-Curing Establishments : in Com. of Sup., 9173 (v).

Fish exported into New York State, Prohibition of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. L. P. Demers) on M. for Sup., 6177 (iv).

Fish Hatcheries, Distribution of : in Com. of Sup., 2904 (ii).

Fish Hatcheries in Lake Winnipeg: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 6635 (iv).

Fishing Regulations, Conflict between Dom. and Provinces, &c. Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 4751 (iii).

Fishing Rights in Estuaries, Jurisdiction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1346 (i).

Fisheries Industry, Commission of Investigation, Recommendation, &c.: M. (Mr. Ganong) to adjn., 6312 (iv).

——— Expenses *re* : in Com. of Sup., 9172 (v).

See 'Herring,' &c.

Fishermen Immigrants from England and Scotland for Cod Fisheries, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 586 (i).

Fish Transportation from Boston to Montreal via G. T. Ry., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 1930 (i).

Georgian Bay and Lake Huron Fisheries, Requests for Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5479 (iii).

Halibut Fisheries, B.C., American Encroachments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 585 (i).

Halifax Fishery Award, Amount received by Can. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Piché) 8886 (v).

Halifax Fishery Award and Claims of P.E.I., Memorials, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. A. McLean) for Copies, 1386 (i).

——— Distribution *re* Provinces, Basis *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1593 (i).

——— Payment to Provs., Ref. *re* : Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2065 (ii).

Hatcheries, N.B., Salmon Pond, N.B., Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 590 (i).

Herring and Fishing Industry, Rep. of Commission, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4552 (iii).

Herring Industry and Bait Freezers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1146 (i).

Herring Industry, Experiments at Canso, N.S., Emplymt. of Mr. Cowie : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5425 (iii).

Hurley, J.M., Inspector, Rep., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 2895 (ii).

Inspection, N.S., Violation of Regulations, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9687 (v).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

Inspectors' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 2878, 2890 (ii), 6630 (iv).

James Bay Lobsters, Investigation *re* by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6475 (iv).

Lake Manitoba, Closing *re* Fishing, Protests, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2901 (ii), 6630 (iv).

Lake Winnipeg Fish Hatcheries : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2905 (ii).

Lobster Canneries, Licenses, Applications, &c., N.B. District No. 1 : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 584 (i).

——— Number issued by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 910 (i).

Lobster and Herring Industry, Rep. of Commissioners : Ques. (Mr. McLennan) 4371 (iii).
See 'Fisheries Industry,' &c.

Lobster Fishing, Open Season in 1903-4-5 : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 1504 (i).

Lobster Fisheries, Res. of Board of Trade, Moncton : Read (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 2909 (ii).

Lobsters, Legal Length in Bay of Fundy, Changes *re* : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 583 (i).

Manitoba Lake Fishing, Closing of, Cor., Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Crawford) 9698 (v).

Markey, F. H., Lease to *re* Fishing Rights in N. Western Lakes : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).

Moose Lake Fishing Licenses, Grants to by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).

Nelson River, &c., Fishing Rights : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).

Overseers, Complaints against : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6632 (iv).

Overseers in Colchester Co., N.S., Number and Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Laurence) 5978 (iv).

Oyster Culture, Protection *re* : in Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).

Pound Net Licenses issued by Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 2892 (ii).

——— Little Current, Cor. between A. E. Dyment and Govt. *re* : M. for Copies* (Mr. Crocket) 1399 (i).

P. E. I. Fisheries, Supervision, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1762 (i).

Protection Service : in Com. of Sup., 2907 (ii), 6630 (iv).

Protection Service, Strs., Monthly Pay-roll, &c., Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1350 (i).

Protection Steamers, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 1347 (i).
See 'Marine,' &c.

Salmon Canning Fisheries, B.C., Suspension, &c., Representations *re* : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 269 (i).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

Salmon Hatcheries and Provincial Fishing Licenses : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2905 (ii).

Fitz-Simons, Jean Marie, Relief B. No. 130 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 4081 ; 2°*, 4414 (iii) ; in Com., 6377 ; 3° m.. 6378 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 94.)

Fog Horns, Toronto Harbour, Testing, &c., Complaints *re* : Cor., &c., Read (Mr. Kemp) 9281 (v).
See 'Marine,' &c.

Fog Signals, Submarine : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 891 (i).

Foote, J., Gratuity to : in Com. of Sup., 6434 (iv).

Foreign Coin Circulation, Prevention *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 8776 (v).
See 'Finance,' &c.

Forest Protection in Man.: in Com. of Sup., 9298 (v).

Fort Lawrence Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 6838 (iv).

——— Name of Contractor, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5034 (iii).

Fort Macleod Court House, Inspection *re* : Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 1644 (i).

Fort William and Port Arthur Harbours, Number of Tenders, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 6729 (iv).

Fort William and Port Arthur Open Navigation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6645 (iv).

Fort William Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 784 (i), 6900 (iv).
See 'Pt. Arthur,' &c.

Ft. William, G. T. P. Ry. Station Plans, filed in Ry. Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 2009 (ii).
See 'G. T. P. Ry.', &c.

Franchise Act (1898) Amt. B. No. 52 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 818 (i) ; 2°*, 2112 ; in Com., 2112 (ii), 9198 ; 3°* 9199 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 13.)

Franking Privilege Abuse *re* Circulars of Dental Institute : Remarks (Mr. Ames) 1807 (i).

——— Circular issued by Jacques Cartier Club, &c. : Remarks (Mr. O. E. Talbot) on M. for Ways and Means, 9798 (v).

——— Regulations after Prorogation : Remarks (Mr. Clements) 9395 (v).

——— Use of Stamp *re* Documents : Remarks (Mr. Barr) 5134, 5963 (iii).
See 'Campaign,' &c.

Frank, Relief to Settlers *re* Land Slide : Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 9603 (v).

Frechette, L. A., Translation *re* Excise Branch: in Com. of Sup., 1690 (i).

Fraser River Ship Channel Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7574 (iv).

Fraserville Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7323 (iv).
Fredericton, Military Buildings, Tender *re* Construction : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 728 (i).
——— Post Office, Equipment, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 170 (i).
——— Station Agent, Dismissal of Mr. O. White : M. for Cor. (Mr. Crocket) 192 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 107 (i).
——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Crocket) 698 (i).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Free Mail Delivery, Total Cost, &c. : Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 729 (i).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Freeport Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Freetown Agent's Dwelling House, P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 2180 (ii).
Free Transportation of Hay, &c., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 59 (i).
See 'Hay', 'Passes,' &c.
Freight Diversion I.C.R. and Traffic Arrangements : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2219 (ii).
——— Letter from C. W. Stewart : Read (Mr. Daniel) 2227 (ii).
Freight Rates, Advancement of Rebate : Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 1545 (i).
——— Discrimination, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 890 (i).
——— Increases of, &c.: Statement (Mr. Emmerson) in Reply to Mr. Taylor, 6112 (iv) ; Cor. read, 6115 (iv).
——— Ref. to Gananoque and Fredericton : Reply (Mr. Taylor) to Min. of Rys., 6585 (iv).
See 'Agriculture-Holstein,' 'Trade and Commerce,' &c.
Frude's Point Wharf Enlargement, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).
Fruit Growers Association, P.E.I., Res. *re* Maintenance of Industry : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 381 (i).
Fruit Inspectors, Number, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 588 (i).
Fruit Marks Act, Convictions under : Ques. (Mr. Gunn) 3010 (ii).
Fruit Marks Act, Inspectors appointed, Names, Salaries, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 736 (i).
Fuel Inspector, I.C.R., Duties, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 451 (i).
Fumigating Stations : in Com. of Sup., 1831 (i).
Furness, Withy & Co., Contract *re* S. African Trade : in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).
See 'Trade and Commerce.'
Gabarus Harbour Improvements : in Com of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Galena Oil Co., Oil purchased for I.C.R. : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).
Galician Vote *re* Edmonton Election : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 4201 (iii).
Galops Canal, Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 1220 (i).
——— Channel Completion : in Com. of Sup., 1230 (i).
——— Removing Shoals : in Com. of Sup., 9354 (v).
——— Repairs *re* Leakage : in Com. of Sup., 1492 (i).
Gamebridge Masonry Inspector, Dismissal, Imperfect Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5600 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 8004 (v).
See 'Canals,' &c.
Gananoque Armoury : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1656 (i).
Gas and Electric Light Inspection at Three Rivers, Total Cost, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1760 (i).
Gas and Electric Light Inspection, Rep. *re* : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1692 (i).
Gas Plant, Parry Sound, Purchase of Property : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2725 (ii).
See 'Acetylene,' &c.
Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 934 (i).
Gatineau Point Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7303 (iv).
Gatineau River Slides and Booms : in Com. of Sup., 7630 (iv).
Gaynor-Greene Extradition, Charges against Mr. Lafontaine, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3937 (ii).
General Statistics : in Com. of Sup., 6274 (iv).
Geographical Board of Canada, Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 625 (i).
Geological Museum, Ottawa : in Com. of Sup., 754 (i).
Geological Survey, Appnmts. and Absences, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 382 (i).
——— Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 122(i). 6248 (iv).
——— Director, Name, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9303 (v).
——— Explorations, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8669, 9685 (v).
——— Maps, Printing and Distribution, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8670 (v).
——— Mr. F. Nicolas' Salary : in Com. of Sup., 9249 (v).
Georgetown, Increased Accommodation, P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 2179 (ii).
Georgeville Wharf Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal Surveys, Engineers, Reps., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brabazon) 192 (i).
——— Instructions *re*, Inquiry for Copies (Mr. White) 822 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 7637 (iv).
——— Survey via French River, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9547 (iv).
Georgian Bay Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6886 (iv).
Georgian Bay Indian Surveys : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 236 (i).
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale, Jurisdiction, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. Wright) 6477 (iv).
——— Sale to Mr. F. W. Grant : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6479 (iv).
——— Sale of : Personal Explanation (Mr. Grant) 6736 (iv).
Georgian Bay and Lake Huron Fisheries, Requests for Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5479 (iii).
Georgian Bay and Seaboard Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 35 (Mr. Grant) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1288 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 95.)
Gillies Brothers Limited B. No. 95 (Mr. A. A. Wright) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 2763 ; 3°*, 2765 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 96.)
Gillis, N. J., Emplymt. by Govt. at St. Louis Exhibition : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3361 (ii).
Gimli Wharf, Lake Winnipeg : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9577 (v).
——— Public Building, Purchase of Site : Ques. (Mr. Blain) 9697 (v).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1034 (i).
Glanders, Spread among Horses, Prevention of by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6690 (iv).
Glenn Ross P.O., Abolition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1149 (i).
Godbout, Mr. J., Lighthouse-keeper, Political Partisanship *re* Dom. Elections : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1343 (i).
Goderich Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7553 (iv).
Goderich Mail Contract, Tender *re* : Ques. (Mr. Gunn) 2493 (ii).
Gold Medal Furniture Manufacturing Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 102 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com., 3399 ; 3°*, 3400 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 97.)
Gold of the Yukon purchased by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Thompson) in Com. of Sup., 6264 (iv).
Goodwin Car Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 17 (Mr. Bickerdike) 1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 415 (i).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3361 (ii).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Wednesdays and Thursdays: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 820 (i).
See 'Business.'
Government Legislation : Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 820 (i).
Govt.Railways Act Amt. B. No. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) 1° m., 4186 (iii) ; 2°*, and in Com., 6139, 7583 ; 3° m., 7584 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 36.)
Government Railways, Disposal of Old Rails, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2066 (ii).
See 'I. C. R.', 'Old Rails,' &c.
Govt. Steamers, Expenditure *re* Repairs : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1349 (i).
——— Maintenance, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2595 (ii).
——— statement of expenditure : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2597 (ii).
——— Purchase of Supplies : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2617 (ii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Govt. Works Contract B. No. 51 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 818 ; 2°*, 1672 ; in Com., 1672 ; 3°*, 1806 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 7.)
Gov. Gen.'s Instructions, Changes in : Remarks (Mr. Maclean, York) 227 (i).
Gov. Gen. Secretary's Office, Clerical Assistance: in Com. of Sup., 6248 (iv).
——— Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 70 (i), 9053 (v).
Grades and Curves, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1987 (i).
Graeme Hunter, Charges *re* Immigration Society : Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2188 (ii).
See 'Immigration.'
Grain carried and exported through Govt. Elevators, Arrangements *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 1917 (i).
See 'I.C.R.'
Grain Inspection Act (commercial grades) Amt. B. No. 174 (Mr. Fisher) 1°*, 7420 (iv) ; 2°*, 9395 ; in Com., 9395 ; 3°*, 9408 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 14.)
Grain Inspection : in Com. of Sup., 6901 (iv).
Grain Inspectors, List of, &c.: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. of Sup., 7224 (iv).
Grain Standards *re* Inspection : Stmnt. (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup., 9681 (v).
Grain Survey Boards, Appnmt. for Montreal and Toronto : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 910 (i).
——— Pets., Memorials, &c., *re* : M. (Mr. Ames) for Copies, 1763 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 7230 (iv).
Grain Warehouses, Montreal, Preparation of Plans : Ques. (Mr. Piché) 1345 (i).
Grand Bend Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7553 (iv).
Grand Bend Pier, Delay in Building, &c.: (Mr. Armstrong) 1344 (i).
Grand Manan and Mainland : SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 922 (i).

Grand Manan, N.B., Life-saving Crew, Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 4921 (iii).
Grand Mechins Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7303 (iv).
Grand Piles Dam, St. Maurice River : in Com. of Sup., 7326 (iv).
Grand River and Western Power Co.'s incorp. B. No. 122 (Mr. Zimmerman) 1°*, 2681 ; 2°*, 3136 (ii).
Grand River, Ont., Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6873 (iv).
Grande Rivière de Beaupré Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 3400 (ii) ; on Order for Com., 7621, 7622 ; in Com., 7622, 7625 ; 3° m., 7853 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 98.)
G. T. P. Ry., Agreement with National Transcontinental Ry. Act: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 2776 (ii).
——— Commissioners, Appnmts., Total Amount expended : M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret.*, 916 (i).
——— Commission, Appnmt. of Hon. S. N. Parent : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 699 (i).
——— Commission, Staff and Salaries : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 688 (i).
——— Commission, Surveys, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2277 (ii).
——— Commission, Surveys, &c., Number of Employees : M. (Mr. Gervais) for Ret.*, 1770 (i).
——— Contracts, Awarding of, &c.: Answer to Question (Mr. Emmerson) 9782 (v).
——— Construction, Location from Winnipeg, &c., Rumours *re* : Remarks (Mr. Lamont) 9814 (v).
See 'Route.'
——— Contracts, Winnipeg Terminals : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9541, 9812 (v).
——— Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9498 (v).
——— Estimates : Remarks (Mr. Foster) *re* Discussion, 2182 (ii).
——— Interim Rep.: Presented (Mr. Emmerson) 6310 (iv).
——— Plans *re* Terminal Points, deposited with Ry. Dept.: M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 917 (i), 2816 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1150 (i).
——— Plans of Terminal at Port Arthur, Approval of Location : Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 6138 (iv).
——— Questions answered by Ministers : Remarks (Mr. Monk) 1595 (i).
——— Route proposed, West of Winnipeg, Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 729 (i).
See 'Construction.'
——— Surveys and Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 2282, 2298 (i)), 7498 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Surveys in B.C., Information *re* : Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 3009 (ii).
——— Surveys, Information given out by Mr. Hays in Address: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2007 (ii).
——— Surveys, Number and Names of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gervais) 686 (i).
——— Surveys, O.C. *re* Commission : Remarks (Mr. Maclean, York) 229 (i).
——— Surveys, Plans, Field Notes, &c., Repayment for, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9490 (v).
——— Surveys, Quebec and Moncton Route, Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 228 (i).
——— Survey of Route, Moncton to Winnipeg, Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6134 (iv).
——— Surveys through Madawaska, N.B., Suggested Route : Ques. (Mr. Costigan) 5688 (iii).
——— Terminals, Right of Way, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9498 (v).
——— Canadian Northern, Joint Terminals : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 9499 (v).
——— Terminals at Winnipeg, Cor. *re* : Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 9541, 9812 (v).
G.T.Ry., Appeal in *re*, 4 Edward VII., c. 31 : Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 9080 (v).
G.T.Ry. Arbitration Act Amt. B. No. 199 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 9279 ; 2°*, 9280 ; in Com. 9529 ; 3°*, 9529 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 15.)
G.T.R. and I.C.R. Arbitration, Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 68, 165 (i).
——— Arbitration *re* Traffic Arrangements, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1929 (i).
See 'I.C.R.'
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. No. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) 1° m., 727 ; 2°*, 909 (i) ; on Order for Com., 2765 ; in Com., 3649, 3879 (ii) ; 4123, 4202 ; 3° m., 4228 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 75.)
Grand Trunk Ry. B. No. 45, Statement *re* Amalgamation with C. A. R. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 4222 (iii).
——— Statement *re* Mileage (Mr. Ingram) 4223, 4231 (iii).
——— 3° m., Ques. of Order (Mr. Ingram) 4228 (iii).
Grand View Station, Murray Harbour Branch P.E.I. Ry., Location, &c., Cor. : M. (Mr. Martin) for Copies*, 1770 (i).
Grasshopper Scourge, Claims for Relief to Man. Farmers : Ques. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 909 (i).
Grass Seed Exports, Quantity and Quality : Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 913 (i).
Gratuities to Ry. Employees : in Com. of Sup., 2183 (ii).
See 'Employees,' &c.

Grazing Leases, &c. : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 8529 (v).
See 'Interior.'
G. B. and Canada Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 864 (i).
See 'Trade and Commerce,' 'Atlantic,' &c.
G. B. and Her Colonies, Inter-Imperial Parliament : Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2334 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 2401 ; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2401.
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Ingram) 2402 ; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2402 (ii).
Great Northern Ry. Co. of Canada B. No. 71 (Mr. M. S. Schell) 1°*, 1504 ; 2°*, 1710 (i) ; in Com., 4258 ; 3°* 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 99.)
Great Salmon River Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7498 (iv).
Great West Ry. Co. : *See* 'Northwest Coal,' &c.
Gregory, Col., Retirement of : Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 418 (i).
Greece's Point Wharf, Total Cost, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2063 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 7301 (iv).
Green, Samuel H., Postmaster at Kaslo, B.C., Dismissal, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 2331 (ii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Grenville Canal, Appnmt. of Inspector : Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1509 (i).
——— Guide Piers : in Com. of Sup., 1499 (i).
See 'Canals,' &c.
Grimsby. Establishment of Experimental Farm: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6165 (iv).
Grondine's Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Grosse Isle Hospital Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).
Grosse Isle Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7305 (iv).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1108 (i), 6734 (iv).
——— Steamer : in Com. of Sup., 1838 (i).
——— Telegraph System : in Com. of Sup., 9604 (v).
Guelph and Georgian Bay Ry Co.'s B. No. 100 (Mr. Guthrie) 1°*, 2108 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 101.)
Guelph Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1555 (i).
Haggard, Rider, Rep. to Imp. Govt., &c. : Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 9523 (v).
Haileybury, Lake Temiscaming Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6887, 7556 (iv).
Haldimand Armoury : Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 1656 (i).
Half-Breed Scrip issued to United States Citizens : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6311 (iv).
——— Memo. from Mr. Cote : Read (Mr. Oliver) 6403 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip to non-residents, Cancellation of O.C.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6489, 6560 (iv).
Half-Breeds Patents, Issue of, Claims, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 6907 (iv).
——— Inquiry for : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7020, 7099 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip, Charges *re* Mr. McDonald, Cor., &c. : Read (Mr. Foster) 7647 (iv).
——— Charges, &c. : Personal Explanation (Mr. Bole) 7812 (iv).
——— Charges *re* Mr. Chaffee's Claims : Personal Explanation (Mr. Foster) 7916 (iv).
——— Instructions to Judge Myers *re* Investigation : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7723 (iv).
——— O. C., *re* Judge Myers : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8003 (v).
——— patents issued, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8003 (v).
——— scope of instruction to Judge Myers : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8170 (v).
——— Mr. Chaffey's letter : Read (Mr. Foster) 8183 (v).
——— Investigation, Apppmt. of Counsel : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8528, 8697 (v).
——— Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8777 (v).
——— statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8777 (v).
——— Investigation *re* Progress, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9725 (v).
——— inquiry for papers (Mr. Foster) 7422 (iv), 9028 (v).
——— further papers laid on Table (Mr. Oliver) 9075, 9179 (v).
Half-Breed Scrip, Unsettled Claims in N. W. Ter., Complaints from Old Settlers : Remarks (Mr. Herron) 9813 (v).
——— Application by Norman Oulette and Others, Purchase of, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Staples) 9078 (v).
See 'Immigration,' 'Indians,' 'Interior,' &c.
Half Island Cove Breakwater, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9584 (v).
Halibut Fisheries, B.C., American Encroachments, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 585 (i).
Halifax and Canso SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 937 (i).
Halifax and Esquimalt Defences, Cor., O. C.'s, &c., with Dom. Govt. : M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 2334 (ii).
——— Abandonment of by G. B. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6510 (iv), 9677 (v).
——— Par. in Ottawa 'Journal' *re* Govt. Control : Read (Mr. S. Hughes) 1402 (i).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Halifax and Newfoundland SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 906 (i).
Halifax and W. Indies SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 7087 (iv).

Halifax, Deep Water Dredging *re* I.C.R. Terminals : in Com. of Sup., 2026 (ii).
——— Detention Hospital : in Com. of Sup., 1037 (i).
——— Dom. Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1036 (i).
See 'Public Works,' &c.
——— Fishery Award, Amount received by Can. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Piché) 8886 (v).
——— Claims of P.E.I., Memorials, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. A. McLean) for Copies, 1386 (i).
——— Distribution *re* Provinces, Basis *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1593 (i).
——— Payment to Provs. Ref. *re* : Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2065 (ii).
Halifax Immigrant Building : in Com. of Sup., 1036 (i).
Halifax, I.C.R., Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 2032 (ii), 9391 (v).
Halifax Lightship, Maintenance, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2708 (ii).
Halifax Military Equipment : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6511 (iv).
Halifax, St. John's Nfld. and Liverpool Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 902 (i).
Hamilton and Kilbride Mail Contractor, Distance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 9080 (v).
Hamilton Cove P.O. Mail Service and Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7421 (iv).
Hamilton Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1559 (i).
Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Ry. Co.'s B. No. 112 (Mr. Guthrie) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4700 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 102.)
Hamilton Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iv).
Hamelin and Gosselin, Imprisonment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1849 (i).
Hanault, L. O., Payments *re* Lachine Canal : in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).
'Hansard' Index, Change of : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1570 (i).
See 'Debates,' &c.
Harbours and Boards of Commissioners, Names, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1063 (i).
Harbour Buoys, Maintaining, Placing, &c., Contracts *re* : M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret.*, 917 (i).
Harbour Commissioners, Control by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6725 (iv).
Harbours, Docks and Slides, Working Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges Generally : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
——— B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
——— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 7569 (iv).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1744 (i), 7497 (iv), 9588 (v).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, N.W.T., General Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
——— N.W.T. Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv), 9602 (v).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1727 (i), 6837, 7237, 7395 (iv), 9551 (v).
——— N.S., Govt. Policy *re* Breakwaters, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v).
——— Ont. : in Com. of Sup., 6729, 6869, 7546 (iv), 9595 (v).
——— Ont., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7555 (iv).
——— P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 1734 (i), 9585 (v).
——— Quebec : in Com. of Sup., 770 (i), 2448 (ii), 6436, 6839, 7285 (iv), 9590 (v).
See 'Public Works,' 'Marine,' &c.
Harper, Geo. Dance, Relief B. No. 154 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) 1°*, 5919 (iii) ; 2°*, 5976 ; in Com., 6377 ; 3°*, 6377 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c., 103.)
Harrigan Cove Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
Harrison, Capt., Allowance *re* Services : in Com. of Sup., 6466 (iv).
Harvey, N.B., Customs Collector, Appnmt. of : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 9696 (v).
Haultain, Mr., Letter *re* Autonomy Bill : Remarks (Mr. Borden) on M. for Sup., 2493 2548 (ii).
See 'Autonomy.' &c.
Hawkesbury Public Building : in Com of Sup., 1560 (i).
Hay exported from Quebec to Boston, Number of Tons : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 689 (i).
Hay, Free Transport over I.C.R., Cor. between Govt., &c. : M. for copies (Mr. Foster) 164
——— O.C., Circulars, &c. : M. for copies* (Mr. Foster) 280 (i).
——— Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 919 (i), 2005. 2595, 3450 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 59 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 1929 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 108 (i).
Hay Imports from U.S., Quantity, Duties collected, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1064 (i).
Hay Lake Channel, Lowering of Water : Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 701, 1420 (i).
Herring and Fishing Industry, Rep. of Commission, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4552 (iii).
Herring Industry and Bait Freezers, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1146 (i).
Herring Industry Experiments at Canso, N.S., Emplymt. of Mr. Cowie : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5425 (iii).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.

Hersey, Arthur Howe Relief B. No. 167 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) 1°*, 6232; 2°*, 6868; M. for Com., 7624 ; On Order for Com., 7682 ; M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 7682 (iv).

Hersey, Arthur Relief B. No. 167 : M. (Mr. L. P. Demers) to employ Stenographers, 8527 (v).

Higgin's Shore Pier, P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 1734 (i).

High Commissioner's Office : in Com. of Sup., 120 (i).

High Court Judgeship, Exchequer Court Division, Vacancy *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5209 (iii).

Highland Cadet Corps, Montreal, Letter *re* : Read (Mr. Monk) 7813 (iv).
See 'Militia,' &c.

Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 2038, 2127 (ii).
See 'Murray Harbour,' &c.

Hodgins, Jonathan,, Resignation from Montreal Harbour Commission : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 151 (i).

Hog Cholera in Essex and Kent Cos. : Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 6711 (iv).
See 'Agriculture.'

Holland River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9359 (v).
See 'Trent,' &c.

Holliday Bros., Contract *re* North Shore Navigation : in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).

Holstein Breeders, Complaints *re* Freight on Rys., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6680 (iv).

Homesteads for Residents, N.W.T., Second Applications, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 2067 (ii).

Homesteads Inspectors as Active Politicians : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6407 (iv).
See 'Interior,' &c.

Honora Wharf, Freight Shed : in Com. of Sup., 9597 (v).

——— Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 6887 (iv).

Hope Island Timber Cutting : Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Bennett) 2759 (ii).

Hospital Dues for Sick Mariners Fund, Surplus, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2687 (ii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS :

Ballots, Blank, Printing, Custom *re* Procedure : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 911 (i).

Ballot Box Frauds in Dom. Elections, Demonstration *re* Fraudulent Box : (Mr. Porter) on M. for Sup., 9199 (v).

Ballots, Blank, Method of Issuing, Complaints *re* S. Lanark and Ottawa : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 1342 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

Ballot Boxes, Payment to Mr. Cayouette : Letter read (Mr. Morin) 989 (i).

Bills, Royal Assent : Mess. from Dep. Governor (Mr. Speaker) 6084 (iv).

——— Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 6991 (iv).
See 'Bills.'

Books purchased for Library, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 75 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L., Notification of Election (Mr. Speaker) 583 (i).

——— Introduced, 624 (i).

Carleton Co., Electoral District, Certificate *re* Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 583 (i).

——— Vacancy : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 98 (i).

——— Committee Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 6594 (iv).

Controverted Elections, Lisgar, Judges' Certificate : Presented (Mr. Speaker) 9 (i).

Desks, in House of Commons, Improvement in : Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) in Com. of Sup., 1566 (i).
See 'Locked.'

Doorkeepers Inattention : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6600 (iv).

Dorchester Co., Returning Officers, Appnmt. of, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Morin) for Copies*, 916 (i).

Edmonton Electoral District, Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 5131 (iii).

Electoral Lists in N.W.T., Names of Qualified Electors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7422 (iv).

——— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 7684 (iv).

——— Employees : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 5209 (iii).

Internal Economy Commission : Mess. from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 8 (i).

——— Res. *re* Purchasing Furniture : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6612 ; Res. read (Mr. Speaker) 6614 (iv).

——— Reps. presented to the House : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9076 (v).

Legislation, House of Commons : in Com. of Sup., 6268 (iv).

Levis Electoral District, Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 7175 (iv).

——— Vacancy, Issue of Writ : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 6474 (iv).

Library, Books and Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 75 (i), 6944 (iv).

——— Enlargement of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6944 (iv).

——— Joint Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 8 (i).

Locked Desks for Members' Papers : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
See 'Desks.'

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
London and N. Oxford By-Election, Issue of Writ : Notification (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6311 (iv).
——— Issue of Writ : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 6473 (iv).
——— Resignation of Mr. W. F. Maclean : Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6384 (iv).
See 'Oxford.'
Man. Elections : Duties of Ret. Officers, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1506 (i).
Manitoba Election Returns : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1672 (i).
——— Voters' Lists returned to Clerk of Crown : Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1405 (i).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Greenway) on M. for Sup., 6738 (iv).
Marquette Voters' Lists, Original Copy : M. for Copy* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 97 (i).
Meetings after six o'clock, Recess : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 450 (i).
Members, New, 111, 624, 1846 (i), 7420 (iv).
Messengers, House of Commons : in Com. of Sup., 240 (i), 6612 (iv).
Ministers, Absence from House : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1285 (i).
Morning Sittings : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9081 (v).
Nicolet, Controverted Election, Certificate from Judges : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 9081 (v).
N.W. Ter., Voters' Lists : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2594 (ii).
Oxford and London Elections, Resignation of Mr. D. D. McKenzie : Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. on B. 69, 8474 (v).
Oxford N., Electoral Vacancy : Notification to Mr. Speaker (Mr. Sproule) 5961 (iv).
——— Issue of Writ : Notification (Mr. (Mr. Speaker) 6046 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6135 (iv).
——— Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 8177 (v).
Petitions, Presenting, Endorsement of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 2490 (ii).
P.O., Complaints *re* Delivery of Mails : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com of Sup., 199 (i).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Purchases, Auditing of : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6617 (iv).
Quebec Centre Electoral District, Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 110 (i).
Questions answered by Ministers : Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 1067 (i).
Ret. Officers, Dep., Delay in Payments to, Letter from Mr. Walker : Read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 6560 (iv).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
Ret. Officers, Forms and Instructions *re* Dom. Elections : M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 697 (i).
——— Instructions *re* Form of Oath at London and Oxford Elections : M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7331 (iv).
——— for Mackenzie and Dauphin, Man. Special Reps. Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1336 (i).
Rooms for Members, Allotment : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 238, 250 (i).
Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 6268 (iv).
Selkirk Ret. Officers, Occupation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 1761 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Conferences, Mess. from the Senate : Read (Mr. Fielding) 9028 (v).
———M. (Mr. Fielding) to conc., 9280 (v).
Sergeant-at-Arms, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 240 (i), 6610 (iv).
Sessional Clerks : in Com. of Sup., 239 (i), 6595 (iv).
Sessional Messengers : in Com. of Sup., 240 (i), 6612 (iv).
Sessional Pages : in Com. of Sup., 6613 (iv).
Sessions of Parliament, Delays in bringing down Estimates, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9085 (v).
Speaker, Election of : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2 (i).
Speaker, Dep.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to appoint, 50 (i).
Stationery : in Com. of Sup., 238 (i), 6594 (iv).
Steward for Speaker's Rooms, Appnmt. of : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 240 (i).
Toronto Centre, Electoral District, Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 4370 (iii).
——— Issue of Writ, Registration, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3251 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster 2777 (ii).
——— Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2841 (ii).
——— Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3362
Ventilation in the House of Commons : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
See 'Public Works,' &c.
Voters' Lists, Algoma, East and West, Revision, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 594 (i).
——— Edmonton Election, Preparation of : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).
——— Electoral Atlas : in Com. of Sup., 6722 (iv).
——— Macdonald, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Staples) 697 (i).
——— N. W. Ters., Use in Dom. Elections, 1905 : M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 601 (i).
See 'N.W.T.'

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
Voters' Lists, Man., Printing, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 60 (i).
See 'Man.' &c.
——— Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6897, 6954 (iv).
——— Unorganized Ters., Cor. *re*, Instruction, &.: M. (Mr. Boyce) for Copies*, 1397 (i).
Wright Electoral District : Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1846 (i).
——— Vacancy : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 98 (i).
Yukon Election, and Returning Officer, Cor. : Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1254 (i).
Yukon Elections for Dom., Delay in opening Ballot Boxes : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 987 (i).
——— Ret. of Member Elect, Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 453 (i).
——— Returning Officer, Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1152 (i).
——— Return of Member Elect : Telegrams Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1066 (i).
Yukon Territorial District, Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2322 (ii).
Howard's Cove, P.E.I., Surveys *re* Wharf : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4703 (iii).
Hudson's Bay and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 109 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 104.)
Hudson's Bay Servants, Claims *re* Lord Selkirk's Estate, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lamont) 9698 (v).
Hudson's Bay, Sovereignty over : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. on B. 69, 5608-9 ; Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5609 (iii).
See 'Autonomy,' &c.
Hull Wharf, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2064 (ii).
Huot, Mr. J., Payments to *re* L'Ange Gardien Beach : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1343 (i).
Hurley, J. M., Fishery Inspector, Rep., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 2895 (ii).
Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Co.'s B. No. 84 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 1788 ; 2°*, 1891 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 105.)
Hydrographic Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 2679 (ii), 6623 (iv), 9172 (v).
Ice-Boats, Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9177 (v).
Ice-Breakers, Govt. Steamers, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9034 (v).
——— 'Montcalm,' Accident to, Information : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4752 (iii).
——— statement (Mr. Préfontaine) 4752 (iii).
——— *re* St. Lawrence Channel : in Com. of Sup., 6464 (iv), 9617 (v).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Ice Jam in St. Lawrence River, Govtl. Action *re* : Remarks (Mr. Broder) 699 (i).
Ice Jam on Thames River : Remarks (Mr. Clements) on M. for Sup., 1013 (i).
Ideal Manufacturing Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 166 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 6232 ; 2°*, 6868 ; in Com., and 3°* 7625 ; M. *re* Amts., 8383 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 106.)
Immigration, Fraudulent Representation B. No. 120 (Mr. Logan) 1° m., 2323 (ii) ; 2°*, 9699 ; in Com., 9699 ; 3°*, 9700 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 16.)
IMMIGRATION :
Agents, in Canada and G. B., &c., Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 9308 (v).
——— Memo. from Toronto Trade and Labour Council : Read (Mr. Osler) 9309 (v).
Agents, G. B., &c., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6384, 7685 (iv), 9226 (v).
——— on Conc.: M. (Mr. Foster) to reduce Mr. Nixon's Salary, 9770 ; Neg. (Y. 30, N. 66) 9770 (v).
Associated British Canadian Society, Charges against Graeme Hunter : Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2188 (ii).
Association in Prince Edward County : Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 7706 (iv).
Austrians stranded in Ottawa, Provision for, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 4845 (iii).
Bonus to Transportation and Booking Agents : Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 7811 (iv).
See 'North Atlantic.'
Children from English Workhouses, Proposal of Mr. Neill : Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 6188 (iv).
——— Govt. Assistance: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1341 (i).
——— Par. in 'Citizen' *re* Mrs. Close's Scheme (remarks) 1933 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) on M. for Sup., 2125 (ii).
——— Cor. with Mr. C. Kinloch Cooke : Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 5478 (iii).
——— Reply to Ques.: Read (Mr. Oliver) 5576 (iii).
Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 7709 (iv).
Detention Hospital, B.C., Proclamation *re* : Read (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 9331 (v).
——— Authority, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9927 (v).
False Representations to, &c. : Remarks *re* Bills (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8177 (v).
Farmer, Bonus paid by Govt., &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7811 (iv).
Graeme Hunter, Charges *re* Immigration Society : Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2188 (ii).
Haggard, H. Rider, Rep. to Imp. Govt., &c. : Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 9523 (v).
See 'Salvation,' &c.

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Immigrants deported in 1904-1905, Nationalities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1592, 1847 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv).
——— Examination *re* Qualifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 2187 (ii).
Immigration Property, Montreal, Leases by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 913 (i).
——— Interpreters, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7701 (iv).
——— Literature, Distribution of Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7710 (iv).
——— Medical Inspection, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9226 (v).
——— Office, G. B., Number of Employees, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 592 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Ten Year Contract *re* Immigrants, &c.: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 7906 (iv), 8387 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. U. Wilson) 8145 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8182 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9318 (v).
——— Notice of M. (Mr. Osler) 9329 (v).
——— Prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) on M. for Sup., 9437; Neg. (Y. 40, N. 76) 9480 (v).
——— Protests *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 8887 (v).
See 'SS. Subsidies,' &c.
Number of Immigrants arriving in 1904, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 1148 (i).
Peterborough Immigrant Homes, Inspection *re*: Remarks (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. of Sup., 7694 (iv).
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Immigration Agent, Salary, &c., Reps., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 452 (i).
Salvation Army and Immigration, Cor., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7684 (iv).
Salvation Army Colonies, Rider Haggard's Rep.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 6188 (iv).
See 'Haggard.'
Skilled Labour, Allegations from Toronto Labour Council: Notice of Motion (Mr. Foster) 7424 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 7504 (iv).
——— SS. Steamship Bonuses to by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9318 (v).
——— Subsidies to SS. Companies, Contract *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7699, 7705 (iv).
See 'North Atlantic.'
Imperial Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. No. 98 (Mr. Belcourt) 1°*, 2043; 2°*, 2297; in Com., 2770; 3°*, 2772 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 107.)
Imperial Institute, Can. Exhibit: in Com. of Sup., 1838 (i).
Imports and Exports, Agricultural Products, Duties paid, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Clements) 3203 (ii).
Imports and Exports for Home Consumption, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 380 (i).
Imports from United Kingdom, Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 267 (i).
Imports under Preferential Tariff, Amounts paid, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 152 (i).
Indemnity of Members, &c.: *See* 'Senate and House of Commons,' &c.
Indian Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
——— Pet. *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8178 (v).
INDIANS:
Agents acting as Magistrates: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 6545 (iv).
Blankets, Clothing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 225 (i).
B. C. Indians, Miscellaneous Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 9339 (v).
——— Industrial Schools: in Com. of Sup., 6556 (iv), 9339 (v).
——— Travelling Expenses *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6557 (iv).
Bryce, Dr., Payments to: in Com. of Sup., 6558 (iv).
Caughnawaga Indians, Medical Attendance: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Bergeron) 225 (i).
Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 111 (i).
Deptl. Salaries, Indian Affairs: in Com. of Sup., 116 (i).
Doncaster Reserve, Abolition of: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 7812 (iv).
Dukis Reserve, Sale of Timber: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3202 (ii).
Georgian Bay Indian Surveys: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 236 (i).
Grants to Agricultural Societies: in Com. of Sup., 237 (i).
Half-Breed Scrip, Applications by Norman, Oulette, and Others, Purchase of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 9078 (v).
Half-Breed Scrip, Further Papers laid on Table: (Mr. Oliver) 9197 (v).
See 'Interior,' &c.
Inspectors, Man. and N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6548 (iv).
Jamieson, Dr., Payment to by Govt. *re* Indian Attendance: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).

INDIANS—*Con.*
Lands Management Fund : in Com. of Sup., 236 (i).
Legal Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 237 (i).
Legal Expenses *re* Test Case at Oka : in Com. of Sup., 9335 (v).
Live Stock, purchased for Indians, Man. and N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
——— Statement : Read (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).
McDonald, Mr. J. L., Dismissal as Indian School Teacher, N.S. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6514 (iv).
Indians, Man. and N.W.T., Annuities : in Com. of Sup., 6538 (iv).
——— Implements : in Com. of Sup., 9336 (v).
——— Provisions, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9338 (v).
Medical Inspection, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 6555 (iv).
——— N.B. : in Com. of Sup., 6516 (iv).
——— Ont., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 223 (i).
——— P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 6537 (iv).
Medical Inspection, Payments *re* : Remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6553 (iv).
Moose Mountain Indian Agency, Letter from Rev. E. Mackenzie : Read (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 9337 (v).
N.B., Indians, Supt.'s Salary : in Com. of Sup., 9336 (v).
Indians, N.S., General Vote : in Com. of Sup., 6514 (iv).
Oka Indians, Settlement of Claims, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 235 (i).
Ont. and Quebec, Indians, Medical Attendance : in Com. of Sup., 223 (i).
Pemberton Band of Indians, B.C., Purchase of Land : in Com. of Sup., 9339 (v).
Printing for Indians, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6558 (iv).
Promotions, Indian Dept., &c.: Conc., 6909 (iv).
——— Promotion of Mr. Bray : Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6920 (iv).
Purchase of Provisions : in Com. of Sup., 6550 (iv).
Reserves, Sale of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes), on M. for Sup., 6563 (iv).
Salaries, Indians, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6516 (iv).
Seed Grain, Indians, Man. and N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
——— N.B. : in Com. of Sup., 6516 (iv).
Schools, Indian : in Com. of Sup., 225 (i).
——— Establishment of : Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) in Com. of Sup., 230 (i).
——— Mar. Provs. : in Com. of Sup., 225 (i).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 230 (i).
INDIANS—*Con.*
Stoney Indians, Depleting Game, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 6548 (iv).
Surveys, Man. and N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).
———Que. and Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 236 (i).
Timber on Indian Lands, Procedure *re* Sale of : Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 9280 (v).
Treaty No. 9, Payments *re* Indians : in Com. of Sup., 9336 (v).
Unforeseen Expenses, Indians : in Com. of Sup., 6517 (iv).
Yoho Park Reserve, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 7719 (iv).
Industrial Schools, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 9339 (v).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. No. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) 1° m., 7421 (iv) ; 2°, 8676 ; in Com., 8676; 3°*, 8685 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 17.)
INLAND REVENUE :
Adulteration of Food, Centralization of Samples : Remarks (Mr. Black) in Com. of Sup., 1717 (i).
——— Violations of Act, Prosecutions, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1699, 1710 (i).
Cement Testing Laboratory, Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7613 (iv).
Culling Timber, Inspectors, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7236 (iv).
Deptl. Rep. : Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 51 (i), 4085 (iii).
Deptl. Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 89 (i), 9069 (v).
Electric Light Inspectors : in Com. of Sup., 1696 (i).
Excise, Additional Remuneration for extra work : in Com. of Sup., 1688 (i).
——— Allowance to Customs Collectors : in Com. of Sup., 1689 (i).
——— Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 6724 (iv).
——— Inspectors' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 1679 (i).
——— Inspectors' Travelling Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 1689 (i).
——— Officers, B.C., Provisional Allowance : in Com. of Sup., 1690 (i).
Fertilizers, Inspection of : Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 1726 (i).
Fréchette, L. A., Translation *re* Excise Branch : in Com. of Sup., 1690 (i).
Gas and Electric Light Inspection at Three Rivers, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1760 (i).
Gas and Electric Light Inspection, Rep. *re* : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1692 (i).
Inspectors of Weights and Measures, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1692 (i).

INLAND REVENUE—*Con.*

Jams, Preserves, Adulteration of, Prosecutions *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).

Maple Products, Adulteration of, Prevention by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 1340 (i).

Methylated Spirits, Purchased by Exercise Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 1691 (i).

Metric System, Adoption of: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1694 (i).

Preventive Service *re* Excise: in Com. of Sup., 1688 (i).

Spirits in Bond, Age Limit, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. on B. 176, 8679 (v).

Tobacco Industry, Inspection *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1681 (i).

Weights and Measures Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 1692 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 1695 (i).

Weights and Measures Standards: in Com. of Sup., 1695 (i).

Inspection of Staples, Grain, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6901, 7224 (iv).

Inspector General of Militia: in Com. of Sup., 437 (i).

Inspectors of Customs, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 405 (i).

See 'Customs,' &c.

Inspector of Insurance and Director General of Public Health B. No. 200 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 9688; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 9690 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 46.)

Inspectors of Weights and Measures, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1692 (i).

See 'Inland Revenue,' &c.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:

Additional Sidings, Spur Lines, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1970 (i), 6431 (iv).

Advertising Car, Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 2257 (ii).

Advertising in Newspapers, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2236 (ii).

Agents, Dwelling Houses, Policy of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).

Amherst Station Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 1983 (i).

Annual Statement, on M. for Sup. (Mr. Emmerson) 1888, 1891 (i).

Antigonish Station Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 1967 (i).

Arbitration, I.C.R. and G. T. R., Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 68, 165 (i).

Arbitration, I.C.R. and G.T.R., *re* Traffic Arrangements, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1929 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Book-keeping Methods, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1928 (i).

Bridge Strengthening: in Com. of Sup., 1912 (i), 9384 (v).

Campbellton Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1968 (i).

Cape Road Crossing, Elimination of: in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).

Capital Account, Total Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Chisholm) 2064 (ii).

Chapman, F. B., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1342 (i).

Coal carried to Ottawa Free: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 2065, 2192 (ii).

Coal purchased, 1904, Quantity: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 910 (i).

Coal for Govt. Railways, Quantity accepted from N.S. Mines: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 2191 (ii).

Double Tracking: in Com. of Sup., 1933 (i), 2027 (ii), 9390 (v).

Drummond County Ry., Expenditure on Capital Account, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2334 (ii).

Drummondville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1960 (i).

Earnings per Train Mile, Stmnt.: Read in Com. of Sup., 9503 (v).

Employees, Messrs. Weldon, McDougall, Political Partisans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 1146 (i).

Employees, Pensions, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) 9029, 9288 (v).

See 'Pensions.'

Engine Houses, Riviere du Loup: in Com. of Sup., 9389 (v).

Expenditure *re* Capital, &c: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1940 (i).

Facilities, Increased: in Com. of Sup., 9482 (v).

Financial Statement: (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. of Sup., 1888, 1891 (i), 7448; Reply (Mr. Haggart) 7447, 7457 (iv).

Fredericton Station Agent, Dismissal of Mr. O. White: M. for Cor. (Mr. Crocket) 192 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 698 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 107 (i).

See 'White.'

Freight Diversion and Traffic Arrangements: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2219 (ii).

——— Letter from C. W. Stewart: Read (Mr. Daniel) 2227 (ii).

Freight Rates, Increase in, &c.: Statement (Mr. Emmerson) in Reply to (Mr. Taylor) 6112 (iv); Cor. read, 6115 (iv).

——— Ref. to Gananoque and Fredericton: Reply (Mr. Taylor) to Min. of Rys., 6585 (iv).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Fuel Inspector, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 451 (i).
Galena Oil Co., Oil purchased : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).
See 'Oil.'
Government Railways, Disposal of Old Rails, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2066 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4751 (iii).
Grades and Curves : in Com. of Sup., 1987 (i).
Halifax, Deep Water Terminals, Dredging *re* I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2026 (ii).
Halifax, Terminals : in Com. of Sup., 2032 (ii).
Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 9391 (v).
Hay transported free over I.C.R., Cor. between Govt., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Foster) 164 (i).
——— O.C., Circulars, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 280 (i).
——— Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 919 (i), 2005, 2595, 3450 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 59 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 108 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 1929 (i).
Increased Expenditure : Remarks (Mr. White) in Com. of Sup., 2215 (ii).
Indiantown and Blackville Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 9482 (v).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Claims for Damages, Amounts paid, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Kemp) 383 (i).
Locomotives, Purchase of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1964 (i).
Levis Property for I.C.R. Purposes, Charges *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) on M. for Sup., 6668 (iv).
Locomotive Machinery for Shops : in Com. of Sup., 6428 (iv).
'Maritime Express,' Running Time : Remarks (Mr. Lavergne) 6831 (iv).
M. C. B. Coupler for Rolling Stock, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 2178 (ii).
Memramcook Ry. Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 1977 (i).
Mitchell Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 1940 (i).
Mitchell, Diversion of Line : in Com. of Sup. 1940 (i).
Moncton, Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 1967 (i)., 9391 (v).
——— Shops, Capacity of : Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 1965 (i).
Newcastle Station Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1967 (i).
Oil and Supplies, Purchases *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2246 (ii).
See 'Galena.'
Original Construction : in Com. of Sup., 1912 (i).
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Parlour, and Dining Cars, Profits, &c., *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).
Passenger Stations and Freight Sheds : in Com. of Sup., 1977 (i).
Passes over I.C.R. for Legislators of Quebec Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 1922, 1925 ; Reply (Mr. Emmerson) 1925 (i).
Passes issued, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 2257 (ii).
Pension Scheme for Old Age : Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 2492 (ii).
See 'Employees.'
Pictou Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 9390 (v).
P.E.I. Railway : in Com. of Sup., 2025, 2127 (ii), 8692 (v).
———Agents' Houses ; in Com. of Sup., 2180 (ii).
——— Bloomfield Agent's House : in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).
——— Branch Lines, Survey and Construction, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies*, 916 (i).
——— Cardigan to Montague Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 2171 (ii), 9482 (v).
——— Charlottetown, P.E.I. Ry., Station, Cor. and Reps. *re* Construction : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 194 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. Martin) 4810 (iii).
——— Charlottetown Railway Station, Site &c.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 60 (i).
——— Charlottetown Station Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 2025 (ii), 6433 (iv).
——— Freetown Agent, Dwelling House : in Com. of Sup., 2180 (ii).
——— Georgetown Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 2179 (ii), 9486 (v).
——— Grand View Station, Murray Harbour Branch, Location, &c., Cor.: M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies*, 1770 (i).
——— Kitchen, Mr., Contractor for Hillsborough Bridge, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 2138 (ii).
——— Kensington Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 2178 (ii).
——— Land Expropriations, Papers laid on Table (Mr. Emmerson) 8528 (v).
——— M. C. B. Coupler : in Com. of Sup., 2178 (ii).
——— Morrell River Bridge Swing Span : in Com. of Sup., 2177 (ii).
——— Morrell River Ry. Bridge, Complaints *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5035 (iii).
——— Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 2038, 2127 (ii), 7494 (iv), 8692, 9482, 9488 (v).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
P.E.I. Ry., Murray Harbour Branch, Amount due Contractors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2064 (ii).
——— Murray Harbour Branch, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 189 (i).
——— delegation *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. A. Mc- 265 (i).
——— and Murray Harbour Branch Expenditure to Jan. 1st, 1905 : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 106 (i).
——— Standard Gauge, Cost of Construction : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2181 (ii).
——— Stanley Bridge, &c., Surveys *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 266 (i).
——— Stanley Bridge, Total Cost, Claim for Damages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 587 (i).
——— Summerside Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 2176 (ii).
——— Train Service : Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 697 (i).
——— Vernon River Bridge Branch Line : in Com. of Sup., 2177 (ii).
——— Water Service Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 2170 (ii).
——— West Cape Branch Surveys : Ques (Mr. Lefurgey) 589 (i).
——— Westinghouse Brakes : in Com. of Sup., 2178 (ii).
——— Working Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 6901, 6908 (iv).
Private Cars, Number, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2258 (ii).
Receipts and Expenditures, Total Amount : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 688 (i).
Revenue Collections : in Com. of Sup., 2204 (ii).
Rivière Ouelle Spur Line, Extension, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Barker) in Com. of Sup., 1981 (i).
Rolling Stock : in Com. of Sup., 1986 (i), 2037 (ii), 6428 (iv).
——— Number added 1900-4: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 736 (i).
——— Stmnt. of Estimated Cost : Read in Com. of Sup., 9501 (v).
Running Rights over C. A. Ry.: *See* 'Govt. Rys. B. 132.'
Running Time, Connections at Montreal : Remarks (Mr. Morin) 6831 (iv).
St. Cyrille, Diversion of Ry. Line : in Com. of Sup., 1969 (i).
St. Fabien Subway : in Com. of Sup., 1980 (i).
Ste. Flavie Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 9390 (v).
St. John Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 9389 (v).
St. Lambert and Beloeil Double Tracking : in Com. of Sup., 2183 (ii).
St. Moise Station Improvements : in Com. of Sup.. 1976 (i).
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Sackville Railway Station, Tenders *re* Erection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 5133 (iii).
Semaphores : in Com. of Sup., 1986 (i).
Snow Blockades, Delay in Service, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2028 (ii).
Station Accommodation along Line : in Com. of Sup., 6429 (iv).
Steel Rails and Fastenings : in Com. of Sup., 1988 (i), 2038 (ii).
See 'Govt. Rys.', &c.
Superannuation Scheme : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 2241 (ii).
Sydney, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 1912 (i).
——— Collections for Freight, &c.: M. Mr. A. Martin) for Ret., 1767 (i).
Sydney Mines, Extension of Line : in Com. of Sup., 1987 (i).
Ties, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6429 (iv).
Time Table, Changes and Delays : on M. for Sup., 6827-9 (iv).
Time Tables, Printing in English and French: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 6827 (iv).
Traffic and Freight Arrangements, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2228 (ii).
Traffic Arrangements with Foreign and Can. Rys., Amounts received : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4703 (iii).
Traffic Arrangements with other Rys.: Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 1915 (i).
Train Service, Stalled by Snowstorms, Tel.: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 695 (i).
——— Explanation (Mr. Emmerson) 726 (i).
Transportation Facilities *re* Fish Trade with Mar. Provs.: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) 1930 (i).
Truro, Dining Room : Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 2255 (ii).
——— Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 9391 (v).
White, Odbur, Dismissal as Station Agent : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 107 (i).
——— M. for Cor. *re* (Mr. Crocket) 193 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 2295 ; Cor. (read) 2206 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 2235 (ii).
Woodill, Seymour, Emplymt.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 2191 (ii).
Working Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 6907 (iv), 9384 (v).
Inter-Imperial Parliament between G. B. and Her Colonies : Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2334 (ii).
INTERIOR :
Acreage in Provisional District Alberta, Sas., &c., Disposal of, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 601 (i).
Acres of undisposed Lands, N. W. Ters. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 601 (i).

INTERIOR—*Con.*
Alaska Boundaries, Demarcation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7719 (iv).
Alberta, Provisional District, Acreage disposed of: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 601 (i).
Assay Apparatus for Geological Survey: in Com. of Sup., 8671 (v).
Badgley Island Timber Cutting, Licenses granted: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 452 (i).
Banff Hot Spring Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iv).
Banff Pamphlets, Printing and Distribution: in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Cabinet Vacancy, Interior Dept., Information *re* (Mr. Foster) 3450 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4085 (iii).
See 'Interior,' &c.
Colonization Roads, Man. and N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7594 (iv).
Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 453 (i).
Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 114 (i), 6264 (iv), 9070 (v).
Dep. Minister of, Resignation, Appnmt, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4370 (iii).
Dom. Lands, Homestead Inspectors' Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6407 (iv).
——— Inspectors' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).
——— Maps, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6406, 6424 (iv).
——— N.W.T., Open to Applicants for Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1935 (i).
——— N.W.T. Sales, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2006 (ii).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9251, 9289 (v).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 8671 (v).
Doukhobors Homestead Entries *re* Village Lots: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6414 (iv).
Edmonton, Dom. Lands Office: in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
Entennier, Mr. Henry, Entries for Homestead Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 190 (i).
Forest Protection in Man.: in Com. of Sup., 9298 (v).
Geological Survey, Appnmts. and Absences, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 382 (i).
——— Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 6248 (iv).
——— Director, Appnmt., &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9303 (v).
——— Explorations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8669; on conc., 9685 (v).
——— Maps, Printing and Distribution, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8670 (v).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 122 (i).
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale, Jurisdiction, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. Wright) 6477 (iv).

INTERIOR—*Con.*
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale to Mr. F. W. Grant: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6479 (iv).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. Grant) 6736 (iv).
Govt. Lands, N.W.T., Sale of in 1903-4, Rates, &c.: M. for O. C.* (Mr. Foster) 164 (i).
Grazing Leases, N.W.T., Number issued, Names of Lessees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5478 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 8529 (v).
Half-Breed Patents, Claims, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 6907 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip, Charges *re* Mr. Chaffee's Claims: Personal Explanation (Mr. Foster) 7916 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip, Charges *re* Mr. McDonald, Cor, &c.: Read (Mr. Foster) 7647 (iv).
——— Charges, &c.: Personal Explanation (Mr. Bole) 7812 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip, issued to United States Citizens: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6311 (iv).
——— Memo. from Mr. Cote: Read (Mr. Oliver) 6403 (iv).
——— to non-residents, Cancellation of O. C.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6489, 6560 (iv).
——— O. C.'s, Forms, &c.: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 7099 (iv).
——— Instructions to Judge Myers *re* Investigation: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7723 (iv), 8170 (v).
——— Mr. Chaffey's letter: Read (Mr. Foster) 8183 (v).
Half-Breed Scrip, O. C. *re* Judge Myers: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8003 (v).
——— Patents issued, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8003 (v).
Half-Breed Scrip Investigation, Appnmt. of Counsel: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8528, 8697 (v).
——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8777 (v).
——— Progress, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster 9725 (v).
——— Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8777 (v).
Half-Breed Scrip, Further Papers laid on Table (Mr. Oliver) 9075 (v).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 7422 (iv), 9029 (v).
——— Issue of Patent, Inquiry for: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7020 (iv).
——— Unsettled Claims in N. W. Ter., Complaints from Old Settlers: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 9813 (v).
Homesteads for Residents, N.W.T., Second Applications, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 2067 (ii).
Immigration Property, Montreal, Leases by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 913 (i).

INTERIOR—*Cno.*

Interior Dept., Appnmt. of Minister: Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4200 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1152 (i).

See 'Cabinet.'

——— Dep. Minister, Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4370 (iii).

——— Vacancy in Cabinet: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3362 (ii).

Leach, Mr. R. E. A., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1151 (i).

Litigation Expenses, Interior Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 7720 (iv).

Logberg Printing Co., Winnipeg, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4373, 4457 (iii).

——— Remarks *re* Question (Mr. Taylor) 4374 (iii).

Maps for Dom. and N.W.T. Engraving, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7721 (iv), 9307 (v).

National Boundary Fence: in Com. of Sup., 8672 (v).

See 'Wire Fence,' &c.

Nicolas, Mr., Emplymt. by Geological Survey Dept.: on Conc., 9685 (v).

Nixon, Jos., Appnmt. as Lands Agent at Macleod, N.W.T.: Explanation (Mr. Oliver) 6110 (iv).

——— Charges *re* Irregularities: M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8098 (v).

——— Delays in Answers to Questions: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 9075 (v).

——— Investigation: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8697 (v).

——— Second Investigation, Letter *re* Payment of Money: Read (Mr. Foster) 9787 (v).

N.W.T. Boundary, Erection of Wire Fencing, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5478 (iii).

N.W. Ters., Land Sales: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 1154 (i).

N.W. Land Titles Office, Registrars' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 9249 (v).

Patterson, T. W., Sale of Dom. Lands, B.C., Price paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4371 (iii).

Preston, Mr., Immigration Office G.B., Number of Employees, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 592 (i).

Preston, W. T. R., Visit to Canada: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 451 (i).

Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Change in Boundaries, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9298 (v).

St. Lawrence Islands, Govt. Control *re* Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Walsh) 6477 (iv).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Issue of Patents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8267, 8655 (v).

School Lands sold by Auction, in N.W.T., Number of Acres: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 730 (i).

Schukin, Ivan, Homestead Patent cancelled: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 6408

INTERIOR—*Cno.*

Seed Grain, Advance to Settlers, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 9307 (v).

Settlers Effects, Duty *re*: in Com. on Ways and Means, 8996 (v).

Seymour, Mr. D. G., Complaint *re* Homestead Location: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9033, 9294 (v).

Smart, Jas. A., Dep. Min. of Interior, Resignation, &c: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4370 (iii).

Surveys, Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 9306 (v).

Timber Limits, Sale in N.W.T. and Man., Advertisements *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7097 (iv).

Tree Culture and Forest Protection, Man., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9297 (v).

Wood, Major Z. T., Additional Living Allowance *re* Yukon: in Com. of Sup., 9250 (v).

Young, Thos. and G. C. McNab, Dom. Officials and Political Organizers: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9254 (v).

Internal Economy Commission: Mess. from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 8 (i).

——— Res. *re* purchasing Furniture: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6612; Res. read (Mr. Speaker) 6614 (iv).

——— Reps. presented to the House: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9076 (v).

International Boundary Fence: *See* 'N.W.T. Boundary Line,' 'Wire Fencing,' &c.

International Congress of Americanistes, Cebration at Quebec, Grant to: in Com. of Sup., 9622 (v).

International Postal Supply Co., Rent of Stamping Machines: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).

International Terminal and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 87 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) 1°*, 1933 (i); 2°*, 2062; in Com., 3135; 3° m., 3135 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9695 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 108.)

International Water Ways Commission, Appnmt. of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 701 (i).

See 'Deep Waterways,' &c.

Interprovincial and James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 150 (Mr. Devlin) 1°*, 5783 (iii); 2°*, 6868; in Com., and 3°*, 7060 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 109.)

Inverness Mines, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7405 (iv).

Inverness, N.S., Postmaster, Personal Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 8885 (v).

Inverness, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1040 (i).

Irish Cove Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).

Iron and Steel Bounties, Payments *re*: in Com. of Sup., 7216 (iv).

Isle Bizard Wharf Butments, Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 2067 (ii).

Jacques Cartier Surveys, Costs, Reports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 593 (i).
James Bay Lobsters, Investigation *re* by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6475 (iv).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 65 (Mr. Watson) 1°*, 1336 ; 2°*, 1541 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 110.)
James Bay Ry., Deviation of Line, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Grant) 9697 (v).
——— Maps or Plans *re* Location, Filing of : Ques. (Mr. Grant) 2190 (ii).
'James W.', Schooner, Rescue of Crew by SS. 'Durango': Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4198 (iii).
Jamieson, Dr., Payment to by Govt. *re* Indian Attendance : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).
Jams, Reserves, Adulteration of, Prosecutions *re* : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).
Janvrin's Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7406 (iv).
Japan Exhibition, Trade Increase : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6273 (iv).
——— Discrimination *re* Canadian Goods, Quotations *re* in 'Industrial Canada': Read (Mr. Barker) 6654 (iv).
——— Relations with Canada, Treaty, &c.: Statement (Mr. Fisher) 7908 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8385 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7816 (iv).
Jean Effront, Patent Relief B. No. 33 (Mr. Demers, Iberville) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1755 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 89.)
'J. I. Tarte' Dredge, Defective Boilers, Accident, &c. Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2466 (ii).
Johnston, Mr. T. G., late M.P., Decease of : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8694 (v).
Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Ry. Co.'s B. No. 191 (Mr. O. E. Talbot) 1°*, 9072; 2°*, 9179 ; M. to place on Orders for Com., 9278 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9340 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 111.)
Joliette County Ry. Surveys, Total Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1346 (i).
Judge Advocate General, Appnmt. of : Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act (salaries) Amt. B. No. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) Res. prop., 9702 ; in Com. on Res., 9740, 9797 ; 1°* of B., 2°*, 9792 ; in Com., 9792, 9798 ; 3°*, 9798 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 31.)
Judicial Vacancies, Length of Vacancies, Appnmts., &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7423 (iv).
——— Promotions and Appnmt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8002 (v).
——— Statement (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8002 (v).
JUSTICE :
Admiralty Court Registrars, Fees, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 125 (i).
JUSTICE—*Con.*
Atlin, B.C., Living Allowance to Judge : in Com. of Sup., 9683 (v).
B. C. Judgeship, Appnmt. of W. W. B. McInnes : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 382 (i).
Castonguay, Dismissal and Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 5688 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. O. E. Talbot) 6653 (iv).
Consolidation of Statutes : in Com. of Sup., 7244 (iv).
Court Room, Prince Albert : in Com. of Sup., 124 (i).
Dodd, Judge, Salary: in Com. of Sup., 124 (i).
Dominion Police Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 138 (i).
Dorchester Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 480 (i).
Edmonton Jail : in Com. of Sup., 481, 1638 (i).
——— Extension of Building : in Com. of Sup., 9684 (v).
Exchequer Court, Admiralty Jurisdiction, Number of Actions, &c. M. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) for Ret.*, 1770 (i).
——— Judgeship in Ont., Appnmt. *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5209 (iii).
——— Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 125 (i).
Extradition Cases by U.S., before Commissioners at Montreal : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3937 (ii).
Gaynor-Greene Extradition, Charges against Mr. Lafontaine, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3937 (ii).
Hamelin and Gosselin, Imprisonment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1849 (i).
High Court Judgeship, Exchequer Court Division, Vacancy *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5209 (iii).
Judges, Man. and N.W.T., Travelling Allowances : in Com. of Sup., 122 (i).
Judges Salaries in Yukon : Remarks (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).
Judicial Vacancies, Length of Vacancies, Appnmts., &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7423 (iv).
——— Promotions and Appnmt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8002 (v).
——— Statement (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8002 (v).
Justice, Administration of, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 101 (i), 6721 (iv).
——— Prisoners' Maintenance : in Com. of Sup., 122 (i).
Justice, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup.,72 (i).
——— Penitentiaries : in Com. of Sup., 465 (i).
Keewatin Ter., Maintenance of Lunatics : in Com. of Sup., 7720 (iv).
Kingston Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 477 (i).
Manitoba, Stony Mountain Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 481 (i).
New Westminister, B.C., Penitentiary, Payment to W. A. Duncan : in Com. of Sup., 9684 (v).

JUSTICE—*Con.*
N. W. T. Supreme Court Judges, Additional : in Com. of Sup., 9683 (i).
Parole Officer, W. T. Archibald, Salary : in Com. of Sup., 6721 (iv).
Parole System for Convicts : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 465 (i).
Penitentiaries, General Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 465 (i).
——— Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 271 (i).
Prince Albert Court Room : in Com. of Sup., 124 (i).
Prince Albert Jail : in Com. of Sup., 481 (i).
Regina Jail : in Com. of Sup., 481 (i).
St. Regis Lockup : in Com. of Sup., 237 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 480 (i).
Secret Service, Expenditure *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6958 (iv).
Sheriffs of Yukon, Allowances : in Com. of Sup., 132 (i).
Statutes Revision Commission : in Com. of Sup., 8672 (v).
——— Completion of : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 745 (i).
——— Indexing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 8673 (v).
Stony Mountain Penitentiary, School Fees : in Com. of Sup., 9684 (v).
Sunday Observance Legislation, Payment for Legal Services : in Com. of Sup., 6722 (iv).
Supreme Court Bench, N.S., Vacancy, Appnmt., &c., Delay : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5036, 5209 (iii), 6837 (iv).
Supreme Court Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 125 (i).
Three Rivers, Additional Judge : in Com. of Sup., 9682 (v).
Yukon, Court Fees : in Com. of Sup., 137 (i).
——— Judges Allowances : in Com. of Sup., 126 (i).
——— Law Books : in Com. of Sup., 136 (i).
——— Prisoners, Maintenance of : in Com. of Sup., 135 (i).
——— Witnesses Fees, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 135 (i).
Kamloops, Lower Nicola Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 7610 (iv).
Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Ry. Co.'s B. No. 141 (Mr. Galliher) M. to receive Pet., 3744 (ii) ; 4375 ; 1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 113.)
Kaslo, Dismissal of Mr. S. H. Green as Postmaster : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 2331 (ii).
Keewatin Act Amt B. No. 158 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 6103-4 (iv) ; Order dschd., 8176 (v).
Keewatin Ter., Maintenance of Lunatics : in Com. of Sup., 7720 (iv).
Kelly's Cove Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9582 (v).
Kensington Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 2178 (ii).
Kent, Miss A., Dismissal as Postmistress at Kent, N.S. : Ques (Mr. Lancaster) 2331 (ii).
Kentvale Postmaster Sureties, Dismissal, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5977 (iv).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site, Charges *re* : Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) on M. for Sup., 6656 (iv).
——— Judgment of Exchequer Court, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6664, 7584 (iv).
——— Rep. of Evidence, Printing, &c. : Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 8698 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) on M. for conc., 9686 (v).
——— Statement read (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 9706 (v).
Killam, Judge : *See* 'Ry. Com. B. 36.'
Killarney and Little Current Mail Service, Tenders *re* Contract, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 3669 (ii).
Kincardine Harbour, Piers and Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7558 (iv).
'King Edward' and 'St. Lawrence' Strs., SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
King, Mackenzie : *See* 'Labour Gazette,' &c.
'Kingsford,' Dredge, Cost of Operating : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 801 (i).
Kingston and Dom. Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 97 (Mr. Harty) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2325 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5113 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 86.)
Kingston Lighthouse Depot, Establishment by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 914 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 915 (i).
Kingston Military Stables : in Com. of Sup., 1561 (i).
Kingston. N.B. and Jubilee Station Mail Contract, Tenders *re*, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 5133 (iii).
Kingston, Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 477 (i).
——— Military Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 1560 (i).
Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 137 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 4978 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°* 6383 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 114.)
Kitchen, Mr., Contractor for Hillsborough Bridge, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 2138 (ii).
Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 24 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*. 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 115.)
Labels, Union : *See* 'Union Labels.'
Labourers employed by Govt., Political Partisanship : Remarks (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup., 6858 (iv).
Labour Dept. Gazette : in Com. of Sup., 7511 (iv).

'Labour Gazette,' and Partisan Officials : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7511 (v).
Labour Deptl. Rep. : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 54 (i).
——— Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 100 (i).
Labour Unions : *See* 'Aliens,' 'Union Labels.'
Lachine Canal, Cote St. Paul, Water Power used for Manufacturers : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 1515 (i).
——— Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).
——— Installation of Electrical Appliances : in Com. of Sup., 9354 (v).
——— Lock Gates, Suspension : in Com. of Sup., 6300 (iv).
——— Machinery for Shops : in Com. of Sup., 1240 (i).
——— Mill Street Paving : in Com. of Sup., 6301 (iv).
——— Power House Flumes : in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).
——— Rebuilding Wall Basin, Lock No. 2 : in Com. of Sup., 1421 (i).
——— Rebuilding Wharf below Dock : in Com. of Sup., 1421 (i).
——— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6306 (iv).
——— St. Gabriel's Basin Walls : in Com. of Sup., 9378 (v).
——— Tail Race Widening : in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).
——— Wall Underpinning : in Com. of Sup., 6298 (iv).
——— Water Privilege, Lease to Wm. Parkyn, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5132 (iii).
Lachute Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1111
La Compagnie de Chemin de fer Electrique : *See* 'Three Rivers,' &c.
'Lady Laurier,' Govt. Str., Accident, Investigation *re* : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2597 (ii).
——— Number of Crew at Halifax : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 2616 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. No. 43 (Mr. Gervais) 1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2042 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 116.)
Lake Champlain Co. : *See* 'St. Lawrence.'
Lake Daulphin, Lowering : in Com. of Sup., 7569 (iv).
Lake Manitoba, Closing *re* Fishing, Protests, &c. : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2901 (ii), 6630 (iv).
Lake St. Francis Outlet Guide Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).
Lake St. John Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).
Lake St. Peter Permanent Piers : in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv), 9171 (v).
Lake Superior and Sault Ste. Marie Co., Purchase of Steel Rails, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 1995 (i).
Lake Temiscaming Wharfs : in Com. of Sup., 7559 (iv).
Lakeville and North Lake Mail Service, Complaints *re* : Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 9612 (v).
Lake Winnipeg Fish Hatcheries : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2905 (ii).
Lambert's Pier, P.E.I., Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4373 (iii).
Land Titles Act Amt. B. No. 162 (Mr. Oliver) 1°*, 6104 (iv); 2°*, 9082 ; in Com., 9082 ; 3°*, 9085 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 18.)
Langly Wharf Protection Bank : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
Laprairie Ice Piers : in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv), 9590 (v).
L'Ardoise Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 6838, 7407 (iv).
Larry's River Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Lavaltrie Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup. 7306 (iv).
Law Clerk, Railways and Canals, Appnmt. of : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup. 9066 (v).
Lawson, Mr. H., Dismissal of as Postmaster, Cor., &c. : M. for Copy* (Mr. A. Martin) 1398 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1062 (i).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Laws, Printing and Binding : in Com. of Sup., 6948 (iv).
Leach, Mr. R. E. A., Emplymt. by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1151 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1065 (i).
Lead Bounties, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 7222 (iv).
Leather Trunks for Members : in Com. of Sup., 6606 (iv).
Lebonk and Thunder Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 61 (Mr. Bole) 1°*, 1241 ; 2°*, 1338 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 117.)
Lefebvre, A. P., Dismissal from Markstay Post Office, Investigation, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Broder) 7096 (iv).
Legal, M'gr., Quotation *re* Separate Schools, N. W.T..: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6187 (iv).
Legislation by O.C., Payments of Moneys, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6700 (iv).
Legislation, House of Commons : in Com. of Sup., 238 (i), 6268, 6592 (iv).
See 'House of Commons.'
Lemieux, Jos., Appnmt. *re* Lightship Service, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1762 (i).
Lennoxville Post Office, Construction of : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4373 (iii).

Lepreaux Point Light, &c., Caretaker, Investigation *re* Dismissal : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6475 (iv).

Leslie, Capt., Wrecking Plant in St. Lawrence Channel : Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 2476 (ii).

Lesser Slave Lake Post Office, Establishment, Mail Service, &c. : Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7018 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) in Com. on B. 69, 8163 (v).

Letter Carriers, Bonuses, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 215 (i).

——— Contract *re* Boots, &c.: (Remarks) in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).

——— Payments on Sick Leave, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 173-6 (i).

——— Uniforms, Contracts *re* : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

Leverette, Geo. Milton, Postmaster, Kitley District, Partisan Conduct as Ret. Officer : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6240 (iv).
See 'Post Office,' &c.

Levis Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 7175 (iv).

Levis Property for I.C.R. Purposes, Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) on M. for Sup., 6668 (iv).

Levis Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1112 (i).

Levis Vacancy, Issue of Writ : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 6474 (iv).

Lewis, Edward Norman, M.P., Relief B. 142 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 5136 ; in Com., 5136 ; 3°*, 5137 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 19.)

Library, Accommodation in Archives Building Remarks (Mr. Hyman) in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).

——— Books and Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 6944 (iv).

——— Enlargement of, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6944 (iv).

——— Extension, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).

——— Joint Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 8 (i).

Library and Printing Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Name, 5685 (iii).

Liege Exhibition : in Com. of Sup., 1832 (i).

——— Cor. between Govt. of Quebec and Dom. *re* : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Lavergne) 9698 (v).

Lt. Governors, Alberta and Saskatchewan B. No. 193 (Mr. Fielding) Res. prop., 8693 ; in Com. on Res., 9033 ; 1°*, 2°*, 9033 ; in Com., 9033 ; 3°*, 9033 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 20.)

Lifeboat Crews, N.S., Number, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 912 (i).

Life Insurance Companies Funds, Total Amount, Par Value, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 3204 (ii).

Life-saving Crew, Grand Manan, N.B., Payments to : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 4921 (iii).

Life Saving Stations and Rewards : in Com. o. Sup., 2624 (ii).

Lighting Ottawa Buildings : in Com of Sup., 6816 (iv).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'

Lighthouse Agencies, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2705 (ii).

Lighthouse in Bay of Quinté : Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service, Inspection : in Com. of Sup., 2697, 2859 (ii), 9035 (v).

——— Keepers' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 2698 (ii), 9175 (v).

——— Maintenance and Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6636 (iv).

——— Steamers, Ports of Call, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 1850 (i).

Lighthouse Construction as Aids to Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 9175 (v).

Lighthouse Depot at Kingston, Establishment of : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 914 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 915 (i).

——— Prescott, Tenders *re* Contract : Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1340 (i).

Lighthouse Engineers, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2760 (ii).

Lighthouse Keeper, at Bicquet, Name, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3202 (ii).

Lighthouse Revolving Lights, Maintenance : in Com. of Sup., 2704 (ii).

Lighthouse Service and Aids to Nav., Applications from Lighthouse Board : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lewis) 917 (i).

Lighthouse Supply Depots : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2709 (ii).

Lightships, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2706 (ii).

——— Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3035 (v).
See 'Marine.'

L'Ile d'Alma, Removal of Point of Rock : in Com. of Sup., 7307 (iv).

Lindsay Drill Hall, Erection of : Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 271 (i).

Litchfield Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).

Litigation Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 7247 (iv).

——— Interior Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 7720 (iv).

——— Railways and Canals : in Com. of Sup., 1522 (i).

Little Brook Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).

Little Current Channel, Georgian Bay : in Com. of Sup., 6886, 7559 (iv).

Little Judique Boat Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).

Little Pabos Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7307 (iv).

Live Stock, purchased for Indians, Man. and N. W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).

——— Statement ; Read (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).

Live Stock Records Associations incorp. B. No. 148 (Mr. Fisher) 1° m., 5076 ; 2°* 5922 ; in Com., 5922 ; 3°* 5927 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 21.)

Live Stock Records Associations, Delay to Farmers, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5577 (iii).

——— Notice of resuming in Com. on B. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5808 (iii).

Live Stock Records, Associations : in Com. of Sup., 6680 (iv).

——— Nationalization, Establishment of, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1848 (i), 2185 (ii).

Loans by Govt., Temporary or Permanent, Total Amount, Rate of Interest, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 4921 (iii).

Lobster and Herring Industry, Rep. of Commissioners : Ques. (Mr. McLennan) 4371 (iii). *See* 'Fisheries.'

Lobster Canneries, Licenses, Applications, &c., N.B., District No. 1 : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 584 (i).

Lobster Fishing, Open Season in 1903-4-5 : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 1504 (i).

——— Res. of Board of Trade, Moncton : Read (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 2909 (ii).

Lobsters, Legal Length in Bay of Fundy, Changes *re* : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 583 (i).

——— Licenses, District No. 1, N.B., Number issued by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 910 (i).

Locked Boxes : *See* 'Post Office.'

Locomotive Machinery for I.C.R. Shops : in Com. of Sup., 6428 (iv).

Locomotives, I.C.R., Purchase of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1964 (i).

Logberg Printing Co., Winnipeg, Payments to : Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4373 (iii).

——— Remarks *re* Question (Mr. Taylor) 4374 (iii).

Lloydminster as Meridian Divisional Line : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8634 (v).

Lloydminster Immigrant Building, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6734 (iv).

London Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 1562 (i).

London By-Election, Resignation of Mr. W. F. Maclean : Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6384 (iv).

London Drill Hall, Electric Wiring : in Com. of Sup., 6732 (iv).

——— Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 8384 (v).

London Electoral District, Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 8001 (v).

London Military Stores, Magazine, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1562 (i).

London Militiamen at Niagara : Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* London Elections, 7249 (iv). *See* 'Militia.'

London Post Office Building : in Com. of Sup., 1563 (i).

London and Saint Clair Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 32 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 118.)

London Vacancy, Issue of Writ : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 6473 (iv).

——— Issue of Writ : Notification (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6311 (iv).

Longueuil Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1113 (i).

Lotbinière Wharf Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).

Louisburg, Old Fort, C.B., Preservation of : in Com. of Sup., 9170 (v).

Louise Embankment, Quebec Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 770 (i).

Lowe, Mr., Refusal to accept Boat 'Neptune' : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).

——— Honorarium to: in Com. of Sup., 6473 (iv).

Lowville to Milton Mail Contract, Distance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 9080 (v).

Lumber purchased by Govt. for Grenville Canal, Price, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1514 (i), 2711 (ii).

Lumpjaw in Cattle, Prevention of : Remarks (Mr. Barr) on conc., 6917 (iv).

Lunenburg Dredging Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7408 (iv).

L'Union Saint Joseph du Canada incorp. B. No. 151 (Mr. Belcourt) M. to present Pet., 2490 ; M. to receive Pet., 2491 (ii) ; 1°*, 5783 (iii) ; 2°*, 5976 (iv) ; in Com., and 3°*, 8146 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 170.)

Lurcher and East Point Lightships, Amounts paid to Contractors, Renewals, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lewis) 2333 (ii).

'Lurcher' Lightship, Expenditure, *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 2747 (ii).

——— Investigation *re* Accident : Statement Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2851 (ii).

——— Memoranda to Dep. Minister of Marine : M. for Copies* (Mr. Lewis) 2333 (ii).

——— Rep. of Capt. Salmon, Laid on Table, 2878 (ii).

——— Submarine Signal *re* : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 2873 (ii). *See* 'Marine,' &c.

Mackenzie, District of, B. No. 157 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 6103 (iv) ; Order dschd., 8176

Mackenzie and Dauphin, Man., Special Reps. from Ret. Officers, Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1336 (i).

Macleod Board of Trade, Pets. *re* Mail Service : Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 9612 (v).

Macleod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co.'s B. No. 78 (Mr. Turriff) 1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 119.)

McAlpine, Mr. E. H., Litigation Expenses *re* Purchase of Canada Eastern Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1522 (i).

McCormack & Sharples Patent Relief, Pet. *re* : M. (Mr. Calvert) to receive, 6558 (iv).

McDermot, Clara Bidwell, Relief B. No. 152 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 5919 (iii) ; 2°*, 5976 ; in Com., 6275, 6347 ; 3° m., 6376 ; agreed to (Y. 38, N. 13) 6377 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 121.)

McDonald, Mr. J. L., Dismissal as Indian School Teacher, N.S.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6514 (iv).

McGill University Grant to Ry. Transportation School : in Com. of Sup., 9381 (v).

McGillicuddy, Mr. D., Emplymt. by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6601 ; Letter to Sir William Mulock, Ref. to, 6601 (iv).

McKenzie, D. D., M.P., Resignation *re* Autonomy B.: Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. on B. 69, 8474 (v).

——— Ques. of Order (Mr. A. Johnston) 8475 ; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 8476 (v).

McKnight, Mr. A., Dismissal as Postmaster from Boissevain P.O.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2327 (ii).

McLaren's Creek Bridge, Trent Canal : in Com. of Sup., 9379 (v).

McMichael, Mr., Customs Inspector, Duties, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 406 (i).

McPherson's Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1735 (i).

Mabou Harbour Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 7408 (iv).

M. C. B. Coupler for Rolling Stock, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 2178 (ii).

Maccan Mail Contract, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 188 (i).

Madoc and Eldorado Ry. Bonus, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 7261 (iv).

Magann & Finn, Payments to *re* Port Colborne Contract : in Com. of Sup., 1232 (i).

Magdalen Island Breakwaters and Piers : in Com. of Sup., 7308 (iv).

Magdalen Island SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 906 (i).

Magog Post Office, Erection of : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5784 (iii).

Magog Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1114 (i).

Mahone Bay Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7408 (iv).

Mail Bags, Locks, Repairs, &c., Contracts *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 205 (i).

Mails carried free by Rys.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 185 (i).

Mail Contracts, Tenders, Competition, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup. 179 (i).

Mail Delivery, Free System, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 729 (i).

Mail Distributing Station, Montreal, Purchase of Site : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 915 (i).

Mail Service, General Vote : in Com. of Sup., 219 (i), 6629 (iv).

——— Miscellaneous Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 9609 (v).

——— System of Payments : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).

See 'Post Office.'

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 864, 919 (i), 6901, 6909, 7087, 7176 (iv), 8691, 9616, 9680 (v).

——— Information *re* System, Utility, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 923 (i).

Mail Subsidies *re* Newfoundland Service : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).

Main à Dieu Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7409 (iv).

'Maisonneuve' Steam Launch, Expenditure by Govt. *re* : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1849 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2744 (ii).

Major's Hill Park, Maintenance : in Com. of Sup., 6817 (iv).

Maladie du Coït, Horse Disease : Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 6702 (iv).

Malignant Cove Channel Piers : in Com. of Sup., 7409 (iv).

Mallein Test for Cattle : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 2317 (ii).

Manchester SS. Line Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 932 (i).

Man. and N.W.T. Govt., Officials, Resignation, &c., 1904 : Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1344 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Pets., &c., *re* : M. (Mr. W. J. Roche) for Copies, 1768 (i).

——— M. for Copies* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2067 (ii).

——— O. C. March 21st, 1905, Reply of Man. Govt. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3744 (ii).

Manitoba Boundaries, Res. passed by Man. Legislature : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4082 (iii).

——— Mr. Jackson's Speech *re* Settlement : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4842 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Memorandum *re* Separate Schools : Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3834 ; Cor. read, 3841 (ii).

——— 'Payment of Political Debts,' Ques. of Order : Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3857 (ii).

——— Naming Member, &c. (Mr. Speaker) 3858.

——— 'Scurvy Politician,' Quotation, &c. : Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3863 (ii).

Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation : M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 3938 (ii).

Manitoba Boundaries, Letter to Cardinal Rampolla : Read (Mr. Foster) 3956 (ii).
——— Letter of Mr. Chas. Russell to Cardinal Rampolla : Read (Mr. Foster) 3957 (ii).
——— Letter of Mr. Fitzpatrick to Bishops of Quebec : Read (Mr. Bergeron) 4053 (ii).
Manitoba, Dom. Buildings : Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) in Com. of Sup., 857 (i).
——— Renewals, Repairs, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1634 (i).
See 'Public Works.'
Man. Elections, Duties of Ret. Officers, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1506 (i).
Manitoba Election Returns, Duties of Returning Officers : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4678 (iii).
——— Voters' Lists returned to Clerk of Crown: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1405 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1672 (i).
Manitoba Farmers, Relief from Grasshopper Scourge : Ques. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 909 (i).
Manitoba Grenadiers, 95th Batt. Reduction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 909 (i).
Manitoba Lake Fishing, Closing of, Cor., Pets., &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. Crawford) 9698 (v).
Manitoba Public Works, Claims for Damages, Pet. *re* : Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 7571 (iv).
Manitoba School Fund, Amt. paid to Man. Govt. Ques. (Mr. Bole) 379 (i).
See 'Autonomy,' &c.
Manitoba, Stony Mountain Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 481 (i).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. : Remarks (Mr. Greenway) on M. for Sup., 6738 (iv).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. No. 114 (Mr. Dyment) 1°* 2185 ; 2°*, 2773 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 6610 ; Sen. Amts., 7625 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 120.)
Manufacturing Industries, Statistics *re* : Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. on B. 5, 1085 (i).
Maple Products, Adulteration of, Prevention by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1340 (i).
Maps for Dom. and N.W.T., Engraving, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7721 (iv), 9307 (v).
Maps, Sale by Govt. : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1476 (i).
Marble Mountain Wharf, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9580 (v).
Marconi Station at Table Head, Glace Bay, Amount expended, Delays, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 383 (i).
Marconi Stations, List : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 2869 (ii).
Marconi System, Grosse Isle : in Com. of Sup., 9604 (v).
Marconi Stations, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6625 (iv).
Marconi Tel. System on Strs. 'Stanley' and 'Minto' : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 188 (i).
Marconi Wireless Cable Service : in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).
Marconi Wireless Tel. Service *re* Govt. Steamers : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2615 (ii).
See 'Wireless,' &c.
Margaree Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7409 (iv).
Margaretville Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7412 (iv).
MARINE :
'Aberdeen,' Boilers, Repairs, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6464 (iv).
'Acadia' Str., Disposition of Fittings, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1849 (i).
Acetylene Gas Lights, Annual Saving, Expenditure, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1592 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
See 'Carbide.'
'Agnes Donahoe,' Schr., Seizure by Uruguayan Govt. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6106 (iv).
——— Seizure : Telegram read (Mr. Wm. Roche) 6137 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) 1507 (i).
Aids to Navigation : in Com. of Sup., 2758 (ii).
Aids to Navigation, *re* St. Lawrence Channel : in Com. of Sup., 2850, 2891 (ii).
——— Repairs to Lighthouses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6636 (iv).
——— programme *re* Boards of Trade : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 6641 (iv).
Anglo-American Tel. Co., P.E.I., Charges, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).
Anticosti Lightships, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 1850 (i).
Arctic Expedition, Capt. Peary's Voyage : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4753 (iii).
Bicquet Lighthouse Keeper, Name, Salary, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3202 (ii).
Bout de L'Isle Ferry Service, Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 9696 (v).
Bronte Pier Lighthouse : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 2868 (ii).
——— Statement *re* : (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 9176 (v).
Brothers' Light, Salary of Keeper : Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).
Buoy Contracts, Tenders, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2742 (ii).
Buoys, Construction and Maintenance : in Com. of Sup., 2729 (ii).

MARINE—*Con.*
'Canada'-'Cape Breton' Accident, 'Statement of Case': M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 2067 (ii).
——— Report *re* Investigation, Instructions, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2625 (ii).
——— Capt. Salmon's Resignation, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Ames) 384 (i).
'Canada,' Str., Expenditure *re* Equipment, Names of Employees, Payments to, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 1399 (i).
Carbide for Acetylene Gas Purposes, Quantity purchased: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 914 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2710, 2743 (ii).
'Champlain,' Str., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 149 (i).
See 'Ice Breakers.'
Coal Supply for Govt. Steamers, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2613 (ii).
'De Levis,' Str., for Hydrographic Survey, Total Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 914 (i).
Dom. Lighthouse Depot, Kingston, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 914 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 915 (i).
'Druid,' Str., Expenditure *re* Maintenance: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 2703 (ii).
Fog Signals, Submarine: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 891 (i).
Gas Plant, Parry Sound, Purchase of Property: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2725 (ii).
Godbout, Mr. J., Lighthouse-keeper, Political Partisanship *re* Dom. Elections: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1343 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Expenditure *re* Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1349 (i).
——— Maintenance, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2595 (ii), 6464 (iv).
——— Purchase of Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2617 (ii).
——— Statement of Expenditure: Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2597 (ii).
Grand Manan, N.B., Life-saving Crew, Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 4921 (iii).
Halifax Lightship, Maintenance, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2708 (ii).
Harbours and Boards of Commissioners, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1063 (i).
Harbours Buoys, Maintaining, Placing, &c., Contracts *re*: M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret.*, 917 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, Marine Dept., Que.: in Com. of Sup., 2448 (ii).
Harrison, Capt., Allowance *re* Services: in Com. of Sup., 6466 (iv).

MARINE—*Con.*
Hospital Dues for Sick Mariners Fund, Surplus, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2687 (ii).
Hydrographic Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 2679 (ii), 6623 (iv), 9172 (v).
See 'De Levis.'
Ice-Boats, Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9177 (v).
Ice-breaker 'Montcalm,' Accident to, Information: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4752 (iii).
——— Statement (Mr. Préfontaine) 4752 (iii).
Ice-breakers *re* St. Lawrence Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6464 (iv), 9617 (v).
——— Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9034 (v).
See 'Champlain.'
'James W.', Schooner, Rescue of Crew by SS. 'Durango': Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4198 (iii).
Kingston Lighthouse Depot, Establishment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 914 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 915 (i).
'Lady Laurier,' Govt. Str., Accident, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2597 (ii).
——— Number of Crew at Halifax: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 2616 (ii).
Lemieux, Jos., Appnmt. *re* Lightship Service, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1762 (i).
Lepreaux Point Light, &c., Caretaker, Investigation *re* Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6475 (iv).
Leslie, Capt., Wrecking Plant in St. Lawrence Channel: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 2476 (ii).
Lifeboat Crews, N.S., Number, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 912 (i).
Life-saving Crew, Grand Manan, N.B., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 4921 (iii).
Life Saving Stations and Rewards: in Com. of Sup., 2624 (ii).
Lighthouse Agencies, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2705 (ii).
Lighthouse Construction as Aids to Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 9175 (v).
Lighthouse Service and Aids to Nav., Applications from Lighthouse Board: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lewis) 917 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 2850 (ii), 9035 (v).
——— Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
Lighthouse, Bay of Quinté: Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).
Lighthouse Depot at Kingston, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 914 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 915 (i).
——— Prescott, Tenders *re* Contract: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1340 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*

Lighthouse Engineers, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2760 (ii).

Lighthouse Keeper at Bicquet, Name, Salary, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3202 (ii).

Lighthouse Keepers' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 2698 (ii), 9175 (v).

Lighthouse Revolving Lights, Maintenance of : in Com. of Sup., 2704 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service Steamers, Ports of Call, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 1850 (i).

Lighthouse Supply Depots : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2709 (ii).

Lightships, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2706 (ii), 6636 (iv).

Lightships, &c., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9035 (v).

'Lurcher' and East Point Lightships, Amounts paid to Contractors, Renewals, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lewis) 2333 (ii).

'Lurcher' Lightship, Expenditure *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 2747 (ii).

——— Investigation *re* Accident : Statement Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2851 (ii).

——— Memoranda to Dep. Minister of Marine: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lewis) 2333 (ii).

——— Rep. of Capt. Salmon laid on Table 2878 (ii).

——— Submarine Signal *re* : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 2873 (ii).

Marconi Wireless Cable Service : in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).

Marconi Wireless Tel. Service *re* Govt. Steamers : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2615 (ii).

——— on Strs. 'Stanley' and 'Minto' : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 188 (i).

Marconi Stations, List : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 2869 (ii).

Marconi Tel. System on Strs. 'Stanley' and 'Minto' : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 188 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Circulars *re* Private Tenders, Cor., &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1399 (i).

Marine Supplies, Purchase of : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 4753 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Orders with or without Tender : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lalor) 1397 (i).

Marine Deptl. Supplies : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lalor) 2594 (ii).

Marine Hospitals, Fernhill Cemetery, Care of: in Com. of Sup., 6628 (iv).

Marine Hospitals for Sick Seamen : in Com. of Sup., 2686 (ii).

Marine Hospital, Yarmouth : in Com. of Sup., 9172 (v).

Marine Insurance, Decrease of Rates : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2865 (ii).

MARINE—*Con.*

Marine Officers at Halifax, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. A. Johnston) 2755 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 102 (i), 2443 (ii), 6266 (iv), 9050 (v).

——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Préfontaine) 111 (i), 2594 (ii).

Marine Schools : in Com. of Sup., 2639 (ii).

Marine Technical Officers, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9050 (v).

Masters and Mates Examination : in Com. of Sup., 2623 (ii).

Meteorological Building, Toronto, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1149 (i).

Meteorological Observatory, Removal to Ottawa : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9772 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9800, 9810 (v).

——— Statement (Mr. Préfontaine) 9812 (v).

Meteorological Service : in Com. of Sup., 2679 (ii).

——— Pay-roll List, &c.: M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies*, 917 (i).

Midland Harbour, Range Lights, Complaints *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 2734 (ii).

——— Statement Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2852 (ii).

Moncton Harbour Master, Appnmt. of Mr. D. Robertson : Ques. (Mr. Stockton) 2329 (ii).

'Montcalm,' Ice-breaker, Accident to : Statement (Mr. Préfontaine) 4752 (iii).

——— Experiments *re* Ice-breaking : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).

——— Rep. of Capt. Koenig, and Cor.: Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2451 (ii).

——— Total Cost : Ques. (Mr. Morin) 150 (i).

Montevideo, British Seamen Imprisoned in, Litigation *re* : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2689 (ii).

Naval Militia and Cruiser 'Canada' : in Com. of Sup., 9178 (v).

Naval Militia for Canada, Total Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1346 (i).

——— Policy of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2909 (ii).

Obstructions, Removal of in Navigable Waters : in Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).

Ocean and River Service, Amounts of Payments on Pay-roll, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1349 (i).

Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 2595 (ii), 6463, 6623 (iv), 9171, 9617 (v).

———Maintenance of Steamers : in Com. of Sup., 9034 (v).

——— Removing Obstructions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 151 (i).

——— Strs., Names and Tonnage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 1347 (i).

Parry Sound Buoy Contract : Statement Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2856 (ii).

MARINE—*Con.*
Parry Sound Gas Plant, Purchase of Land, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2725 (ii).
'Petrel,' Repairs to Boilers : in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).
Pilotage Service : in Com. of Sup., 2760 (ii).
Prescott Lighthouse Depot, Total Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1148 (i).
P.E.I. Steam Communication Contract with Steam Nav. Co.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5316 (iii)
P.E.I. and Mainland, Winter Communication, Cor., &c., since Confederation : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 9698 (v).
P. E. I. Steam Communication, Snow Blockade and Delay in Mails : Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 1753 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1595 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2203, 2261 (ii).
——— Explanation (Sir William Mulock) 2261 (ii).
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, Str. 'Stanley,' Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies*, 916 (i)
——— Inspection of Str. 'Stanley' : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 687 (i).
P. E. I. Communication with Mainland : Remarks (Mr. A. Martin), Tel. Read, &c., 831 (i).
——— Tidings of Str. 'Stanley' : Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1338 (i).
P. E. I. Winter Communication, Claims of Travellers *re* Refund of Expenses on account of Delay : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4807 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* Soundings, Tunnel, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2778 (ii).
'Quadra,' Str., Repairs to : in Com. of Sup., 9171 (v).
Reid, Capt., Rep. *re* Submarine Signals : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2886 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep. : Presented (Mr. Préfontaine) 2594 (ii).
Ste. Famille Wharfage Dues, Abolition of : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1150 (i).
St. Lawrence Channel, Aids to Navigation : in Com. of Sup., 2858 (ii).
——— Res. from Montreal Board of Trade : Read, 2859 (ii).
——— Res. from Allan SS. Owners : Read, 2860 (ii).
St. Lawrence Channel, Aids to Navigation : Remarks (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com. of Sup., 2891 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 891 (i).
St. Lawrence River Channel, Dredging, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2448 (ii).
——— 'Montcalm' Ice Breaker, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2451 (ii).

MARINE—*Con.*
St. Lawrence Channel, Lights, Buoy Service, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2703 (ii).
——— New Dredge Plant : in Com. of Sup., 9171 (v).
St. Louis, Lake, Buoy and Light Service : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 2704 (ii).
St. Louis, Capt., Certificate *re* Reinstatement: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 591 (i).
Salmon, Capt., Rep. *re* Accident to Lurcher, Laid on Table 2878 (ii).
——— Resignation *re* 'Canada,' &c., Collision: M. (Mr. Ames) for Cor., 384 (i).
See 'Canada-Cape Breton.'
Schools of Navigation : in Com. of Sup., 2639 (ii).
'Scotia,' Str., Certificates of Engineers, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8385 (v).
'Scout,' Str., Compensation Claims *re* Injuries, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 6463 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re* Cost Service : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 2700 (i).
——— Investigation *re* Explosion of Acetylene Gas, Appnmt. of Experts : Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4841 (iii).
——— Repairs, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6643 (iv).
Shipwrecked Seamen : in Com. of Sup., 2688 (ii).
Signal Service *re* Lighthouses : in Com. of Sup., 2760 (ii).
See 'Fog,' &c.
Steamboat Inspection : in Com. of Sup., 6628 (iv).
——— Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).
Stevens, Douglas, Answer to Capt. Salmon's Rep. *re* 'Lurcher' Accident : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2878 (ii).
Stevens, Mrs. Douglas, Gratuity : in Com. of Sup., 6628 (iv).
Submarine Signal Apparatus : Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 892 (i).
——— Installation : in Com. of Sup., 2871 (ii).
——— Reps. of U.S., List of Stations : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2871 (ii).
Submarine Signal Co. of Boston, Cor. with Min. of Mar., &c. : M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies*, 917 (i).
Sydney Harbour Pilots, Charges *re* Widows and Orphans Fund : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9036 (v).
Tidal Service, Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).
Toronto Island Fog Horns, Nuisance *re* Testing : Remarks (Mr. Kemp) 9281, Cor., &c. (read) 9282 (v).

MARINE—*Con.*
Vessels, List of: Rep. Presented (Mr. Préfontaine) 6907 (iv).
Wharfs, Piers, Docks, constructed by Govt. since 1896: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2777 (ii).
Winter Mail Service, P.E.I., Ice Boat: in Com. of Sup., 2648 (ii).
——— Cor. Read (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2649; Res. from P.E.I. Delegates (read)—(Mr. A. A. McLean) 2651 (ii).
——— Statement of Trips of Ice Boats: Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2675 (ii).
See 'P.E.I.' &c.
Wrecks, Investigation *re*, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6466 (iv).
Wrecking Plant *re* Life Saving Stations: in Com. of Sup., 2624 (ii).
Wrecking Plant *re* St. Lawrence Channel: in Com. of Sup., 2476 (ii).
[illegible] Express,' I.C.R., Running Time [illegible]ks (Mr. Lavergne) 6831 (iv).
Markey, F. H., Lease to *re* Fishing Rights in N. Western Lakes: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).
Martineau Defalcations, Evidence *re* Bank Suit: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 112 (i).
Martin, Eli, Emplymt. in Customs Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7097 (iv).
Marquette Voters' Lists, Original Copy: M. for Copy* (Mr. Roche) 97 (i).
Maskinongé River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6842, 7325 (iv), 9590 (v).
Masters and Mates Certificate B. No. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) 1°*, 9; on Order for 2°*, 733 (i).
——— B. No. 44 (Mr. Lancaster) 1° m., 684; on Order for 2°, 918, 1399 (i).
Masters and Mates Certificate B. No. 44 (Mr. Lancaster): Remarks on M. to adjn., 3249 (ii).
Masters and Mates Examination: in Com. of Sup., 2623 (ii).
Matchedash Bay Channel Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iv).
Matthews, Geo., Co., Claims *re* Damages by Flooding: in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).
Meadow Creek Ranching Co., Patent *re* Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 6476 (iv).
Meaford Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iv).
——— Mr. A. Pigott's Claims: in Com. of Sup., 9599 (v).
Medical Attendance, Indians, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 9599 (v).
——— Indians, Ont., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 223 (i).
——— P.E.I., Indians: in Com. of Sup., 6537 (iv).
See 'Indians.'
Medical Officers in Militia Districts, Appnmt., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 417 (i).
Medical Officers in Militia, and Independence of Parlt. Act: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 418 (i).
Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. No. 74 (Mr. P. Talbot) 1°*, 1671; 2°*, 1758 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 122.)
Medicine Hat Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
Meetings after six o'clock Recess: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 450 (i).
Megantic Lake Piers: in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
Melbourne and Upper Melbourne Mail Contract, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4372 (iii).
Melfort Mail Service, Complaint from Board of Trade, Saskatchewan, *re* Delays: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9789 (v).
Members introduced: 111, 624, 1846 (i), 5234 (iii), 7420 (iv).
Members Speeches, Delay in Printing at Bureau: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7723 (iv).
Memramcook Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 1077 (i).
Mess. from His Ex., Opening of Parlt.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 4 (i).
——— Read (Mr. Speaker) 6165 (iv).
——— (Suppl. Estimates) 1906 (read) 8718 (v).
Messengers, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 240 (i).
See 'House of Commons.'
Metal Volatilization Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 183 (Mr. McCool) 1°*, 7810 (iv); M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096; 2°*, 8146; in Com., and 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 123.).
Meteghan Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
Meteorological Building, Toronto, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1149 (i).
Meteorological Observatory, Removal to Ottawa: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9772 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9800, 9810 (v).
——— Statement (Mr. Prefontaine) 9812 (v).
Meteorological Service: in Com. of Sup., 2679 (ii).
——— Pay-Roll List, &c.: M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies*, 917 (i).
Methylated Spirits, Purchased by Excise Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 1691 (i).
Metric System, Adoption of: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1694 (i).
Mexico Steamers, Subsidy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1560 (i).
Middle Fork Falls, Location of, Sale or Lease by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 9079 (v).
Midland Govt. Dock and Storehouse, Tenants and Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5428 (iii).

Midland Harbour, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 9601 (v).
——— Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iv).
——— Range Lights, Complaints *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 2734 (ii).
——— Statement Read (Mr. Prefontaine) 2852 (ii).
Mileage *re* Mail Service, Additional : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 184 (i).
Military College : *See* 'Royal.'
Militia Act Amt. B No. 170 (Sir Frederick Borden) Res. prop., 6905 ; in Com. on Res., 6984 ; 1°*, of B., 6991 ; on Order for 2°, 7263 ; 2° m., 9179 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9198 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 22.)
MILITIA :
Accountant of Militia Board : in Com. of Sup., 434 (i).
Advisory Board *re* Militia, Constitution of, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 415 (i).
Ammunition, Small Arms, Inspection of : in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Annual Drill *re* Militia : in Com. of Sup., 441 (i), 6512 (iv).
Cadet Corps, Ammunition supplied : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) 7815 (iv).
Dominion Arsenal : in Com. of Sup., 9170 (v).
——— Ammunition, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7012 (iv).
——— Col. Gaudet's Salary : in Com. of Sup., 6513 (iv).
——— Establishment of : in Com. of Sup., 445 (i).
Dress Regulation for Military Officers : in Com. of Sup., 438 (i).
Dundonald, Earl of, Cor., O.Cs., &c., *re* Dismissal : M. for Copies* (Mr. Belcourt) 3205 (ii).
Esquimalt and Halifax Garrisons, Situation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9128 (v).
Esquimalt Defences : in Com. of Sup., 9170 (v).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Abandonment by Imp. Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 188 (i).
Halifax and Esquimalt Defences, Cor., O.Cs., &c., with Dom. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 2334 (ii).
——— Abandonment of by G.B.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9677 (v).
——— Par. in Ottawa 'Journal' *re* Govt. Control : Read (Mr. S. Hughes) 1402 (i).
Halifax Fortifications, Retention of Imperial Troops : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6510 (iv).
Halifax Military Equipment : Semarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6511 (iv).
Highland Cadet Corps, Montreal, Letter *re* : Read (Mr. Monk) 7813 (iv).
MILITIA—*Con.*
Hospital, St. John's, P.Q., Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5687 (iii).
Inspector General of Militia : in Com. of Sup., 437 (i).
Kentvile Militia Camp, Purchase of Site, Charges *re* : Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) on M. for Sup., 6656 (iv).
——— Judgment of Exchequer Court, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6664, 7584 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) on M. for conc., 9686 (v).
——— statement read (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 9706 (v).
——— Rep. of Evidence, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 8698 (v).
King's Regulations and Orders : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 54 (i).
London Militiamen at Niagara : Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* London Elections, 7249 (iv).
——— Telegrams read (Sir Frederick Borden) 7331 (iv).
Manitoba Grenadiers, 95th Batt. Reduction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jackson) 909 (i).
Medical Officers in Militia Districts, Appnmt., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 417 (i).
Military Buildings, Fredericton, Tenders *re* Construction : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 728 (i).
Military Camp Casualties, Indemnity *re* : Remarks (Mr. Worthington) in Com. of Sup., 9147 (v).
Military Camps : Remarks (Mr. Worthington) in Com. of Sup., 442 (i).
Military Camp, Establishment of at S. Simcoe : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 9712 (v).
Military Depots, Chain of, Ref. to in General Statement, on Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) 9112 (v).
Military School for Montreal, Selection of Site : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7009 (iv).
Military Sites, Purchased of : Remarks (Mr. Worthington) in Com. of Sup., 427 (i).
Military Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
Military Training Camp, Central Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. White) 268 (i).
Militia and Defence, Accountant's Salary : in Com. of Sup., 9067 (v).
——— Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 9068 (v).
——— Deptl. Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 112 (i).
Militia Council, Appnmt. of Officers : Remarks (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. of Sup., 415 (i).
——— Memorandum laid on Table (Sir Frederick Borden) 9073 (v).
——— Memorandum : Read (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9116 (v).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Militia Council, Regulations : Read (Sir Frederick Borden) 420 (i).
——— Appnmt. of Heads : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 432 (i).
Militia, Equipment for Defences : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 446 (i).
Militia Estimates, Permanent Force (general statement): in Com. of Sup., 9105 (v).
——— Unfair Criticism *re* : Remarks (Sir Frederick Borden) 9099 (v).
Militia Force, Reduction of : Explanation (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for Sup., 6992 (iv).
——— Infantry Corps, Reduction of, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Belcourt) 7019 (iv).
Militia Medical Officers, Disqualifications as Members of H. of C.: Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8997 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., Cor. read, 9149 (v).
Militiamen at London Elections, Voting, Tel.: Read (Sir Frederick Borden) 7331 (iv).
See 'London.'
Militiamen, Pensions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6957 (iv).
Militia, Officers gazetted *re* Examinations, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 8886 (v).
——— Orders and Civil Servants : Remarks (Mr. Perley) 1260 (i).
——— Pay and Allowance : in Com. of Sup., 415 (i), 6510 (iv).
———Staffs of Officers, Reduction in Number : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 5315 (iv).
——— Stores : in Com. of Sup., 6513 (iv).
———Tranportation : in Com. of Sup., 6513 (iv).
Miltimore, Lt. J. M., Application *re* Permission to attend Cavalry School, Toronto : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 6383 (iv).
Ninety-Fifth Batt, Reduction and Disbandment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jackson) 909 (i).
Pay and Allowance *re* Militia : in Com. of Sup., 6510 (iv).
Permanent Force, Recruiting Points, Total Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5977 (iv).
Plains of Abraham, Number of Acres purchased by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
Quebec Military School, Improvement of : Remarks (Mr. O. E. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 9162 (v).
Rifle Grants : in Com. of Sup., 444 (i), 9169 (v).
Ross Rifles, Examination of, &c.: Remarks (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9123 (v).
Ross Rifle Factory, Tank on Martello Tower : Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 431 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Royal Military College : in Com. of sup., 7000 (iv), 9170 (v).
Royal Scots Armoury, Military Properties : in Com. of Sup., 9169 (v).
Sherbrooke Armouries, Provision for Militia, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 266 (i).
——— Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 191 (i).
Simcoe Military Camp, Establishment of : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 9712 (v).
S.A. War, King's Medals for Canadian Soldiers : M. for Cor., &c.,* (Mr. Worthington) 3204 (ii).
Sussex Rifle Range, Inspector : Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7011 (iv).
Target Ranges : in Com. of Sup., 445 (i).
Uniforms for Militia, Regulation *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 438 (i).
Veterans of 1866 and 1870, Grants of Lands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6047 (iv).
Woodstock, N.B., Rifle Range, Purchase of Land : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 5132 (iii).
Milk River Ranche, Quarantine, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2312 (ii).
Mill Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
Mille Vache Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7310 (iv).
Miltimore, Lt. J. M., Application *re* Permission to attend Cavalry School, Toronto : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 6383 (iv).
Miminegash Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1735 (i).
——— Contract *re* Repairs : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1350 (i).
——— Dredging, Commencement of Work : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3834 (ii).
Mineral Specimens for Exhibitions : in Com. of Sup., 6269 (iv).
Mines Branch, Int. Dept. : in Com. of Sup., 6264 (iv).
Mines Branch, Smelting Ore Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 9303 (v).
Ministers' Absence from House : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1285 (i).
Ministerial Changes since 1904, Mr. Aylesworth's Position (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1336
Ministers of Finance and Interior, Absence, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 321 (i).
'Minto,' Str., Losses to P.E.I. Merchants *re* Damaged Goods : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2623 (ii).
Mint, Royal, Building : in Com. of Sup., 606 (i).
Mint, Royal Canadian, Estimated Cost, Capacity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2185, 2326 (ii).
——— Establishment of in Can., Cor. with Imp. Govt. : M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies*, 916 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 2595 (ii), 7424 (iv), 8387 (v).

Miscellaneous Expenditure, Charwomen : in Com. of Sup., 6268 (iv).

Miscellaneous Legal Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 6723 (iv).

Miscou Harbour Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7498 (iv).

Mistook Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7310 (iv).

Mitchell Bridge, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1940 (i).

Mitchell, Diversion of Line, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1940 (i).

Molsons Bank B. No. 14 (Mr. Ames) 1° m., 317; 2°*, 415; in Com.. 1755; 3°*, 1755 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 124.)

Monarch Bank of Canada incorp. B. No. 164 (Mr. Gordon) 1°*, 6232; 2°*, 6868 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8655 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 125.)

Moncton Harbour Master, Appnmt. of Mr. D. Robertson : Ques. (Mr. Stockton) 2329 (ii).

Moncton, Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 1946 (i), 9391 (v).

——— Shops, Capacity of : Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 1965 (i).

Money transmitted through Mail, Par. in Quebec Papers *re* Legislation : Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4807 (iii).

'Montcalm.' Ice-breaker, Accident to : Statement (Mr. Préfontaine) 4752 (iii).

——— Experiments *re* Ice breaking : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).

——— Rep. of Capt. Koenig, and Cor. : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2451 (ii).

——— Total Cost : Ques. (Mr. Morin) 150 (i).

See 'Marine.'

Monterey Electric and Gas Co.'s B. No. 89 (Mr. Macdonell) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 126.)

Montevideo, British Seamen imprisoned in, Litigation *re* : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2689 (ii).

See 'Marine—Agnes,' &c.

Mont Louis Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7310 (iv).

Montmagny Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7311 (iv).

Montmorency Falls Cribwork : in Com. of Sup., 7311 (iv).

Montmorency Wharf, Expenditure *re* by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 1015 (i).

——— Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 6852 (iv).

See 'Chateau Richer,' &c.

Montreal Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 1118 (i).

Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. No. 138 (Mr. Piché) 1°*, 4550; 2° m., 4703 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6275 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 127.)

Montreal Customs, Dep. Collector, Appnmt. of: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 256 (i).

Montreal Examining Warehouse : in Com. of Sup., 1119 (i).

Montreal Free Port, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 7317 (iv).

Montreal Grain Warehouses, Preparation of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Piché) 1345 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Power B. No. 192 (Mr. Préfontaine) 1° m., 9028 ; 2°*, 9288 ; in Com., 9288 ; 3°*, 9288 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 23.)

Montreal and G.B., St. John and Manchester, SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 932 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commission, Appnmt. of Members : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 150 (i).

——— Expenditure, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 779 (i).

Montreal Harbour, Grain Conveyors, Preparation of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Piché) 2187 (ii).

——— Permanent Sheds, &c., Cor. between Govt., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. Monk) 153 (i).

——— Preparation of Plans and Specification, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Piché) 2186 (ii).

——— Claims of P. Lyall & Sons, &c.: M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret.*, 1397 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Ames) 687 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Question, 696 (i).

——— Cor. between P. W. St. George and Mar. Dept.: M. for Copies (Mr. Ames) 689 (i).

——— Rep. of Mr. Geo. S. Green, *re* Plans, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 3204 (ii).

——— Steel Sheds, Contract *re* : Remarks (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. of Sup., 761 (i).

Montreal Harbour, Raising of Sunken Elevator: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 151 (i).

Montreal Inland Revenue Building : in Com. of Sup., 1119 (i).

——— Addition, Site, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 1120 (i).

Montreal Military Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1125 (i).

Montreal, Ottawa, Kingston & Co. : *See* 'Kingston and Dom., &c.'

Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. No. 47 (Mr. Geoffrion) 1°*, 728 ; 2°*, 1101 (i).

Montreal Postal Station : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1128 (i).

Montreal Post Office, Charges *re* Registered Letters : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 183 (i).

——— Illegal Stamping of Letters for Election Matters : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 194 (i).

——— cor. read (Sir William Mulock) 194 (i).

Montreal Post Office, Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1127 (i).

——— New Station : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 222 (i).

——— Pneumatic Installation, System : in Com. of Sup., 1131 (i).

Montreal Post Office, St. Catherine St. Branch, Rents paid and unsanitary condition : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 201 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 182 (i).

——— Stealing of Cheques, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 198 (i).

Montreal, Quebec, &c., Harbours, Dues and Charges *re* Transportation Problem : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).

Montreal, Quebec and Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 73 (Mr. Gervais) 1°*, 1592 ; 2°*, 1757 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 128.)

Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s B. No. 96 (Mr. Geoffrion) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 129.)

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness, Collections, &c. : M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 402 (i).

Montreal Wharfs, Removal of Shoals, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 7319 (iv).

Moosejaw and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 20 (Mr. Scott) 1°*, 318 ; 2°*, 415 (i) ; in Com., 2715, 2762 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 130.)

Moosejaw Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).

Moose Lake Fishing Licenses, Grants to by Govt. : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).

Moose Mountain Indian Agency, Letter from Rev. E. Mackenzie : Read (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 9337 (v).

Morning Sittings : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9081 (v).

Morrell River Bridge Swing Span, P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 2177 (ii).

——— Complaints *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5035 (iii).

Morrison, Hector D., Customs Officer at Pinette, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2330 (ii).

Motions, Notices of, and Order Paper : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9523 (v).

Mounted Police Act Amt. B. No. 8 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) Res. prop., 59 ; in Com., 98 ; 1°*, 109 ; 2°*, 459 ; in Com., 459 ; 3°*, 465 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 24.)

See 'N. W. M. P.' &c.

Mount Stewart Wharf, P.E.I. : Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 9585 (v).

Mud Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7500 (iv).

Municipal Telephone System, Application *re* Port Arthur, &c., before Ry. Commission : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 595 (i).

See 'Telephone.'

Murphy, Albert Edward Relief B. No. 126 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 3091 ; 2°*, 3400 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 131.)

Murray Bay and Riviere Ouelle SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 938 (i).

Murray Canal Inspector : Remarks (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).

Murray Canal Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 1495 (i).

Murray Harbour Branch, P.E.I. Ry., Amount due Contractors, &c. : (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2064 (ii).

——— Claims for Land Damages from T. Curley, &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2334 (ii).

——— Completion, Delegation *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 265 (i).

——— Completion, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 189 (i).

——— Total Expenditure to Jan., 1905 : Ques. (Mr. A. McLean) 106 (i).

Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 2038, 2127 (ii), 8692, 9482 (v).

See 'I.C.R.-P.E.I. Ry.'

Museum, Geological : in Com. of Sup., 754 (i).

See 'Interior,' &c.

Musquodoboit Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6224 (iv).

See 'Stewart.'

Mutual Reserve Insurance Co., Payment of Claims, &c. : Ques. (Mr. T. Martin) 2332 (ii).

Narrows Lake Quarry Channel : in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).

National Boundary Fence : in Com. of Sup., 8672 (v).

See 'N.W.T. Boundary,' &c.

National Transcontinental Ry. : *See* 'G.T.P. Ry.,' &c.

Naturalization Act, Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 6957 (iv).

Naturalization and Aliens Act Amt. B. No. 184 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1°*, 7906 (iv) ; 2°*, 8685 ; in Com., 8685, 8689 ; 3°*, 8690 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 25.)

Naval Militia and Cruiser 'Canada' : in Com. of Sup., 9178 (v).

Naval Militia of Canada, Total Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1346 (i).

——— Policy of Govt. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2909 (ii).

Neepawa Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).

Nelson River, &c., Fishing Rights : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).

New Brunswick Southern Ry., Negotiations *re* Purchase, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 584 (i).

New Campbellton Ballast Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).

New Carlisle Wharf Pier Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7312 (iv).

Newcastle Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).

Newcastle Station Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1967 (i).

Newfoundland Mail Subsidies : in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).

New London, P.E.I., Breakwater Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 1735 (i).

Newport Breakwater Extension, Que. : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).

Newport Landing Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).

Newspapers, Sensational Reports *re* Interviewing Prisoners : Remarks (Mr. Lavergne) 3250 (ii).

New Westminster, B.C., Dom. Exhibition, Grant : in Com. of Sup., 9339, 9608 (v).

——— Penitentiary, Payment to W. A. Duncan : in Com. of Sup., 9684 (v).

Niagara Fruit Growers' Association, Cor. *re* : Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 9395 (v).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. No. 39 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 132.)

Niagara-Welland Power Co.'s B. No. 40 (Mr. Guthrie) 1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1710 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 133.)

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s B. No. 34 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., 1706 ; 3°*, 1755 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 134.)

Nicolas, Mr., Emplymt. by Geological Survey Dept. : on Conc., 9685 (v).

Nicolet, Controverted Election, Certificate from Judges : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 9081 (v).

Nicolet Pier Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7313 (iv).

Ninety-Fifth Battalion, Reduction and Disbandment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 909 (i).

Nixon, Jos., Appnmt., as Lands Agent at Macleod, N.W.T. : Explanation (Mr. Oliver) 6110 (iv).

——— Appnmt. as Land Agent : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5718 (iii).

——— Charges *re* Irregularities : M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8098 (v).

——— Delays in Answers to Questions : Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 9075 (v).

——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 6048 (iv).

——— Investigation : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8697 (v).

——— M. (Mr. Foster) to reduce Vote *re* Salary, 9316 (v).

——— Second Investigation, Letter *re* Payment of Money : Read (Mr. Foster) 9787 (v).

See 'Interior,' &c.

Noel Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).

Noonday Gun, Firing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 121 (i).

North Atlantic Trading Co. and Bonuses *re* Immigrants : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9318 (v).

——— Notice of M. (Mr. Osler) 9329 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8182 (v).

——— Prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) on M. for Sup., 9437 ; Neg. (Y. 40, N. 76) 9480 (v).

——— Protests *re*: Remarks (Mr Monk) 8887 (v).

——— Inquiry for Contract (Mr. U. Wilson) 8145 (v).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 7906 (iv).

North Bay Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1563 (i).

Northern Bank B. No. 104 (Mr. Bole) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 135.)

North Hastings, Census Enumerators, Payments to : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. on B. 5, 1077 (i).

North Thompson River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).

North Thompson River, B.C., Improvements *re* Navigation, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5783 (iii).

Northwest Cases, Re-hearing before Ry. Commission : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 56 (i).

Northwest Coal and Coke Ry. Co.'s B. No. 140 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 100.)

Northwest Irrigation Act Amt. B. No. 161 (Mr. Oliver) 1° m., 6104 (iv) ; 2°*, 8775; in Com., 8775 ; 3°*, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 26.)

N. W. Land Titles Office, Registrars' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 9249 (v).

N. W. Mounted Police, Patrol Boat : in Com. of Sup., 9178 (v).

——— Pay of Force, N. W. Ter.: in Com. of Sup., 8657 (v).

——— Pensions : in Com. of Sup., 6957 (iv).

——— Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 78 (i).

——— Yukon Force : in Com. of Sup., 8662 (v).

See 'Mounted Police,' &c.

Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. No. 28 (Mr. Turriff) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., for 3°*, 2714 (ii) ; 3° m., 2325 ; on Order for 3*, 2714 (ii) ; 3° m. 6346 ; Sen. Amts., 7683 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 136.)

N. W. Ter. Autonomy : *See* 'Autonomy,' &c.

Northwest Territories B. No. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 6104 (iv) ; 2° m., 8763 ; in Com., 8764 ; 3°*, 9408 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 27.)

N. W. T. Boundary, Erection of Wire Fencing, Contract *re* : Ques (Mr. Clements) 5478 (iii).

——— Contract *re* Erection of Wire Fencig : M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5578 (iii).

N. W. T., Boundary Line, Wire Fence Contract, Letter from Dep. Min. Cory and Hon. R. F. Sutherland: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5689-91 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5808 (iii), 5961 (iv).

Northwest Territories, Govtl. Grant : in Com. of Sup., 9622 (v).

N. W. T. Govt. Lands, Sale of in 1903-4, Rates &c: M. for O.C.* (Mr. Foster) 164 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 1154 (i).

N. W. T. Govt. Officials, Interference *re* Elections and Political Partisanship : Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 9713 (v).

N. W. T. Grazing Leases, Number issued, Names of Lessees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5478 (iii).

N. W. T. Officials and Interference in Political Campaigns : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9254 (v).

Northwest Territories Representation Act Amt. B. No. 156 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 6046 (iv) ; 2°*, 8769 ; in Com., 8769 ; 3°*, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 28.)

N. W. T. Supreme Court Judges, Additional : in Com of Sup., 9683 (v).

Northwest Ters. Surveys, Number of Milles, Total Cost, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1396 (i).

N. W. Ter., Voters' Lists : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2594 (ii).

Notre Dame du Portage Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).

Oaths of Office, Administration of, B. No. 1 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1°*, 5, pro forma.

Obstructions, Removal of in Navigable Waters : in Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).
See 'Marine.'

Ocean and River Service, Amount of Payments on Pay-roll, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1349 (i).

Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 2595 (ii), 6463, 6623 (iv), 9171, 9617 (v).

——— Maintenance of Steamers : in Com. of Sup., 9034 (v).

——— Removing Obstructions &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 151 (i).

——— Strs., Names and Tonnage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 1347 (i).

Officials dismissed by Mr. Whitney : Remarks (Mr. Finlay) in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iv).

Ogden's Pond Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).

Oil and Supplies, I.C.R., Purchases *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2246 (ii).

Oka Indians, Settlement of Claims, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 235 (i).

Oliphant Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).

Oliver, Hon. Frank, Appnmt. as Minister of Interior : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4201
See 'Interior' &c.

Ontario Boundaries, Cor. with Dom. Govt.: Inquiry for (Mr. Barker) 3590 (ii).

——— Cor. with Ross Govt.: Inquiry for (Mr. Barker) 4078 (ii).

Ontario Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp B. No. 105 (Mr. Boyce) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 ; in Com., 2772 ; 3°* 2950 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 137.)

Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 113 (Mr. Dyment) 1°* 2185 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5132 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 138.)

Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s, Limited, B. No. 86 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 1933 (i) ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 2715, 2763, 3134 ; 3°*, 3135 (ii) ; Sen. Amts., 9817 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 139.)

Ontario Subsidies, Letter from Premier of Ont. to Fin. Min.: Read (Mr. Henderson) 6092 (iv).

Orangemen, Attack by Quebec papers 'Yellow Dog' Quotations : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. on B. 39, 8350 (v).
See 'Autonomy,' &c.

Order, Ques. of, Naming Member : Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3858 (ii).

——— Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 3879 (ii).

Order, Ques. of, 'Political Advantage,' Charges by Mr. Belcourt *re* Mr. Foster's Speech on Autonomy Bill, 3517 ; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 3520 (ii).
See 'Personal,' 'Privilege.'

Original Construction, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1912 (i).

Orillia Public Building, Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).

Ormrod, Wm., Dismissal from Burritt's Rapids Locks : Ques. (Mr. Reid) 8381 (v).

Oshawa Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).

Oshawa Harbour Revenues, Amounts, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1504 (i).

Oshawa Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1564 (i).

Otonabee River, Damages by Floods, Claim of Mr. Jas. Clarke : M. (Mr. Ward) for Copy of Cor., 1396 (i).

Otonabee River, Peterborough Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6886, 7564 (iv).

Ottawa, Additions to Eastern Block : in Com. of Sup., 9547 (v).

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Surveys : Inquiry for Copies of Plans, &c. (Mr. White) 822 (i).

Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. No. 92 (Mr. Belcourt) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 (ii); in Com., 4965, 5736 (iii), 5963 ; 3°*, 5973 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 141.)

Ottawa, Bridges : in Com. of Sup., 6889, 7585 (iv).

Ottawa Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 603, 754 (i), 6814 (iv), 9550 (v).
——— Additions, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
——— Corry Block, Rentals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6818 (iv).
——— Elevator Attendance : in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i), 9551 (v).
——— Heating, Engineers, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i).
——— Heating : in Com. of Sup., 6816 (iv).
——— H. of C. Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
——— Leased by Govt., Location, Taxes paid, &. : Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 379 (i).
——— Lighting Plant, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i).
——— P. O. Savings Bank Dept. : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
——— Purchase of Site, Stmnt., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9605 (v).
——— Rentals : List Read (Mr. Hyman) in Com. of Sup., 1663 (i).
——— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iv).
——— Stmnt. *re* Rentals, &c. (Mr. Hyman) in Com. of Sup., 9605 (v).
——— Steel Shelving : in Com. of Sup., 1564 (i).
——— Telephone Service : in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i).
——— Treasury Vaults : in Com. of Sup., 6825 (iv).
Ottawa City Act Amt. B. No. 180 (Mr. Fielding) 1°*, 7642 (iv) ; 2°*, 8686 ; in Com., 8686; 3°*, 8688 (v). (5 Edward VII., c., 29.)
Ottawa Coal Sheds : in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
Ottawa Drill Hall, Increased Accommodation : Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 271 (i).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. No. 12 (Mr. Galliher) 1°, 316 ; 2°*, 404 ; in Com., 1283 ; On Order for 2°, 1338 ; in Com., 1888 ; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1890 (i), 2532 ; on Order for House again in Com., 2714 ; in Com., 2950, 3170 ; 3° m., 3393; Amt. (Mr. Stewart) Neg. (Y. 56, N. 80) 3398; 3°*, 3399 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 140.)
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. No. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3170 (ii).
——— Letter from W. A. Littlejohn, Toronto City Clerk : Read (Mr. Maclean) 3170 (ii).
——— Letter from Sec. Treas. D. R. Street : Read (Mr. Stewart) 3183 (ii).
——— Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3199 (ii).
Ottawa Grounds, Maintenance, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6817 (iv).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Expenditure: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 7280 (iv).
——— Number of Employees : Ques. (Mr. Préley) 382 (i).
Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 18 (Mr. Belcourt) 1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 415 ; in Com., and 3°*, 864 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 142.)
Ottawa, Parliamentary Library, Extension : in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
Ottawa Post Office, Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).
——— Restoration and Addition to : in Com. of Sup., 1573 (i).
Ottawa River Ry. Co.'s B. No. 81 (Mr. Pirhé) 1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 79.)
Ottawa River Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 7612 (iv).
——— Wharf at Foot of Rideau Canal : in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).
——— Wharf at Riviere du Lievre : in Com. of Sup., 7375 (iv).
Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 143 (Mr. Telford) 1°*, 4644 ; 2°*, 4978 (iii) ; in Com. and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 144.)
Owen Sound Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6886 (iv), 9600 (v).
——— Harbour Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).
Owen Sound P. O., Site *re* : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 1029 (i).
Owen Sound Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 9547 (v) .
Owens : *See* 'David,' &c.
Oxford and London Elections, Resignation of Mr. D. D. McKenzie : Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. on B. 69, 8474 (v).
Oxford, N., Electoral District, Vacancy, Issue of Writ ; Notification (Mr. Speaker) 6046 (iv).
——— Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 8177 (v).
——— Notification to Mr. Speaker (Mr. Sproule) 5961 (v).
——— Issue of Writ : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6135 (iv).
See 'London,' &c.
Oyster Culture, Protection *re* : in Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).
Pacific Bank B. No. 175 (Mr. Galliher) 1° m., 7420 ; 2° m., 7625 (iv) ; in Com., and 3°*, 8146 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 145.)
Pacific Cable Grant : in Com. of Sup., 7239 (iv).
——— Statement Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. of Sup., 7276 (iv).
Packing of Apples : *See* 'Staple Commodities.'
Papal Ablegate : *See* 'Man. Boundaries.'
Paper Goods Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 68 (Mr. Macdonell) 1°*, 1421 ; 2°*, 1541 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 146.)
Parent, Hon. S. N., Appnmt. to G.T.P. Commission : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 699 (i).

Paris Agency, Expenditure *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6958 (iv).

Parker's Cove Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9552, 9576 (v).

Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c.: M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5785 (iii).

Parlour and Dining Cars, I.C.R., Profits, &c., *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).

Parole Office, W. T. Archibald, Salary : in Com. of Sup., 6721 (iv).

Parole System for Convicts : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 465 (i).

Parrsboro, Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9579 (v).

——— Landing Pier Addition : in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).

Parry Sound Buoy Contract : Statement read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2856 (ii).

Parry Sound Gas Plant, Purchase of Land, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2725 (ii).

Parry Sound Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7562 (iv).

Paspebiac and Gaspe Basin SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 944 (i).

Passenger and Freight Rates, Advancement of, Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 1542 (i).

Passenger Stations and Freight Sheds, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1977 (i).

Passes issued, &c., I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 2257 (ii).

Passes over I.C.R. for Legislators of Quebec Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 1922, 1925 ; Reply (Mr. Emmerson) 1925 (i).

Patent Act Amts. *re* Relief Bills : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 6559 (iv).

Patent Examiners Salary Increases : in Com. of Sup., 9056 (v).

Patent Medicines, Inspection of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 1725 (i).

'Patent Record': in Com. of Sup., 1472 (i).

'Patent Record' supplied to Members : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com., of Sup., 1827 (i).

Patterson, T. W., Sale of Dom. Lands, B.C., Price paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4371 (iii).

Paul, Jos., Compensation *re* Injuries : in Com. of Sup., 6463 (iv).

Pay and Allowance *re* Militia : in Com. of Sup., 6510 (iv).

See 'Militia,' &c.

Payne, J. L., Salary Increase : in Com. of Sup., 9062 (v).

Pearson, Geo. Relief B. No. 153 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 5919 (iii) ; 2°*, 6868 ; in Com., 7623 ; 3° m., 7624 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 147.)

Peel Head Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).

Pelee Island Cable Line : in Com. of Sup., 7609 (iv).

Pemberton Band of Indians B.C., Purchase of Land : in Com. of Sup., 9339 (v).

Pembroke Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).

Pembroke Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7562 (iv).

Penetanguishene Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).

Penetanguishene Harbour Dredging, Name of Owner of Boat : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2063 (ii).

Penitentiary Coal Contracts, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 478 (i).

Penitentiaries, General Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 465 (i).

See 'Justice,' &c.

Penny Banks, Charters, Stmnt. *re* Business, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 687 (i).

Pensions, Compensation in Lieu of Land : in Com. of Sup., 6956 (iv).

Pension Scheme I.C.R., for Old Age : Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 2492 (ii).

See 'Employees,' &c.

Pensions : in Com. of Sup., 6956 ; conc., 6961 (iv).

Perce (North Cove) Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).

Pere Marquette Ry., Emplymt. of Aliens, Rep. *re* : Laid on Table (Sir William Mulock) 6232 (i).

——— Employees : Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Ingram) 7916 (iv).

Peribonca (Petite Riviere) Removal of Snags : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).

Permanent Force, Recruiting Points, Total Number, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5977 (iv).

See 'Militia,' &c.

Personal Explanation *re* Voting in Ottawa (Mr. Logan) 562 (i).

Peterborough Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1578 (i).

Peterborough Immigrant Homes, Inspection *re* : Remarks (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. of Sup., 7694 (iv).

Petewawa Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7562 (iv).

Petitions, Presenting, Endorsement of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 2490 (ii).

Petition *re* Separate Schools in Autonomy Bill : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2319 (ii).

See 'Autonomy,' &c.

Petit de Grat SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 966 (i).

Petite Riviere, Improvements, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9580 (v).

Petit Rocher Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7500 (iv).

'Petrel.' Repairs to Boilers : in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).

Petroleum Bounties, Payments, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).
Phinney's Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 9552 (v).
Photographs : *See* 'Copyright.'
Pictou Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 9390 (v).
Pictou Cattle Disease, Investigation *re* Cause, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 9079 (v).
Pictou and Cheticamp SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 935 (i).
Pictou and Montague Bridge SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 926 (i).
Pierreville Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
Piers and Breakwaters, P.E.I., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1737 (i).
Piers and Bridges, General Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7305 (iv).
See 'Pub. Works,' &c.
Pilotage Service : in Com. of Sup., 2760 (ii).
Pinette Customs Officer, Mr. H. D. Morrison : Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2330 (ii).
Pitblado, Isaac Relief B. No. 185 (Mr. Bole) 1°*, 7906 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 148.)
Plains of Abraham, Number of Acres purchased by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
Pleasant Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).
Plunkett, Geo., Contract *re* Coal for Kingston Penitentiary : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 478 (i).
Plympton Breakwater Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).
Pneumatic Tube Installation in Montreal P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 1131 (i).
——— Toronto P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
——— Cost, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 217 (i).
Pointe au Baril Route, Georgian Bay : in Com. of Sup., 6888 (iv).
Pointe du Chene Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7500 (iv).
Point Edward Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6869, 7563 (iv).
Point Prim Island Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 1736 (i).
Poirierville Landing Pier, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).
Police Patrol Boats in Northern Waters : in Com. of Sup., 9177 (v).
Political Crisis in Quebec, Par. from 'Le Journal' : Read (Mr. Leonard) 753 (i).
——— Explanation asked for (Mr. Leonard) 822 (i).
'Political Debts, Payment of,' Ques of Order *re* Man. Boundaries : Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3357 (ii).
Pollock, Mr. J. R., Emplymt. by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Lake) 190 (i).
Poonamalie Dam, Contribution *re* Repairs : Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 9379 (v).
Port Arthur Dredging Contract, Advertisement *re* Tenders : Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 6875 (iv).
——— Tender of Conmee & Bowman : M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4458, 4645 (iii).
——— Tenders *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5963 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 2685 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2263 (ii), 4921 (iii).
Port Arthur, Fort William and Kaministiquia Harbours, Amount of Expenditure : M. for Ret..* (Mr. S. Hughes) 1398 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1065 (i).
Port Arthur, Fort William Telephone System, Cor. *re* Application to Board of Ry. Commissioners : M. (Mr. Boyce) for Copies, 1391 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 595 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 2203 (ii).
Port Arthur Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 784 (i).
Port Bruce Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).
Port Burwell Dredging Contract, Purchase of Dredge, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Blain) 8656 (v).
Port Burwell Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).
Port Burwell Work, Contractor, Prices paid, &c : Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 589 (i).
Port Colborne : in Com. of Sup., 1263 (i).
Port Colborne Breakwater, Elevator, &c., Cor., Papers, &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 2067 (ii).
Port Colborne, Deepening Summit Level : in Com. of Sup., 1232 (i).
——— Eastern Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 815 (i).
——— Elevator : in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1288 (i).
——— Entrance Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1230 (i).
Port Credit Dredging : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6871, 7555 (iv).
Port Dover Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
Port Essington, B.C., and Queen Charlotte Islands Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 9616 (v).
Port Greville Breakwater Extension : in Com., of Sup., 7414 (iv).
Port Hastings Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).
Port Hawkesbury Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6837 (iv).
Port Hood, N.S., Breakwater, Estimated Cost, Approval, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5132 (iii).

Port Hood Harbour, Northern Entrance : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).
Port Hope Piers and Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
Port La Tour Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7415 (iv).
Port Mulgrave and Bras D'Or Lakes SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 934 (i).
Port Mulgrave and Canso SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 935 (i).
Port Perry Dredging, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Christie) 2190 (ii).
Port Stanley, Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
——— Tenders *re* : Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1760 (i).
Porter's Lake Boat Channel to Three Fathom Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 9583 (v).
Porter, Mr. Sydney, Emplymt. by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Lake) 190 (i).
Portland Cement bought at Quebec : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 435 (i).
Portneuf Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Postage on Newspapers : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 179 (i).
Postage Stamps and Bank Notes, Contract *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 204
Postal Business, Alberta District : M. for Ret. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 599 (i).
Postal Contracts, &c., Patronage for Hamilton : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6228 (iv).
Postal Map Engraving : in Com. of Sup., 9060 (v).
Postal Rates, Increases, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 221 (i).
Postmasters acting as Political Partisans, Charges *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6240 (iv).
Postmaster, Reduction of Salary : Remarks (Mr. Miller) in Com. of Sup. 6863 (iv).

POST OFFICE :
Alberta District Postal Business, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 599 (i).
Ashcroft and Cariboo Mail Service, Tenders *re* Mail Contract : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3670 (ii).
Benrier, Mr. J. P., Postmaster at St. Claud, Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re* : M. (Mr. Staples) for Cor.*, 1397 (i).
Bisonnette vs. Crown, Illegal Stamping of Letters in Montreal P.O., Cor. read : in Com. of Sup., 194 (i).
Boissevain Postmaster, Mr. A. McKnight, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2327 (ii).
Brantford Letter Carriers : Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) in Com. of Sup., 217 (i).
Cairns, A. W., Salary as P. O. Inspector : in Com. of Sup., 6629 (iv).
Campaign Literature and Franking Privileges: Remarks (Mr. White) 1809 (i).
See 'Franking.'

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Canadian Fast Mail Service and SS. 'Virginian' : Tel. Read (Mr. Emmerson) 9279 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) 9773 (v).
Chesley Postmaster, Vacancy, Appnmt., &c. : Ques. (Mr. Barr) 9081 (v).
Civil Servants' Guarantees *re* P. O. Dept. : Ques. (Mr. Chisholm) 1758 (i).
Coldwater and Lovering Mail Service, Contract *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1848 (i), 2594 (ii).
Country Postmasters, Increases in Salaries : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 143 (i).
Detective Service, P. O. Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 209 (i).
Dobey, J. B.: *See* 'Thessalon Postmaster.'
Doutre, Mr., Dismissal as Postmaster from Beauharnois : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6247 (iv).
Dundas, Ry. Mail Clerk, Reinstatement : in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).
Farmington and Wilmot Mail Contract, Guarantee, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 2330 (ii).
Franking Privilege, Abuse of *re* Circulars of Dental Institute : Remarks (Mr. Ames) 1807 (i).
——— Circular issued by Jacques Cartier Club, &c.: Remarks (Mr. O. E. Talbot) on M. for Ways and Means, 9798 (v).
——— Regulations after Prorogation : Remarks (Mr. Clements) 9395 (v).
——— Use of Rubber Stamp : Remarks (Mr. Barr) 5134 (iii), 5963 (iv).
See 'Campaign,' &c.
Fredericton Post Office, Equipment, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 170 (i).
Free Mail Delivery, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 729 (i).
Glenn Ross P. O., Abolition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1149 (i).
Goderich Mail Contract, Tender *re* : Ques. (Mr. Gunn) 2493 (ii).
Green, Samuel H., Postmaster at Kaslo, B.C., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 2331 (ii).
Hamilton Cove, P. O. Mail Service and Revenue : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7421 (iv).
Hamilton and Kilbride Mail Contractor, Distance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 9080 (v).
H. of C. Post Office, Locked Boxes, &c.: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 8387 (v).
International Postal Supply Co., Rent of Stamping Machines : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).
Inverness, N.S., Postmaster, Personal Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 8885 (v).
Kaslo, Dismissal of Mr. S. H. Green as Postmaster : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 2331 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Kent, Miss A., Dismissal as Postmistress at Kent, N.S. : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 2331 (i).

Kentvale Postmaster Sureties, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5977 (iv).

See 'Thessalon,' &c.

Killarney and Little Current Mail Service, Tenders *re* Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 3669 (ii).

Kingston, N.B., and Jubilee Station Mail Contract, Tenders *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 5133 (iii).

Lakeville and North Lake Mail Service, Complaints *re* : Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 9612 (v).

Lawson, Mr. Henry, Postmaster at Stanhope, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1062 (i).

——— Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. A. Martin) 1398 (i).

See 'Stanhope.'

Lefebvre, A. P., Dismissal from Markstay Post Office, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 7096 (iv).

Lennoxville Post Office, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4373 (iii).

Lesser Slave Lake Post Office, Establishment, Mail Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7018 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) in Com. on B. 69, 8163 (v).

Letter Carriers, Bonuses, &c., Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 215 (i).

——— Contract *re* Boots, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).

——— Payments on Sick Leave, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 173-6 (i).

——— Uniforms, Contracts *re* : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

Leverette, Geo. Milton, Postmaster, Kitley District, Partisan Conduct as Ret. Officer : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6240 (iv).

Lowville to Milton Mail Contract, Distance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 9080 (v).

Maccan Mail Contract, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 188 (i).

Magog Post Office, Erection of : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5784 (iii).

Mail Bags, Locks, Repairs, &c., Contracts *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 205 (i).

Mails carried free by Rys.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 185 (i).

Mail Contracts, Tenders, Competition, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 179 (i).

Mail Delivery, Free System, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 729 (i).

Mail Service, P.O. in Com. of Sup., 219 (i), 6629 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Mail Service, Miscellaneous Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).

——— System of Payments : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).

Mail Subsidies *re* Newfoundland Service : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).

Melbourne and Upper Melbourne Mail Contract, Tenders *re* : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4372 (iii).

Melfort Mail Service, Complaint from Saskatchewan Board of Trade *re* Delays : Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9789 (v).

Mileage *re* Mail Service, Additional : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 184 (i).

Money transmitted through Mail, Par. in papers *re* Legislation : Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4807 (iii).

Montreal Post Office, Charges *re* Registered Letters : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 183 (i).

——— Illegal Stamping of Letter for Election Matters : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 194 ; Cor. read (Sir William Mulock) 194 (i).

——— Improvements, New Station : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 222 (i).

See 'Pneumatic.'

——— St. Catherine St. Branch, Unsanitary Condition : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 182 (i).

——— Stealing of Cheques, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 198 (i).

Musquodoboit Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6224 (iv).

——— Letter read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9613 (v).

Newfoundland Mail Subsidies : in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).

See 'Trade and Commerce,' &c.

Newpapers, Postage : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 179 (i).

Pneumatic Tube Installation in Montreal P. O. : in Com. of Sup., 1131 (i).

——— in Toronto P. O. : in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).

See 'Toronto.'

Postage Stamps and Bank Notes, Contract *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 204 (i).

Postal Business, Alberta District : M. for Ret. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 599 (i).

Postal Contracts, &c., Patronage for Hamilton, Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6228 (iv).

Postal Rates, Increases, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 221 (i).

Postmasters acting as Political Partisans, Charges *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6240 (iv).

Postmasters Reduction of Salary : Remarks (Mr. Miller) in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Post Office, Dept., Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 95. 165 (i), 6240 (iv), 9058 (v).
——— Inspectors' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 144 (i).
——— Outside Service : in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).
——— Provisional Allowance : in Com. of Sup., 166 (i).
Post Office, Assessment System, Collections *re* : Ques. (Mr. Chisholm) 3671 (ii).
——— Official, Compassionate Allowance to P. Callery : in Com. of Sup., 6628 (ii).
——— Regulations to Postmasters *re* Distribution of Packages : Remarks (Mr. Barr) on M. for Sup., 6834 (iv).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Barr) 6961 (iv).
——— Rep. presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 54 (i).
Post Offices in N.W.T., Establishment of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 223 (i).
Powers, Jas., Postmaster at Wheatley River, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4374 (iii).
See 'Wheatley.'
P.E.I. Mail Service, Delays, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 1152 (i).
——— Letter from Mr. Pottinger : Read (Sir William Mulock) 1153 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Martin, P.E.I.) 280 (i.)
Railway Mail Clerks : in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).
See 'Dundas.'
Ramsay and New Ross Mail Service, Tenders *re* : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 9696 (v).
Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment in Can., Probable Cost, &c.: M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. Lennox) 2067 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 220 (i).
St. Abdon Post Office, Establishment of, Recommendation *re* : Ques. (Mr. Morin) 6653 (iv).
St. James Division Branch P. O. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 218 (i).
See 'Montreal.'
Ste. Marguerite Postmaster, Dismissal of L. Laflamme : Ques. (Mr. Morin) 6477 (iv).
Shelburne Postmaster, Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies (Mr. Barr) 595 (i).
Sherbrooke Post Office, Improvements, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 191 (i).
——— Postal Delivery Service : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 378 (i).
Stamping Machines : *See* 'International,' &c.
Stanhope, P.E.I., Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1062 (i).
——— Cor., Reps., &c. : M. for copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 1398 (i).
POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Stanhope Postmaster, Dismissal, Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. Martin) 4810 (iii).
See 'Lawson.'
Thessalon Postmaster, Appnmt. and Sureties: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 6105 (iv).
——— Dismissal of W. J. Dobie : M. for Cor. (Mr. Boyce) 3202 (ii).
——— Irregularities, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) on M. for Sup., 6192 (iv).
——— Salary Warrants issued : Inquiry for (Mr. Boyce) 6239 (iv).
——— Papers laid on Table (Sir William Mulock) 6332 (iv).
——— further papers laid on Table (Sir William Mulock) 6646 (iv).
——— M. to reduce Salary (Mr. Foster) 9772 (v).
Toronto Post Office, Additional Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 1591 (i).
——— Pneumatic Postal Service, Contract *re*: Remarks (Mr. Hyman) 5921 (iii).
——— Contract *re* Trench (Mr. Foster) 5922 (iii).
——— Pneumatic Service : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5807 (iii).
Victoria Harbour Mail Contracts : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2191 (ii).
'Virginian's' Trip : *See* 'Canadian Fast Mail,' &c.
Waverley Postmaster, Duties and Residence, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5427 (iii).
Waverley, Postmaster, Personal Duties, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5807 (iii).
Wheatley River Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. James Power, Cor., &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 9698 (v).
See 'Power.'
Winter Mail Service : in Com. of Sup., 6467 (iv).
See 'Marine,' 'P.E.I.'
Yukon, Mail Service : in Com. of Sup., 203 (i).
——— Post Office Officials, Salaries, Living Allowances, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).
Poultry Raising on Experimental Farm : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6183 (iv).
Pound Net Licenses issued by Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 2892 (ii).
Pound Net Licenses, Little Current, Cor. between A. E. Dyment and Govt. *re* : M. for copies* (Mr. Crocket) 1399 (i).
Powers, Jas., Postmaster at Wheatley River, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4374 (iii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Presbyterian College of Halifax B. No. 123 (Mr. Sinclair) 1°*, 2681 ; 2°*, 3136 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 149.)

Prescott Lighthouse report, Total Area, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1148 (i).
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Immigration Agent, Salary, &c. : Reps., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 452 (i).
——— Immigration Office G.B., Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 592 (i).
——— Visit to Canada : Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 451 (i).
Preferential Tariff, Value of Imports, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 152 (i).
See 'Customs,' &c.
Preventive Service, *re* Excise : in Com. of Sup., 1688 (i).
Prime Minister, Salary Increase : *See* 'First Minister.'
Prince Albert, Court Room : in Com. of Sup., 124 (i).
——— Jail : in Com. of Sup., 481 (i).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
P.E.I. and Great Britain SS. Subsidy, Claims f SS. Cos. : in Com. of Sup., 927 (i).
P.E.I. and G.B. SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 7088 (iv).
——— Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7088 (iv).
P.E.I. Communication with Mainland : Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) Tel. read, &c., 831 (i).
P.E.I. Dredging, Number and Names of Harbours, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1148 (i).
P.E.I. Fisheries, Supervision, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1762 (i).
P.E.I. and Mainland SS. Communication, Train Service : Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 280, 697 (i).
P.E.I. Mail Service, Delays, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 1152 (i).
——— Letter from Mr. Pottinger : Read (Sir William Mulock) 1153 (i).
P.E.I. Delay in Mail Service : Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2203, 2261 (ii).
——— Explanation (Sir William Mulock) 2261 (ii).
P.E.I. Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions, Res. from Mar. Board of Trade : Read (Mr. Daniel) 907 (i).
P.E.I. Steam Communication, Contract with Steam Nav. Co. : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5316 (iii).
P.E.I. Steam Communication with Mainland, Delays, &c. : Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1595 (i).
——— Snow Blockade and Delay in Mails : Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 1753 (i).
P.E.I. Subsidy, Additional Grant, Cor., &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 3205 (ii).
P.E.I. and Mainland SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 919 (i).
P.E.I. and Newfoundland SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 940 (i), 7092 (iv).
P.E.I. and W. Indies SS. Subsidy, Amount paid, Representations *re* : Ques. (Mr. Martin, P.E.I.) 591 (i).
P.E.I. Tunnel, Delegation *re* : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6644 (iv).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Claims of Travellers *re* Refund of Expenses on account of Delay : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4807 (iii).
——— Cor., &c., since Confederation : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 9698 (v).
——— Investigation *re* Soundings, Tunnel, &c. : M. for Cor. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2778 (ii).
——— Str. 'Stanley,' Cor., &c. : M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies*, 916 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1338 (i).
——— Inspection of Str. 'Stanley' : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 687 (i).
P.E.I. Mount Stewart Shipping Facilities, Wharf Accommodation, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1763 (i).
P.E.I. Railway : in Com. of Sup., 2025, 2027 (ii), 8692 (v).
——— Bloomfield Agent's House : in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).
——— Branch Lines, Survey and Construction, Cor., &c. : M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies*, 916 (i).
——— Cardigan to Montague Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 9482 (v).
——— Claims for Damages, Amounts paid, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. Kemp) 383 (i).
——— Georgetown Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 9486 (v).
——— Land Expropriations, Papers laid on Table (Mr. Emmerson) 8528 (v).
——— Murray Harbour Branch Extension to Jan. 1st, 1905 : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 106 (i).
——— Murray Harbour Branch : in Com. of Sup., 7494 (iv), 9488 (v).
——— Stanley Bridge, &c., Surveys *re* : Ques. (Mr. Martin, P.E.I.) 266 (i).
——— Water Service Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 2170 (ii).
——— West Cape Branch Surveys : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 589 (i).
——— Working Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 6901, 6908 (iv).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.
P.E.I. Tel. Co. : *See* 'Anglo-American.'
Printing Bureau, Addition to : in Com. of Sup., 1575 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6897 (iv).
——— Enlargement of and Outside Printing : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6948 (iv).

Printing Bureau, New Machinery Plant : in Com. of Sup., 9614 (v).
Printing, Miscellaneous : in Com. of Sup., 6723, 6901, 6948, 6957 (iv).
Prisoners, Maintenance of in N.W.T. : in Com of Sup., 122 (i).
Private Bills Pets., Extension of Time : (Mr. Grant) M. *re* Report, 318, 448 (i).
——— Remarks *re* Debating (Mr. Speaker) 318 (i).
——— M. to extend Time (Mr. Galiher) 4375 (iii).
——— M. (Mr. Gervais) 2203 (ii).
Private Bills, 12th Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Grant) 2491 (ii).
Private Cars, I.C.R., Number, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2258 (ii).
See 'Ry. Commission,' &c.
Privileges, Ques. of *re* Separate Schools : (Mr. Lake) 3649 (ii).
Privy Council Office : in Com. of Sup., 71 (i).
Privy Councillors : *See* 'Cabinet Ministers.'
Prohibitionist Principles, Charges by P.M.G. : Personal Explanation (Mr. Foster) 842 (i).
Prorogation, Date of : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9790 (v).
——— Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. : Read (Mr. Speaker) 9815 (v).
Protection to Women and Children, Amt. to Criminal Code *re* Wife Beaters : Ques. (Mr Ames) 591 (i).
'Protestants driven out of Quebec,' Ref. to in Autonomy Bill Speech (Mr. Lemieux) 3305 ; Reply (Mr. Sproule) 3306 (ii).
'Protestant Govt.,' Ref. to in Speech on Autonomy Bill : (Mr. Fielding) 3006 (ii).
Protestant Schools, Ref. to by Mr. Fielding : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Speech on Autonomy Bill, 3462 (ii).
Provident Savings Association incorp. B. No. 134 (Mr. Gervais) 1°*, 4370 ; 2°*, 4598 (iii) ; in Com. 5974 ; 3°*, 5976 (ii) : Sen. Amts., 9078 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 151.)
Provincial Autonomy *re* N. W. Ters., Cor. between Govts. : M. for Copies (Mr. Monk) 599 (i).
See 'Autonomy,'
Provincial Rights, Par. in 'Le Soleil' : (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn.. 1745 (i).
Provincial Stocks in G. B. : *See* 'Colonial Stock Act.'
Provincial Subsidies, Discussion *re*, in Com. on Autonomy Bill, 5434 (iii).
Provincial Subsidies, Readjustment *re*, Memoranda, &c. : M. for Copies (Mr. Carvell) 2100 (ii).
Pryor, J. A., Relief B. No. 127 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 3091 ; 2°*, 3400 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 150.)
Public Accounts Com. : M. (Mr. McIsaac) 582 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Meeting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 7100 (iv).
——— Calling Meeting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 403 (i).
Public Accounts Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 97 (i).
Public Accounts, Reporting Evidence, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9616 (v).
——— Presented (Mr. Paterson) 50 (i).
Public Buildings, Comparison with U. S. System of Rentals : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1024 (i).
Public Buildings in Towns, Erection of, Amounts first voted, Population, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1398 (i).
——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Foster) 4751 (iii).
——— Erected since Confederation, Cost, &c.: M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) for Ret.*, 1398 (i).
——— Govt. Policy *re* Construction : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 852 (i).
——— Govt. Policy *re* : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 1027 (i).
Public Functionaries, Salaries : *See* 'Lt. Governors.'
Public Works Act Amt. B. No. 54 (Mr. Hyman) 1° m., 819 ; 2°*, 1679 ; 3°*, 1806 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 32.)
Public Works Health Act : in Com. of Sup., 1845 (i).
Public Health, Organized Districts Quarantine : in Com. of Sup., 1841 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS :
Actonvale Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1101 (i).
Alexandria P. O., Contract *re*, Delay, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Macdonnell) 1760 (i).
Aliens employed on Govt. Works at Sault Ste. Marie : Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 1412 (i).
Allandale Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 9595 (v).
Amherstburg Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7546 (iv).
Amherst Pier, N.S., Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4371 (iii).
Anderson and Kennedy's Lake Outlets : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Annapolis, Queen's Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 9576 (v).
Anse à Beaufils Pier Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7285 (iv).
Anse aux Gris Fonds Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7285 (iv).
Anse St. Jean Pier Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).
Anse L'Ilot Landing Piers : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
Antigonish Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 846, 1015 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Apple River Wharf, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 1727 (i), 7395 (iv).
Arbitration and Awards *re* Public Works : in Com. of Sup., 7611 (iv).
Architects for Military Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Architects for Public Works, Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7618 (iv).
Arichat (west) Landing Piers : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Armouries, Generally, Construction of : in Com. of Sup., 1649 (i).
Armouries, Supervision and Control, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 423 (i).
Ashcroft and Dawson Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 6896 (iv).
Assay Office, Vancouver, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7720 (iv).
Baddeck Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7396 (iv), 9585 (v).
Banff, N.W.T., Water Works and Sewage Construction : in Com. of Sup., 9306 (v).
Barachois Boat Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7396 (iv).
Barachois de Malbaie Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).
Barrie (Allandale) Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 9595 (v).
Barrington Passage Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).
Barry's Wharf, Madawaska River : in Com. of Sup., 6873 (iv).
Bass River Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).
Batiscan Channel Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7322 (iv).
Battery Point Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 9552 (v).
Battleford Bridge, N.W.T., Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7587 (iv).
Bayfield Pier, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7546 (iv).
Bay St. Lawrence, Boat Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).
——— Telegraph Lines : in Com. of Sup., 7606 (iv).
Bear Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).
Beaujeu Bank Pier : in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Beaverton Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7546 (iv).
Beckerton Public Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).
Belle River Dredging Channel : in Com. of Sup., 7546 (iv).
Belle River Wharf, P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 9585 (v).
Belleville Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1547 (i).
Beloeil Guide Piers and Booms : in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Bersimis to Godbout Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 7608 (iv).
Bic Harbour Wharf at Pointe à Coté : in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).
——— Land purchased from P. Ross, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1850 (i).
Blanche River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7547 (iv).
Blind River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6870 (iv).
Boisdale Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9585 (v).
Bourgeois Inlet Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).
Bowmanville Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1549 (i).
Bracebridge Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7547 (iv).
Brandon Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1633 (i).
Brantford Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1550 (i).
Breakwaters, &c., N.S., Govt. Policy *re* : Remarks (Mr Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v). 9553 (v).
Breton Cove Boat Landing : in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).
Bridges, Dominion, Generally : in Com. of Sup., 7592 (iv).
Bridgeburg Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1550 (i).
Bridgewater Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Broad Cove, Harbour Works : in Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
——— Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Bronte Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7548 (iv).
Bryson Bridge Reconstruction : in Com. of Sup., 7585 (iv).
Buildings, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1641 (i), 6735 (iv).
——— Renewals, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1641 (i).
Buildings, Generally, Fuel, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6822 (iv).
——— Inspection by Architects, Clerks, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1642 (i).
——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1670 (i).
Buildings, Manitoba : in Com. of Sup., 1633 (i). 9549 (v).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i), 7284 (iv).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 846, 1015 (i).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 1637 (i), 6734 (iv), 9550 (v).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 1547 (i), 9547 (v).
——— Ottawa : in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
See 'Ottawa.'
——— Quebec : in Com. of Sup., 1101 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Buildings, Quebec, Renewals, Repairs, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1107 (i).
Burford Armoury : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com., 1649 (i).
Cacouna Wharf, Expenditure *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7096 (iv).
Calgary, Land Titles Office : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
——— Post Office Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
Campbellton, Public Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1048 (i).
——— Wharf, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1744 (i).
Canning Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Canso Public Building in Com. of Sup., 1023 (i).
Canton Fabre Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7288 (iv).
Cape Tormentine Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7497 (iv).
Carillon Work, Emplymt. of Labourers, Affidavit read *re* Political Influence : Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 6856 (iv).
See 'Canals,' &c.
Carlos Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Cascumpec Sandhills Channel, P.E.I., Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2773 (ii).
Chambord Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7289 (iv).
Champlain Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7290 (iv).
Chance Harbour Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7497 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Stockton) in Com. of Sup., 9588 (v).
Chateauguay River Dredging and Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 6847, 7322 (iv).
See 'St. Louis,' &c.
Chateau Richer Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7290 (iv).
——— Expenditure by Govt. for Public Works: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Morin) 109 (i).
——— Public Works, Dates of Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3202 (ii).
——— Removal of Obstruction : Remarks (Mr. Morin) 1154 (i).
——— Wharf, Expenditure by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 1015 (i).
See 'Montmorency.'
Chatham Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1551 (i).
——— Contract, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 587 (i).
Chezzetcook (east) Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Chicoutimi, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7377 (iv).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1106 (i).
Chilliwack Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Clark's Harbour, Removal of Rocks from Channel : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Clifton Breakwater Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7497 (iv).
Cobourg, Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1554 (i).
——— Piers, Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7548 (iv).
Collingwood, Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6879 (iv).
——— Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iv).
Columbia River, General Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Country Harbour, Removal of Obstructions : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Court Houses, &c., N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
Cow Bay, Fort Morien Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7399 (iv).
Cow Bay Run Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7401 (iv).
Creosoted Timber for Piers and Breakwaters, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1737 (i).
Crowe's Landing Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).
Culloden Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7401 (iv).
Cunningham Point Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Dams across Rivers, Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 6839 (iv).
Depot Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7552 (iv).
Descente Des Femmes, Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7307 (iv).
——— Tel. Lines : in Com. of Sup., 9604 (v).
Desjardins Wharf, Allumette Island : in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).
Devil's Island Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv), 9551 (v).
Digby Pier Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Dipper Harbour Breakwater, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7498 (iv), 9588 (v).
——— Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 912 (i).
Disraeli Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 9593 (v).
——— Expenditure *re* : Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 1729 (i).
Doucet's Landing, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6849, 7298 (iv).
Douglastown Isolated Block : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Dredges employed at Port Arthur, Expenditure, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 790 (i).
Dredges, Govt., Built at Toronto : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 2456 (ii).
Dredges used in Govt. Works, Expenditure *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 795 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Dredging, B.C., New Plant : in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).
Dredging Contracts, Govt. Policy *re* : Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 1419 (i)
Dredging Plant, Generally : in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv), 9604 (v).
——— Man., New Plant : in Com. of Sup., 7577 (iv).
——— Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).
——— Number of Vessels, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6890 (iv).
——— Ont. and Que., New Plant : in Com. of Sup., 7577 (iv).
——— working expenses : in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).
——— P.E.I., New Plant : in Com. of Sup., 7576 (iv).
——— New Vessel : in Com. of Sup., 6891 (iv).
Dredging Vessels, Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6890, 7576 (iv).
Drill Hall, Fredericton, Tenders *re* Construction : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 729 (i).
Durham Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7498 (iv).
Eastern Channel, St. Maurice River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7326 (iv).
East Templeton Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7300 (iv).
Echo Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9598 (v).
Economy Pile Wharf Extension : in Com. of Sup., 9579 (v).
Edmonton Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
Edmonton and Qu'Appelle Tel. Lines : in Com of Sup., 7633 (iv).
Eel Cove Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
English River, Removal of Obstructions : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
Escoumain Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7303 (iv).
Fairford River Bed Outlet : in Com. of Sup., 7569 (iv).
Fernie, B.C., Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1641 (i).
Fort Lawrence Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 6838 (iv).
——— Name of Contractor, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5034 (iii).
Fort William Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 784 (i).
Ft. William and Port Arthur Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6900 (iv).
See 'Port Arthur,' &c.
Fraser River Ship Channel Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7574 (iv).
Fraserville Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7323 (iv).
Fredericton Military Buildings, Tender *re* Construction : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 728 (i).
Freeport Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Frude's Point Wharf Enlargement, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).
Gabarus Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Gatineau Point Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7303 (iv).
Gatineau River Slides and Booms : in Com. of Sup., 7630 (iv).
Georgeville Wharf Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Georgian Bay, Canal Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 7637 (iv).
——— Survey via French River, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9547 (v).
——— Surveys, Engineers Reps., &c. : Ques. (Mr. Brabazon) 192 (i).
Georgian Bay Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6886 (iv).
Gimli Wharf, Lake Winnipeg : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9577 (v).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1034 (i).
——— Purchase of Site : Ques. (Mr. Blain) 9697 (v).
Goderich Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7553 (iv).
Grand Bend, Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7553 (iv).
——— Delay in Building, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1344 (i).
Grand Mechins Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7303 (iv).
Grand Piles Dam, St. Maurice River : in Com. of Sup., 7326 (iv).
Grand River, Ont., Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6873 (iv).
Grand Rivière de Beaupré Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Great Salmon River Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7498 (iv).
Greece's Point Wharf, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 2063 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 7301 (iv).
See 'Carillon.'
Grondine's Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Grosse Isle, Hospital Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).
——— Marconi System : in Com. of Sup., 9604 (v).
——— Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7305 (iv).
——— Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 1108 (i), 6734 (iv).
——— Quarantine Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 9604 (v).
Guelph Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1555 (i).
Haileybury Wharf Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 6887, 7556 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Half Island Cove Breakwater, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9584 (v).
Halifax, Detention Hospital : in Com. of Sup., 1037 (i).
——— Dom. Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1036 (i).
——— Immigrant Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1036 (i).
Hamilton Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1559 (i).
——— Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Harbours, Docks and Slides, Working Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
——— Man. : in Com. of Sup., 7569 (iv).
——— N.B. : in Com. of Sup., 1744 (i), 7497 (iv), 9588 (v).
——— N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 1727 (i), 6837, 7237, 7395 (iv), 9551 (v).
——— N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv), 9602 (v).
——— general repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
——— Ont. : in Com. of Sup., 6729, 6869, 7546, 7555 (iv), 9595 (v).
——— P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 1734 (i), 9585 (v).
——— Quebec : in Com. of Sup., 770 (i), 6436, 6839, 7285 (iv), 9590 (v).
Harrigan Cove Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
Hawkesbury Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1560 (i).
Higgin's Shore Pier, P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 1734 (i).
Honora Wharf Freight Shed : in Com. of Sup., 9597 (v).
Honora Wharf Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 6887 (iv).
Howard's Cove, P.E.I., Surveys *re* Wharf : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4703 (iii).
Hull Wharf, Total Cost, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2064 (ii).
Huot, Mr. J., Payments to *re* L'Ange Gardien Beach : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1343 (i).
Indian Harbour Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
Indian Harbour Wharf : Pet. *re*, Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8178 (v).
Inverness Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1040 (i).
Inverness Mines Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
Irish Cove Wharf, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
Isle Bizard Wharf Butments, Expenditure *re* : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 2067 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Janvrin's Island Wharf : in Com. of Sup.,' 7406 (iv).
'J. I. Tarte,' Dredge, Defective Boilers, Accident, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2466 (ii).
Kamloops, Lower Nicola Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 7610 (iv).
Kelly's Cove Breakwater, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9582 (v).
Kincardine Harbour, Piers and Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7558 (iv).
'Kingsford,' Dredge, Cost of Operating : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 801 (i).
Kingston, Military Stables : in Com. of Sup., 1561 (i).
——— Royal Military Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 1560 (i).
Lachute Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1111 (i).
Lake Dauphin, Lowering : in Com. of Sup., 7569 (iv).
Lake St. Francis Outlet, Guide Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).
Lake St. John Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).
Lake St. Peter Permanent Piers : in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv), 9171 (v).
Lake Temiscaming Wharfs : in Com. of Sup., 7559 (iv).
Lambert's Pier, P.E.I., Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4373 (iii).
Langly Wharf Protection Bank : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
Laprairie Ice Piers : in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv), 9590 (v).
L'Ardoise Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 6838, 7407 (iv).
Larry's River Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Lavaltrie Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).
Levis Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1112 (i).
L'Ile d'Alma, Removal of Point of Rock : in Com. of Sup., 7307 (iv).
Lindsay Drill Hall, Erection of : Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 271 (i).
Litchfield Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Little Current Channel, Georgian Bay : in Com. of Sup., 6886, 7859 (iv).
Little Judique Boat Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Little Pabos Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7307 (iv).
Little Rock Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Lloydminster Immigrant Building, N.W.T: in Com. of Sup., 6734 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
London, Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 1562 (i).
——— Drill Hall, Electric Wiring : in Com. of Sup., 6732 (iv).
——— Drill Hall, Sale of, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Elson) 8384 (v).
——— Military Stores, Magazine, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1562 (i).
——— Post Office Building : in Com. of Sup., 1563 (i).
Longueuil Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1113 (i).
Lotbiniere Wharf Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Louisburg, Old Fort, C.B., Preservation of : in Com. of Sup., 9170 (v).
Louise Embankment, Quebec Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 770 (i).
Lunenburg Dredging Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7408 (iv).
McPherson's Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1735 (i).
Mabou Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 7408 (iv).
Magdalen Island Breakwaters and Piers : in Com. of Sup., 7308 (iv).
Magog Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1114 (i).
Mahone Bay Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7408 (iv).
Mail Distributing Station, Montreal, Purchase of Site : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 915 (i).
Main a Dieu Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7409 (iv).
Malignant Cove Channel Piers : in Com. of Sup., 7409 (iv).
Manitoba Public Buildings : Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) in Com. of Sup., 857 (i).
Manitoulin Island, Silver Water Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9597 (v).
Marble Mountain Wharf, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9580 (v).
Margaree Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7409 (iv).
Margaretville Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7412 (iv).
Maskinonge River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6842, 7325 (iv), 9590 (v).
Matchedash Bay Channel Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iv).
Meaford Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iv).
——— M. A. Pigott's Claims : in Com. of Sup., 9599 (v).
Medicine Hat Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
Megantic Lake Piers : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
Meteghan Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
Midland Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 9601 (v).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Midland Harbour, Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iv).
Military Buildings, Fredericton, Tenders *re* Construction : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 728 (i).
Mill Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
Mille Vaches Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7310 (iv).
Miminegash Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1735 (i).
——— Contract *re* Repairs : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1350 (i).
——— Dredging, Commencement of Work : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3834 (ii).
Miscou Harbour Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7498 (iv).
Mistook Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7310 (iv).
Mont Louis Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7310 (iv).
Montmagny Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7311 (iv).
Montmorency Falls Cribwork : in Com. of Sup., 7311 (iv).
Montmorency, Wharf Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 6852 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re* by Govt. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 1015 (i).
See 'Chateau Richer.'
Montreal, Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 1118 (i).
——— Examining Warehouse : in Com. of Sup., 1119 (i).
——— Harbour, Raising of Sunken Elevator : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 151 (i).
——— Inland Revenue Building : in Com. of Sup., 1119 (i).
——— Military Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1125 (i).
——— Post Office, Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1127 (i).
——— P. O., Pneumatic Installation, System : in Com. of Sup., 1131 (i).
——— Postal Station : Remarks in Com. of Sup.. 1128 (i).
Montreal, Quebec, &c., Harbours, Dues and Charges *re* Transportation Problem : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Moosejaw Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
Mount Stewart, P.E.I., Wharf : Remarks : (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 9585 (v).
Mud Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7500 (iv).
Narrows Lake, Quarry Channel : in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).
New Campbellton Ballast Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
New Carlisle Wharf, Pier Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7312 (iv).
Newcastle Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).
Neepawa Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
New London, P.E.I., Breakwater Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 1735 (i).
Newport Breakwater Extension, Que. : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Newport Landing Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
Nicolet Pier Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7313 (iv).
Noel Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
North Bay Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1563 (i).
North Thompson River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
——— Improvements *re* Navigation, Expenditure, &c. : Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5783 (iii).
Notre Dame du Portage Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Ogden's Pond Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
Oliphant Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).
Orillia Public Building, Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
Oshawa, Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1564 (i).
Otonabee River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
Ottawa, Alexandra Bridge, Lighting, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 7586 (iv).
Ottawa Bridges : in Com. of Sup., 6889 (iv).
——— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7585 (iv).
Ottawa Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 603, 754 (i), 6814 (iv), 9550 (v).
——— Additions to Eastern Block : in Com. of Sup., 9547 (v).
——— Archives Building, Erection of : in Com. of Sup., 603 (i).
———Art Gallery : in Com. of Sup., 7618 (iv).
——— Astronomical Observatory, Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
——— Buildings leased by Govt., Location, Taxes paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 379 (i).
——— Carpets purchased, Quantity, Value, Duty paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Osler) 8266 (v).
——— Clerks of Works, Salaries, &c., Dom. Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1642 (i).
——— Coal Sheds : in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
——— Corry Block, Rental, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6818 (iv).
——— Deptl. Buildings, Purchase of Site, &c. (Stmnt.) : in Com. of Sup., 9605 (v).
——— Drill Hall, Increased Accommodation : Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 271 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Ottawa Buildings, Elevator Attendance : in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i), 6916 (iv), 9551 (v).
——— Engineers, Draughtsmen, &c., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6895 (iv), 9382 (v).
——— Engineers, Firemen, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6822 (iv).
——— Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6817 (iv).
——— Geological Museum : in Com. of Sup., 754 (i).
——— electric lighting, contract *re* : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 760 (i).
——— Grounds, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6817 (iv).
——— Heating, Engineers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i), 6816 (iv).
——— H. of C., Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
——— House of Commons, Remodelling, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
——— ventilation of Chamber : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7812 (iv), 8695 (v).
——— Library Accommodation in Archives Building : Remarks (Mr. Hyman) in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).
———Library, Extension : in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
——— remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).
——— Lighting Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 6816 (iv).
——— Lighting Plant, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i).
——— Major's Hill Park, Maintenance : in Com. of Sup., 6817 (iv).
——— Mint Building : in Com. of Sup., 606 (i).
——— Parliament Buildings, Additions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
——— Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c.: M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5785 (iii).
——— Post Office Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).
——— Post Office, Restoration and Addition to : in Com. of Sup., 1573 (i).
——— Printing Bureau, Addition to : in Com. of Sup., 1575 (i).
——— Rentals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1663 (i), 6818 (iv).
——— Rentals : List read (Mr. Hyman) in Com. of Sup., 1663 (i), 9605 (v).
——— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iv).
——— Rideau Hall, Improvements, Grounds, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6823 (iv), 9550 (v).
——— Steel Shelving : in Com. of Sup., 1564 (i).
———Telephone Service : in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i), 6814 (iv).
——— Treasury Vaults : in Com. of Sup., 6825 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Ottawa Buildings, Western Deptl. Block, Addition to : in Com. of Sup., 766 (i).
Ottawa River Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 7612 (iv).
Ottawa, Wharf at Foot of Rideau Canal : in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).
Owen Sound, Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6886 (iv).
——— Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).
——— Harbour Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).
——— P.O., Site *re* : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 1029 (i).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 9547 (v).
Parker's Cove Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9552, 9576 (v).
Parrsboro, Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9579 (v).
——— Landing Pier Addition: in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
Parry Sound Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7562 (iv).
Peel Head Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Pelee Island Cable Line : in Com. of Sup., 7609 (iv).
Pembroke Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).
Pembroke Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7562 (iv).
Penetanguishene Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).
Penitentiary Coal Contracts, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com.of Sup., 478 (i).
Perce (North Cove) Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Peribonca (Petite Riviere) Removal of Snags: in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
Peterborough Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1578 (i).
Petewawa Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7562 (iv).
Petit Rocher Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7500 (iv).
Petite Riviere Improvements, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9580 (v).
Phinney's Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 9552 (v).
Pierreville Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
Piers and Bridges, General Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7305 (iv).
Piers and Breakwaters, P.E.I., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1737 (i).
Pleasant Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).
Plympton Breakwater Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).
Pointe du Chene Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7500 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Point Edward Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6869, 7563 (iv).
Point Prim Island Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 1736 (i).
Poirierville Landing Pier, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Tender of Conmee & Bowman : M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4458, 4645 (iii).
——— Fort William and Kaministiquia Harbours, Amount of Expenditure : M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Hughes) 1398 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1065 (i).
——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Boyce) 2685 (ii).
——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. S. Hughes) 4921 (iii).
Port Arthur Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 784 (i).
Port Bruce Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).
Port Burwell, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).
——— Contractor, Prices paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 589 (i).
——— Dredging Contract, Purchase of Dredge, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 8656 (v).
Port Credit Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6871 (iv).
Port Dover Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
Porter's Lake Boat Channel to Three Fathom Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 9583 (v).
Port Greville Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).
Port Hastings Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7414
Port Hawkesbury Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6837 (iv).
Port Hood Harbour, Northern Entrance : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).
——— Breakwater, Estimated Cost, Approval, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5132 (iii).
Port Hope Piers and Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
Port La Tour Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7415 (iv).
Portneuf Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Port Perry Dredging, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Christie) 2190 (ii).
Port Stanley, Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
——— Tenders *re* : Ques. (Mr. Macdonnell) 1760 (i).
Prince Albert Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
P.E.I. Dredging, Number and Names of Harbours, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1148 (i.)
P.E.I. Mount Stewart Shipping Facilities, Wharf Accommodation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1763 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Public Buildings in Towns, Erection of, Amounts first voted, Population, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1398 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4751 (iii).
Public Buildings erected since Confederation, Cost, &c.: M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) for Ret.*, 1398 (i).
——— Govt. Policy *re* Construction : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 852 (i).
Public Works, Balance of Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 7628 (iv).
——— Clerical Assistance : in Com. of Sup., 7620 (iv), 9605 (v).
——— Contracts, Names of Tenderers, &c.: M. (Mr. Lewis) for Ret.*, 916 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 94 (i), 6724 (iv), 9071 (v).
——— Deptl. Rep., Date of Issue, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) 755 (i).
——— Deptl. Rep., Delay in bringing down : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 601 (i).
——— Presented (Mr. Hyman) 731 (i).
Public Work Labourers, Political Partisans : Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 6859 (iv).
Public Works and Marine Dept., Line of Demarcation *re* Works : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6841 (iv).
——— in Com. of Sup., 9171 (v).
Public Works, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1727 (i).
Public Works, Portfolio, Appnmt. of Minister, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5961, 6047 (iv).
——— Acting Minister, Unconstitutionality of: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1936 (i).
——— Cabinet Vacancy : M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn., 5471 (iii).
——— Minister, Rumoured Resignation : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5035 (iii).
——— Returns : Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 9688 (v).
——— Supervision, Charges, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7588 (iv).
——— Technical Books, Purchase, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7627 (iv).
Pugwash, N.S., Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
Quaco Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iv).
Qu'Appelle and Edmonton Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 6893 (iv).
Quebec Drill Hall, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1145 (i).
Quebec Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 770 (i), 6724 (iv).
——— Transfer to Mar. Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 771 (i).
Quebec, Immigration Pier : in Com. of Sup., 1138 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Quebec, Trachoma Hospital : in Com. of Sup., 1138 (i), 9547 (v).
Rama Wharf on Lake Couchiching: in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).
Rapide Plat Enlargement, Upper Entrance : in Com. of Sup., 6289 (iv).
Ray's Creek, N.S., Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9576 (v).
Red Deer Court House, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1639 (i).
Red Point Wharf, P.E.I.,: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 9586 (v).
Regina Post Office Customs House, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1639 (i).
Repentigny Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Richelieu Bridge at Sorel, Inquiry for O.C., &c. (Mr. Foster) 8098 (v).
——— Papers laid on Table, 8268 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup., 6960 (iv).
Richelieu River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7376 (iv).
Richibucto, Extension Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iv).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 6730 (iv).
——— explanation (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup., 6813 (iv).
Richmond Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 1738
Rimouski Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7320 (iv).
River Hebert Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
Rivière du Lièvre, Little Rapids Dam: in Com. of Sup., 7325 (iv).
——— Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6839 (iv).
Ottawa River Wharf at Rivière du Lièvre : in Com. of Sup., 7375 (iv).
Rivière du Loup Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7323 (iv).
Rivière Ouelle Pier Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7375 (iv).
Rivière aux Renards Breakwater Pier : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Rivière Verte Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
Roads and Bridges, Ottawa : in Com. of Sup., 6889 (iv).
Rondeau Harbour Works, Tenders *re* : Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1761 (i).
——— Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
Rosseau Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).
Round Hill Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9552 (v).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1738 (i).
Rustico Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1593 (i).
St. Alexis, Ha Ha Bay Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
St. Alphonse de Bagotville Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
St. Alphonse Wharf, Que. : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
St. Andrè de Kamouraska Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
St. Angel Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1759 (i).
St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe Waterways : in Com. of Sup., 7380 (iv).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière Pier Reconstruction: in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
St. Boniface Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
St. Catharines Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1578 (i).
St. Charles Borromèe Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
Ste. Famille Wharf, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1149 (i).
Ste. Famille Wharf Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
Ste. Fidele Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
St. Francis Lake (Beauce) Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
St. François, Isolated Block : in Com. of Sup., 7391 (iv).
St. François Wharf, Expenditure *re* in Sept., Oct. and Nov., 1904 : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1343 (i).
St. Francois de Sales Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7391 (iv).
St. Fulgence Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7392 (iv).
St. Gèdèon Island Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7392 (iv).
St. Geneviève Piers : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
St. Ignace Channel Dam, Plan, Completion, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 592 (i).
St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
St. Jean, Orleans Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).
St. John, Drill Hall, N.B. : in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i), 7503 (iv).
——— Detention Building : in Com. of Sup., 1050 (i).
——— Harbour, N.B. : in Com. of Sup., 9588 (v).
——— Harbour Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7503 (iv).
——— Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 1052 (i).
——— River Tidal Waters : in Com. of Sup., 7503 (iv).
——— Tidal Water, Contribution *re* Wharfs : in Com. of Sup., 9590 (v).
——— Tributaries : in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
St. Johns, P.Q., Military Hospital, Contract *re* Repairs, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5687 (iii).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1143 (i).
St. Joseph's Pier, Lake Huron, Delay *re* Completion : Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2774 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Dredging, St. Mary's Current : in Com. of Sup., 814 (i).
St. Lawrence (lower) Removal of Rock : in Com. of Sup., 7308 (iv).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Suction Dredge, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6437 (iv).
——— Description Read (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 6447 (iv).
St. Louis River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7379 (iv).
See 'Chateauguay,' &c.
St. Mary's Current, St. Lawrence Channel, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 814 (i).
St. Mary's Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1578 (i).
St. Maurice River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6851, 7326 (iv).
St. Maurice District Slides and Booms : in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).
St. Peter's Bay Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1739 (i).
St. Peter's Breakwater, P.E.I., Tenders *re*, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5035 (iii).
St. Simeon Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).
St. Therèse Island, Dredging : in Com. of Sup. 7376 (iv).
St. Timothèe Wharf, Repairs, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7305 (iv).
Sacrè Coeur Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
Saguenay River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7377 (iv).
Salmon River, B.C., Removal of Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
Sandwich Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1579 (i).
Sarnia, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
——— Post Office Building : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 862 (i).
Saskatchewan (North) River Survey : in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).
Saskatoon Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1640 (i), 9550 (v).
Saugeen River, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).
——— Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie, Dredging Govt. Dock. Total Amount expended, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5426 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6881 (iv).
Savage Harbour, P.E.I., Proposed Improvements : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3361 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Scott's Bay Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7415 (iv).
Seaforth Post Office : Remarks (Mr. Gunn) in Com. of Sup., 858 (i).
Selkirk Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1634 (i).
——— Wharf : Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Severn River, Removal of Obstructions at Macdonald's Chute : in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).
Shelburne Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Shelburne Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1043 (i).
Shellmouth Bridge, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7591 (iv).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).
——— Immediate Erection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5784 (iii).
——— Purchase of Land, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Worthington) in Com. of Sup., 427 (i).
Simcoe Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1581 (i).
Skinner's Cove Boat Channel and Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Slides and Booms, Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).
——— Revenue collected : in Com. of Sup., 7629 (iv).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf . in Com. of Sup., 9593 (v).
——— Dredge Building, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 790 (i).
——— Ice Piers : in Com. of Sup., 6841 (iv).
——— Shipyard, Expenditure *re* Wages, Supplies, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 1399 (i).
——— Shipyard, Purchase of Supplies : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 2457 (ii).
Souris Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).
Spanish River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
Stokes Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9598 (v).
Stratford Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1581 (i).
Strathcona Horse Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 1637 (i).
Summerside Harbour Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1739 (i).
Summerville Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Surveys and Inspection *re* Public Works : in Com. of Sup., 7611 (iv).
Sydney Mines P.O.: in Com. of Sup. 1045 (i).
Sydney, Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1044 (i).
——— Quarantine Station Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Taché, J. C., Special Remuneration *re* Tel. Service : in Com. of Sup., 6897 (iv).
Tatamagouche Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9579 (v).
Telegraph Lines, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7635 (iv).
——— Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 7606 (iv).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6893 (iv).
——— Que: in Com. of Sup., 9604 (v).
Telegraph Service, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 7620 (iv).
Temiscaming Lake, Baie des Pères Wharf: in Com. of Sup. 7287 (iv).
Terrebonne Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7394 (iv).
Thames River Dredging : Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 6872 (iv).
Thessalon Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
Thornbury Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
Three Fathom Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Tignish Breakwater, Tenders *re*, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 7018 (iv).
Toney River, N.S., Boat Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).
Toronto, Customs House, Alterations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1581 (i).
——— Drill Hall, Additional Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 1582 (i).
——— Examining Warehouse, Addition to : in Com. of Sup., 1583 (i).
——— Harbour, Eastern Entrance : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
——— Harbour, Expenditure from 1880 to 1904 : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 403 (i).
——— Harbour Island Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7567 (iv)
——— Harbour, Straightening of Don River: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. of Sup., 6888 (iv).
——— Harbour Works, Tender *re* Breakwater at Eastern Gap: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1761 (i).
——— Meteorological Building, Erection of : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1149 (i).
——— Military Buildings, Barracks, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1589 (i).
——— Postal Station 'C' Quarters : in Com. of Sup., 1592 (i).
——— Post Office, Erection of a new Building : Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for Sup., 6833 (iv).
——— Post Office, Land, Pneumatic Plant, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
Trachoma Hospitals in Quebec : in Com. of Sup., 1138 (i), 9547 (v).
Transportation Facilities, Georgian Bay Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 7637 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Transportation Problem and Wharf Buildings : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Trenton, Dredging Trent River : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).
Valleyfield Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1144 (i).
Vancouver Island and Salt Spring, Telephone Line : in Com. of Sup., 7610 (v).
Vancouver Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1642 (i).
Victoria Beach Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Victoria Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
Virden Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1634 (i).
Wallace Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Wharf Building, Policy of Govt.: Remarks (Mr Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Wharfs Construction : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 8178 (v).
Wharfs in Tidal Waters : in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).
Whitby Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6880 (iv).
Whitby Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Christie) 2190 (ii).
White Head Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
White Mud River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Wiarton Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7569 (iv).
Williams Head Quarantine Station Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7576 (iv).
Winnipegosis Channel Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Winnipeg, Customs Examining Warehouse : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
——— Immigration Building : in Com. of Sup., 1635 (i), 9550 (v).
——— Military Buildings, N.C.O. Quarters : in Com. of Sup., 1635 (i).
——— Postal Station : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
——— Post Office, Land and Building : in Com. of Sup., 1636 (i).
Wolfville Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Wood Island, Protection to Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1743 (i).
Woodstock, N.B., Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1057 (i).
——— Ownership of Land, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 4920 (iii).
Yamaska River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7394 (iv).
Yarmouth Harbour Retaining Walls : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Yukon-Ashcroft-Dawson Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 7635 (iv), 9605 (v).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Yukon Buildings, Maintenance, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i).
Yukon Telegraph Lines : in Com. of Sup., 6896 (iv).
Pugwash, N.S., Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
Quaco Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iv).
'Quadra,' Str., Repairs to : in Com. of Sup., 9171 (v).
Qu'Appelle and Edmonton Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 6893 (iv).
Quarantine, Cattle : in Com. of Sup., 6690; conc., 6911 (iv).
Quarantine, Health of Animals : in Com. of Sup., 2309 (ii).
Quarantine : in Com. of Sup., 1838 (i).
Quarantine Officers, Instructions *re* Examination of Ships : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 2304 (ii).
Quarantine, Organized Districts, Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2302 (ii).
Quebec and Blanc Sablon Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 937 (i), 9617 (v).
Quebec Bridge and G. T. Pacific Construction : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2296, 2298 (ii).
Quebec Centre Electoral District, Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 110 (i).
Quebec Drill Hall, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1145 (i).
Quebec and Gaspé Basin SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 926 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners' Act Amt. B. No. 37 (Mr. Préfontaine) 1°, 582 ; 2° m., 1242 ; in Com., 1243 ; 3°*, 1244 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 33.)
Quebec Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 770 (i), 6724 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Works, Transfer to Mar. Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 771 (i).
Quebec Immigration Pier : in Com. of Sup., 1138 (i).
Quebec Military School, Improvement of : Remarks (Mr. O. E. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 9162 (v).
Quebec and Natashquan SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
Quebec Port and Pilotage B. No. 171 (Mr. Préfontaine) 1°*, 7018 ; 2°*, 7440 ; in Com., 7440 ; 3°*, 7444 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 34.)
Quebec Trachoma Hospital : in Com. of Sup., 1138 (i), 9547 (v).
Questions answered by Ministers : Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 1067 (i).
Quinquennial Census, Alberta and Saskatchewan : in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).

Railway Act (Express Cos.) Amt. B. No. 4 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1°*, 9 ; on Order for 2°, 109 (i) ; Remarks, 3246 ; wthdn., 3743 (ii).
Railway Act (crossings) Amt. B. No. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) 1°*, 9 ; 2° m., 281 ; M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 312, agreed to (Y. 85, N. 45) 315; in Com., 1780 (i). 3223 (ii).
Railway Act (ry. comn., chairman, &c.) Amt. B. No. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) Res. prop., 319 ; M. for Com., 493, 535 ; in Com., 563 ; 1°*, of B., 582 ; 2° m., 745 ; in Com., 1596 ; 3° m., 1802 ; Amt. (Mr. Lennox), Neg. (Y. 47, N. 93) 1806 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 35.)
——— Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 320 (i).
——— Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) *re* Express Companies, 1619 ; Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Amt. (Mr. Maclean) 1621 (i); Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 1632 (i).
Railways and Canals, Dept. of, B. No. 53 (Mr. Emmerson) 1° m., 817 ; 2°*, 1673 ; in Com., 1673 ; 3°*, 1806 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 37.)
Ry. Act (express Companies) Amt. B. No. 4 (Mr. Maclean) on M. to adjn. : Remarks, (Mr. Maclean) 3246 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 109 (i).
Railways and Canals, Dep. Minister, Appnmt. of Mr. Butler and Superannuation of Mr. Schreiber, Duties assigned to, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9678 (v).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. : Presented (Mr. Emmerson) 908 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 93, 1219 (i), 9061 (v).
——— Extra Clerks, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 1521 (i).
——— Miscellaneous Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 1520 (i).
Railways and Canals, Subsidized by Govt., Amount expended, &c. : M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Ret.*, 916 (i).
Railway Belt Lands. B.C., Settlement *re* Abuses under Crown Timber Regulations : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9295 (v).
Railway Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 54 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Private Car : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1538 (i).
——— Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Lennox) 2007, 2685 (ii) 6136 (iv).
——— Maintenance, Appnmts., &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1524 (i).
——— Names of Employees, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Perley) 403 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 684 (i).
——— Salaries paid, Private Secs., &c. : Ques. (Mr. Blain) 687 (i).
——— Official Cars, Legal Expenses, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 593 (i).
Railway Commission, Re-hearing of N. W. Cases : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 56 (i).
——— Rental of Rooms : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1542 (i).
Railway Commission Rep., Opinion of Min. of Jus. *re* : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6233 (iv).
——— Non-Production of, on M. for Sup. (Mr. Lennox) 6233 (iv).
——— Report : Presented (Mr. Emmerson) 6346 (iv).
——— Staff Salaries and Rep. of Mr. Blair : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1539 (i).
Railway Mail Clerks : in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Railway Passes, Certificate of Identification for Members : M. (Mr. Bergeron) 7249 (iv).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Committee, 4984 (iii).
See 'Rys.—Freight.'
Railway Rep., Delay in bringing down : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 601 (i).
Railway Statistics : in Com. of Sup., 1521 (i).
Railway and Steamboat Accidents, 1904, Investigation *re* Causes, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Martin) 1397 (i).
Ry. Surveys for Joliette Co., Total Expenditure, &c., *re* : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1346 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 2065 (ii).
RAILWAYS :
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s Claims for Damages, Amounts paid, &c. Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2063 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) 7021 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 9382 (v).
Canada Atlantic Ry., Purchase : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Haggart) 2685 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Haggart) 69 (i).
See 'C. A. Ry.'
Canada Eastern Ry. Improvements of Roadbed : Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 1978 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 734 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 4811 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1922 (i).
C. P. R. Land Taxation, *re* Municipalities, Judgment of Sup. Court : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 2022 (ii).
Caplin and Paspebiac Ry., Payments *re* Subsidy : M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 3203 (ii).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Co., Passenger Rates, Ref. to Ry. Commission : Remarks (Mr. Herron) 6836 (iv).
Freight Rates, Advancement of Rebate : Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 1545
——— Discrimination, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 890 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*
Gratuities to Ry. Employees : in Com. of Sup., 2183 (ii).
See 'I.C.R.', &c.
Jacques Cartier Survey, Costs, Reports, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 593 (i).
James Bay Ry., Deviation of Line, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Grant) 9697 (v).
——— Maps or Plans *re* Location, Filing of : Ques. (Mr. Grant) 2190 (ii).
Joliette Co., Ry. Surveys, Total Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1346 (i).
See 'Ry. Surveys.'
McGill University, Grant to Ry. Transportation School : in Com. of Sup., 9381 (v).
Madoc and Eldorado Ry. Bonus, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 7261 (iv).
National Transcontinental : *See* 'G. T. P.'
New Brunswick Southern Ry., Negotiations *re* Purchase, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 584 (i).
Passenger and Freight Rates, Advancement of, Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 1542 (i).
Père Marquette Ry., Emplymt. of Aliens, Rep. *re* : Laid on Table (Sir William Mulock) 6232 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Ingram) 7916 (iv).
Railways and Canals, Subsidized by Govt., Amount expended, &c.: M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Ret*, 916 (i).
Railway Belt Lands, B.C., Settlement *re*, Abuses under Crown Timber Regulations : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9295 (v).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Committee, 4984 (iii).
See 'Freight Rates.'
Railway Statistics : in Com. of Sup., 1521 (i).
Railway Surveys in Joliette Co., Engineers, Salaries, Instructions, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 2065 (ii).
Tariff *re* Freight Rates Advancement : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1544 (i).
Rama Wharf on Lake Couchiching : in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).
Ramsay and New Ross Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 9696 (v).
Rapide Plat Enlargement Upper Entrance : in Com. of Sup., 6289 (iv).
Ray's Creek, N.S., Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9576 (v).
Receipts and Expenditures, I. C. R., Total Amount : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 688 (i).
Receiver General's Office : in Com. of Sup., 6249 (iv).
Red Deer Court House, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1639 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. No. 76 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 1671 ; 2° m., 1757 (i) ; in Com., 2325 ; 3°*, 2325 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 152.)
Red Point Wharf, P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 9586 (v).
Regina and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 41 (Mr. Scott) 1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2325 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 153.)
Regina Jail : in Com. of Sup., 481 (i).
Regina Post Office, Customs House, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1639 (i).
Reid, Capt., Rep. *re* Submarine Signals : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2886 (ii).
See 'Marine.'
Repentigny Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Reports, Deptl. Delay in Printing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1575 (i).
REPORTS :
Agriculture : Presented (Mr. Fisher) 321 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s, Part I : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 109 (i).
——— Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 271 (i).
Census (1901) : Presented (Mr. Fisher) 50 (i).
Civil Service Examiners : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5428 (iii).
Civil Service Insurance Act, Statement : Presented (Mr. Paterson) 54 (i).
Civil Service List : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 51 (i).
Dom. Police Commissioner's Report : Presented (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 54 (i).
Geographical Board of Canada : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 625 (i).
Indian Affairs : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 111 (i).
Inland Revenue : Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 51 (i). 4085 (iii).
Interior : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 453 (i).
Justice (Penitentiaries) : Presented (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 271 (i).
Marine and Fisheries : Presented (Mr. Préfontaine) 111 (i).
Militia, King's Regulations and Orders : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 54 (i).
Post Office : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 54 (i).
Public Works : Presented (Mr. Hyman) 731
Secretary of State : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5428 (iii).
Trade and Commerce : Presented (Mr. Paterson) 50, 321 (i).
Reptile Fund, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1576 (i).
Resignation of Conservative Ministers in 1896 : Personal Explanation (Messrs. Foster, Haggart and Taylor) 841 (i).
Resignation of Hon. C. Sifton : *See* 'Sifton,' 'Autonomy.'

Restigouche Bridge, Repairs, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 9385 (v).
Returns and Reports : Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1242 (i).
——— Delay in Producing : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1594 (i).
Returns : Inquiry for, 2262 (ii), 4751 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 5600 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. S. Hughes) 5209 (iii).
Ret. Officers' Dep., Delay in Payments to, Letter from Mr. Walker : Read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 6560 (iv).
Returning Officers for Mackenzie and Dauphin, Man., Special Reps., Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1336 (i).
Returning Officers, Forms and Instructions *re* Dom. Elections : M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 697 (i).
——— Instructions *re* Form of Oath at London and Oxford Elections : M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7331 (iv).
Revenue Collections, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 2204 (ii).
Revenue collected in N. W. Ters., Customs and Inland Rev. : M. for Ret. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 600 (i).
Revenue Cruisers for Customs : in Com. of Sup., 409 (i).
Richelieu Bridge at Sorel : Inquiry for O. C., &c. (Mr. Foster) 8098 (v).
——— Papers laid on Table, 8268 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup., 6960 (iv).
Richelieu River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7376 (iv).
Richibucto, Extension Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iv).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 6730 (iv).
——— explanation (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup., 6813 (iv).
Richmond Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 1738
Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s B. No. 103 (Mr. Tobin) 1°*, 2184; on Order for 2°, 2296 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com. 3669 ; 3°*, 3669 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 154.)
Rideau Canal Extension : in Com. of Sup., 1333 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1523 (i).
Rideau Hall, Grounds, Renewals, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
——— Improvements, Grounds, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6823 (iv).
See 'Ottawa,' &c.
Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Change in Boundaries, &c. : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9298 (v).
Rifle Associations, Grants : in Com. of Sup., 444 (i), 9169 (v).
Rimouski Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7320 (iv).
Ritchie, James, Inspection of Masonry *re* Trent Canal, Dismissal, &c. : M. for Cor.* (Mr. Foster) 2777 (ii).
See 'Canals.'
River Hebert Wharf, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
Riviere du Lievre, Little Rapids Dam, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6839, 7325 (iv).
Riviere du Loup Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7323 (iv).
Riviere Ouelle Pier Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7375 (iv).
Riviere Ouelle Spur Line, Extension, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Barker) in Com. of Sup., 1981 (i).
Riviere aux Renards Breakwater Pier : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Riviere Verte Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
Roads and Bridges, Ottawa : in Com. of Sup., 6889 (iv).
Roads and Road Allowances (Alberta and Saskatchewan) B. No. 195 (Mr. Oliver) 1° m., 9075 ; 2° m., 9525 ; in Com., 9526 ; 3°*, 9529; Sen. Amts., 9819 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 38.)
Robert & Co., Lumber purchased, Prices, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 2711 (ii).
Robertson, Mr. D., Appnmt. as Harbour Master for Moncton : Ques. (Mr. Stockton) 2329 (ii).
Rolled Oats : in Com. on Customs Bill, 9763 (v).
——— in Com. on Ways and Means, 8984 (v).
Rolling Stock Equipment, I.C.R., Number added 1900-4 : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 736 (i).
Rolling Stock, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1986 (i), 2037 (ii), 6428 (iv).
——— Stmnt. of Estimated Cost : Read in Com. of Sup., 9501 (v).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
——— Tenders *re* : Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1761 (i).
Rosseau Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).
Ross Rifles, Examination of, &c. : Remarks (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9123 (v).
Ross Rifle Factory, Tank on Martello Tower : Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 431 (i).
Round Hill Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9552 (v).
Rouse, Mr. David, Appnmt. as Customs Collector, Salary, &c. : Ques. Mr. U. Wilson) 452 (i).
Royal Assent : *See* 'Bills.'
Royal Military College Act Amt. B. No. 169 (Sir Frederick Borden) Res. prop., 6904 ; in Com. on Res., 6966 ; 1°* of B., 6984 ; 2°*, 7262 ; in Com., 7262 ; 3°*, 7262 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 39.)

Royal Military College : in Com. of Sup., 7000 (iv), 9170 (v).
——— Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1561 (i).
Royal Mint : *See* 'Mint.'
Royal Scots Armoury, Military Properties : in Com. of Sup., 9169 (v).
Royal Trust Co., Ref. to in Com. on B. 99 (Mr. Fielding) 3651 (ii).
Running Time, I.C.R., Connections at Montreal: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 6831 (iv).
Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment in Can., Probable Cost, &c.: M. for Reps., &c., (Mr. Lennox) 2067 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery System : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 220 (i).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Rustico Harbour, Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1738 (i).
——— Dredging, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1593 (i).
Ryan, Heber W., Emplymt. by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 4458 (iii).
St. Abdon Post Office, Establishment of, Recommendation *re* : Ques. (Mr. Morin) 6653. (iv).
St. Alexis, Ha Ha Bay Pier : Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
St. Alphonse de Bagotville Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
St. Alphonse Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
St. André de Kamouraska, Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
St. Angel Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1759 (i).
St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe Waterways : in Com. of Sup., 7380 (iv).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, Pier Reconstruction: in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
St. Boniface, Hospital : in Com. of Sup., 1846
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
St. Catharines Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1578 (i).
St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 948 (i).
St. Charles Borromée Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
St. Cyrille, Diversion of Ry. Line : in Com. of Sup., 1969 (i).
St. Fabien Subway, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1980 (i).
Ste. Famille Wharfage Dues, Abolition of : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1150 (i).
Ste. Famille Wharf, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1149 (i).
——— Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
Ste. Fidèle Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
Ste. Flavie I.C.R., Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 9390 (v).
St. Francis de Sales Wharf : in Com of Sup., 7391 (iv).
St. Francis, Isolated Block : in Com. of Sup., 7391 (iv).
St. Francis Lake (Beauce) Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
St. François and Quebec SS. Subsidy, Requests *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1504 (i).
St. François Wharf, Expenditure *re* in Sept., Oct. and Nov., 1904 : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1343 (i).
St. Fulgence Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7392 (iv).
St. Gédéon Island Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7392 (iv).
Ste. Genevieve Piers : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Ste. Genevieve and Isle Bizard, Expenditure *re*, Cor., &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Monk) 601 (i).
St. George, Mr. P. W., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 152 (i).
St Ignace Channel Dam, Plan, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 592 (i).
St. James Division Branch P.O.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 218 (i).
St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
St. Jean d'Orleans Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).
St. John Detention Building . in Com. of Sup., 1050 (i).
St. John and Digby SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 904, 966 (i).
——— Resolution from Moncton Board of Trade: Read (Mr. Daniel) 904 (i).
St. John Drill Hall. N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i), 7503 (iv).
St. John, N.B., Dublin, Belfast Winter Service : in Com. of Sup., 902 (i).
St. John, Halifax and London SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 903 (i), 7087 (iv).
——— Memorial from Board of Trade, St. John: Read (Mr. Daniel) 903 (i).
St. John, Halifax and W. Indies Mail Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 7176 (iv).
——— Res. from Montreal Corn Exchange : Read (Mr. Ames) 7178 (iv).
St. John, Halifax and Yarmouth SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 923 (i), 6901 (iv).
St. John Harbour, Improvements : Remarks (Mr. Stockton) in Com. of Sup., 775 (i).
——— Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7503 (iv).
St. John, N.B., Harbour and Transportation Commission, Reps. *re* : M. for Copies* (Mr. Daniel) 9698 (v).
St. John Harbour, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 9588 (v).
St John, Increased Accommodation I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 9389 (v).
St. John and Minas Basin SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 926, 971 (i).

St. John River, Mail Subsidy paid to Star Line: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 181 (i).
St. John Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 1052 (i).
St. John River, Tidal Water, Contribution *re* Wharfs : in Com. of Sup., 9590 (v).
——— Tidal Waters : in Com. of Sup., 7503 (iv).
——— Tributaries : in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iv).
St. John and St. Martins, N.B., Mail Contract : Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2776 (ii).
St. John and W. Indies and S. America, Mail Subsidies : in Com. of Sup., 8691 (v).
St. John and Westport SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 966 (i).
St. John's, P.Q., Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1143 (i).
St. Joseph's Pier, Lake Huron, Delay *re* Completion : Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2774 (ii).
St. Lambert and Belœil, Double Tracking: in Com. of Sup., 2183 (ii).
St. Lawrence Canals, Deepening Shoals: in Com. of Sup., 6289 (iv).
St. Lawrence Channel, Aids to Navigation : in Com. of Sup., 2858 ; Res. from Montreal Board of Trade : Read, 2859 ; Res. from Allan SS. Owners : Read, 2860 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com. of Sup., 2891 (ii).
——— Lights, Buoy Service, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2703 (ii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
St. Lawrence Navigation, Aids to : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 891 (i).
——— Channel, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2448 (ii).
——— 'Montcalm,' Ice Breaker, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2451 (ii).
——— St. Mary's Current : in Com. of Sup., 814 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, New Dredge Plant : in Com. of Sup., 9171 (v).
St. Lawrence (lower) Removal of Rock : in Com. of Sup., 7308 (iv).
——— Suction Dredge, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6436 (iv).
——— description read (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 6447 (iv).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Total Expenditure, &c., *re* Supplies, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 2455 (ii).
St. Lawrence Ice Blockade, Damages *re* : Remarks (Mr. Broder) 280 (i).
St. Lawrence Islands, Govt. Control *re* Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Walsh) 6477 (iv).
St. Louis, Capt., Certificate *re* Reinstatement : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 591 (i).
St. Louis Exhibition : Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 1832 (i).
St. Louis Lake, Buoy and Light Service : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 2704 (ii).
St. Louis River, Feeders and Waterways : in Com. of Sup., 7379, 7380 (iv).
Ste. Marguerite Postmaster, Dismissal of L. Laflamme : Ques. (Mr. Morin) 6477 (iv).
St. Mary's and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 15 (Mr. McIntyre) 1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 415 ; in Com., and 3°*, 864 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 155.)
St. Mary's Current, St. Lawrence Channel, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 814 (i).
St. Mary's Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1578 (i).
St. Maurice River Channel Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6851, 7326 (iv).
St. Maurice District Slides and Booms : in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).
St. Maurice Valley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 173 (Mr. Bureau) Pet. presented, 6826 ; M. to receive Pet., 7017 ; 1°*, 7175 ; 2°*, 7261 (iv) ; in Com. and 3°*, 8655 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 156.)
St. Moïse Station Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1976 (i).
St. Ours Canal, Booms and Piers : in Com. of Sup., 1499 (i).
——— Landing Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6302 (iv).
St. Paul Land and Hydraulic Co.'s Lease, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2777 (ii).
St. Peter's Bay Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1739 (i).
St. Peter's Breakwater, P.E.I., Tenders *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5035 (iii).
St. Peter's Canal, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).
——— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6308 (iv).
St. Regis Lockup : in Com. of Sup., 237 (i).
St. Siméon Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).
St. Stephen and Black Bay SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 936 (i).
St. Thérèse Island, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7376 (iv).
St. Timothée Wharf, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7305 (iv).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 480 (i).
Sabbath Day Legislation, Reference, Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 9684 (v).
Sackville Railway Station, Tenders *re* Erection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 5133 (iii).
Sacre Cœur Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
Saguenay River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7377
Salmon Canning Fisheries, B.C., Suspension, &c., Representations *re* : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 269 (i).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.
Salmon, Capt., Resignation *re* 'Canada,' &c., Collision : M. (Mr. Ames) for Cor., 384 (i).

Salmon, Capt., Rep. *re* Accident to 'Lurcher,' Laid on Table, 2878 (ii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Salmon Hatcheries and Provincial Fishing Licenses : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2905 (ii).
Salmon River, B.C., Removal of Obstructions : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
Salvation Army Colonies, Rider Haggard's Rep.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 6188 (iv).
See 'Immigration.'
Sandwich Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1579 (i).
Sarnia, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
——— Post Office Building : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 862 (i).
Saskatchewan Bill, Conference *re* Boundaries : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8268 (v).
——— Papers *re* Population, &c., Laid on Table, 8267 (v).
Saskatchewan Boundaries, Addition to : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on B. 69, 5621 (iii).
Saskatchewan, Province of, Financial Clauses : prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2914 (ii).
——— Deb.: *See* 'Autonomy Bills.'
Saskatchewan Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 111 (Mr. Scott) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2773 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 157.)
Saskatchewan (North) River Survey : in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).
Saskaztchewan, Permanent Capital at Regina : Remarks (Mr. Lamont) 1596 (i).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Issue of Patents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8267, 8655 (v).
Saskatoon Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1640 (i), 9550 (v).
Saugeen River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).
Saugeen River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie Bonded Warehouse *re* Soft Coal, Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5688 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Construction : in Com. of Sup., 1334 (i).
——— Contracts *re* Construction : in Com. of Sup., 1406 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie, Celebration *re* Ship Canals : in Com. of Sup., 9621 (v).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal Dredging, U.S. and Canadian Contractors, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 589 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Govt. Dredging Dock, Total Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5426 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6881 (iv).
Savage Harbour, P.E.I., Proposed Improvements: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3361 (ii).
Saw-logs, Export Duty, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Sup., 752 (i).
Sbarretti, Memorandum *re* Separate Schools : *See* 'Manitoba Boundaries,' &c.
Sshool Lands sold by Auction in N.W.T., Number of Acres : Ques. (Mr. Lake) 730 (i).
Schools of Navigation : in Com. of Sup., 2639
Schreiber, Mr. : *See* 'Railways and Canals.'
Schukin, Ivan, Claim of, Cor. with Int. Dept. and Dom. Lands Office at Yorkton, &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2334 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iv).
'Scotia,' Str., Certificates of Engineers, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8385 (v).
Scott's Bay Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7415 (iv).
'Scout,' Str., Compensation Claims *re* Injuries, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 6463 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re* Coast Service : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 2700 (ii).
——— Investigation *re* Explosion of Acetylene Gas, Appnmt. of Experts : Remarks, 4841 (iii).
——— Repairs, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6643 (iv).
See 'Marine,' &c.
'Scurvy Politician,' Ques. of Order *re* Quotation : Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3863 (ii).
Seaforth Post Office : Remarks (Mr. Gunn) in Com. of Sup., 858 (i).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. No. 38 (Mr. Préfontaine) 1° m., 583 (i) ; 2°*, 2114 ; in Com., 2115 (ii); wthdn. 4749 (iii).
——— B. No. 147 (Mr. Préfontaine) 1°*, 4750 (iii) ; 2°*, 7424 ; in Com., 7424 (iv), 9029 ; 3°*, 9031 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 40.)
——— Victoria Board of Trade Res. : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 7432 (iv).
See 'Shipwrecked,' 'Marine,' &c.
Secretary of State, Deptl. Employees, Salaries, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Belcourt) 8655 (v).
——— Number of Employees : Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 8147 (v).
——— Deptl. Report : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier 5428 (ii).
——— Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 74 (i), 6248 (iv), 9071 (v).
Secret Service, Expenditure *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6958 (iv).
Seed Grain, Advance to Settlers, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 9307 (v).
Seed Grain, Indians, Man and N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
——— Indians, N.B. : in Com. of Sup., 6516 (iv).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. No. 7 (Mr. Fisher) M. for Com. on Res., 52 ; in Com., 54 ; 1°*, 66 ; 2° m., 322 ; in Com., 322, 1155, 1788 ; 3°, m., 1868 ; 3°*, 1886 (i) ; Sen. Amts., 7583 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 41.)

Selkirk Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1634 (i).
Selkirk Ret. Officers, Occupation, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 1761 (i).
Selkirk Wharf Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Semaphores, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1986 (i).
Senate and House of Commons (indemnity) B. No. 202 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) Res. prop., 9701 ; in Com. on Res., 9726 ; 1°* of B., 9733 ; 2°*, 9791 ; in Com., 9791 ; 3°*, 9792 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 43.)
Senate and House of Commons Conferences, Mess. from the Senate : Read (Mr. Fielding) 9028 (v).
——— M. (Mr. Fielding) to conc., 9280 (v).
Senate Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 6620, 6943 (iv).
Separate Schools, Circulars addressed to Orange Lodge : Remarks on prop. Res. (Mr. Hughes) *re* Imp. Parliament, 2405 (ii).
Separate School Pamphlet, Official Authorization for Distribution, Preparation, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2328 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2006 (ii).
Separate Schools, Pets. from E. Assa. : Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Sproule) 2412 (ii).
Separate Schools, Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Lake) 3649 (ii).
——— *See* 'Autonomy Bill,' 'Man. Boundaries.'
'Seguin,' Str., Purchase by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3834 (ii).
Sergeant-at-Arms, Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 240 (i), 6610 (iv).
Sessional Clerks, House of Commons : in Com. of Sup., 239 (i), 6595 (iv).
Sessional Messengers : in Com. of Sup., 6612 (iv).
Sessional Pages : in Com. of Sup., 6613 (iv).
Sessions of Parliament, Delays in bringing down Estimates, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9085 (v).
Settlers' Effects, Duty *re* : in Com. of Ways and Means, 8996 (v).
Severn River, Removal of Obstructions at Macdonald's Chute : in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).
Seymour, Mr. D. G., Complaint *re* Homestead Location : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9033, 9294 (v).
Shadwell, Mr. J. B., Gratuity to : in Com. of Sup., 6435 (iv).
Shaw, Mr. J. B., Retirement, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lake) 264 (i).
Shelburne Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Shelburne Postmaster, Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re* : M. for Copies (Mr. Barr) 595 (i).
Shellmouth Bridge, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 7591 (iv).
Shellmouth Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1043 (i).
Sherbrooke Armouries, Provision for Militia, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 266 (i).
——— Immediate Erection, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5784 (iii).
——— Purchase of Land, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Worthington) in Com. of Sup., 427 (i).
——— Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 191 (i).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).
Sherbrooke Postal Delivery Service : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 378 (i).
Sherbrooke Post Office, Improvements, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 191 (i).
Sheriff of Yukon, Allowances : in Com. of Sup., 132 (i).
Ships Safety B. No. 21 (Mr. Sinclair) 1°*, 319 ; 2°*, 601 ; in Com. 731 (i).
Shipwrecked Seamen : in Com. of Sup., 2688 (ii).
Sifton, Hon. Clifford, Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill : Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1851 (i).
Signal Service *re* Lighthouses : in Com. of Sup., 2760 (ii).
Silver Coins, Worn, &c., Redemption of : Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 688 (i).
See 'Finance,' &c.
Silver Water, Manitoulin Island Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9597 (v).
Simcoe Military Camp, Establishment of : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 9712 (v).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Simcoe Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1581 (i).
Skinner's Cove Boat Channel and Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Slides and Booms, Facilities, Govt. Policy *re* : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).
——— Revenue collected : in Com. of Sup., 7629 (iv).
Small-Pox on American Ships, Expenditure *re* Mar. Provs.: Remarks (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 2689 (ii).
Small-pox Epidemic in Man., Expenses *re* : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 2306 (ii).
——— Prevention in N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 1841 (i).
Smart, Jas. A., Dep. Min. of Interior, Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4370 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 115 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 6419 (iv).
Smelting Ore, Mines Branch : in Com. of Sup., 9303 (v).
Smith, Mr. E. D., Charges by Min. of Agr. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 874 (i).

Smith, Mr. E. D., Statements *re* Cold Storage : Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 874 (i).

Snow Blockades, I.C.R., Delay in Service, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2028 (ii).

See 'I.C.R.', 'P.E.I.', &c.

Sorel, Deep Water Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9593 (v).

——— Dredge Building, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 790 (i).

——— Ice Piers : in Com. of Sup., 6841 (iv).

Sorel Shipyards, Dredge Building: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 6448 (iv).

——— Expenditure *re* Wages, Supplies, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 1399 (i).

——— Purchase of Supplies : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 2457 (ii).

Soulanges Canal Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 1421 (i), 6290 (iv).

Souris Public Building, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).

S. Africa and Canada SS. Service, Dates of Sailing, Values, &c., of Exports : M. (Mr. A. Johnston) for Ret.*, 1397 (i).

S. Africa and Canada SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).

S. A. War, King's Medals for Canadian Soldiers: M. for Cor.*, &c. (Mr. Worthington) 3204 (ii).

South Shore Ry. Co. and the Quebec Southern Co.'s B. No. 149 (Mr. Brown) 1°*, 5783 (iii) ; 2°*, 6868 (iv) ; M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 9072 ; M. to place on Order Paper for Com., 9278 ; in Com., 9340, 9586 ; 3°*, 9587 ; Sen. Amts., 9815 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 158.)

Sovereign Fire Assurance Co. of Canada's incorp. B. No. 26 (Mr. E. F. Clarke) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., 1755 ; 3°*, 1757 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 159.)

Spanish River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).

Speaker, Election of : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2 (i).

Speaker, Dep.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to appoint, 50 (i).

Speeches of Members, Delay in Printing at Bureau : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7723 (iv).

Speech from Throne : *See* 'Address.'

Spirits in Bond, Age Limit, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. on B. 176, 8679 (v).

Standard Gauge, P.E.I. Ry., Cost of Construction : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2181 (ii).

Stanhope P. O., Dismissal of Mr. H. Lawson, Cor., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 1398 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1062 (i).

See 'Post Office,' &c.

Stanley Bridge, P.E.I. Ry. Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Martin, P.E.I.) 266 (i).

——— Total Cost, Claim for Damages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Martin, P.E.I.) 587 (i).

Staple Commodities Packing and Sale B. No. 121 (Mr. Fisher) M. for Com. on Res., 676 ; in Com. on Res., 681, 736 (i), 2413 ; 1°* of B., 2441 ; 2° m., and in Com., 2841 ; 3°*, 2850 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 44.)

——— Administration B. No. 155 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1°*, 5960 (iii) ; 2°*, 5979 ; in Com., 5979 ; 3°*, 5983 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 45.)

Staples, Inspection, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 9616, 9681 (v).

Station Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 6429 (iv).

Statistical Year-Book : *See* 'Year-Book.'

Statistics, Collection, &c., Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. on B. 5, 1003 (i).

Statutes, Revision Commission : in Com. of Sup., 8672 (v).

——— Indexing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 8673 (v).

——— Completion of : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 745 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 6 (Mr. McCarthy) 1°*, 58 ; 2° m., 315 ; Ref. to Sel. Com., 316 (i).

Steamboat Inspection, Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii), 6628 (iv).

Steel Rails, Fastenings, &c., I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1988 (i), 2038 (ii).

Steel Sheds, Montreal Harbour, Approval of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 151 (i).

See 'Montreal,' &c.

Stenographers, N. W. Ter. Sup. Court : in Com. of Sup., 125 (i).

Sterling Bank of Canada B. No. 182 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 7810 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com., and 3°*, 8655 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 160.)

Stevens, Douglas, Answer to Capt. Salmon's Rep. *re* 'Lurcher' accident : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2878 (ii).

Stevens, Mrs. Douglas, Gratuity : in Com. of Sup., 6628 (iv).

Steward for Speaker's Rooms, Appnmt. of : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 240 (i).

Stewart, Mr. J. Sprott, Charges *re* Dismissal : Letter read (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9613 (v).

See 'Musquodoboit.'

Stokes Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9598 (v).

Stoney Indians, Depleting Game, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 6548 (iv).

Stony Mountain Penitentiary, School Fees : in Com. of Sup., 9684 (v).

Storm Signals at Headlands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 9176 (v).

Stratford Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1581 (i).

Strathcona Horse Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 1637 (i).

Submarine Signal Apparatus : Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 892 (i).

Submarine Signal Bells. Installation : in Com. of Sup., 2871 (ii).
——— reps. of U.S., List of Stations : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2871 (ii).
Submarine Signal Co. of Boston, Cor. with Min. of Mar., &c.: M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies*, 917 (i).
Summerside Drill Hall : Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 1562, 1662 (i).
Summerside Harbour Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1739 (i).
Summerside Improvements, P.E.I. Ry : in Com. of Sup., 2176 (ii).
Summerville Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Sunday Customs Collections, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 413 (i).
Sunday Observance Legislation, Payment for Legal Services : in Com. of Sup., 6722 (iv).
——— Govt. Legislation, *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 8656 (v).
Superannuation Scheme, I.C.R. : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 2241 (ii).
See 'Employees,' &c.
Supply B. No. 168 (Mr. Fielding) Res. prop., 6966 ; 1°* ; 2°* ; in Com., and 3°*, 6966 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 1.)
——— B. No. 206 (Mr. Fielding) M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9798 ; in Com., 9800 ; 1°*, 2°*, 9801 ; in Com., 9801 ; 3°*, 9801 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 2.)
Supply : M. for Com. (Mr. Paterson) 50 (i).

SUPPLY :
COMMITTEE :
Administration of Justice : *See* 'Justice.'
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics :
Aid to Agricultural Societies, 1829 (i).
Archives, 1823 (i), 6679 (iv).
Criminal Statistics, 1473 (i).
Dairying Interests, To promote, 6928, 7014 (iv).
Dairying Interests, Live Stock, &c., 6932 (iv).
Dom. Exhibition, New Westminster, 9608 (v).
Exhibitions, 1831 (i), 6269 (iv).
Experimental Farms, 6165 (iv), 9608 (v).
For Renewing Can. Exhibit at Imp. Institute, 1836 (i).
Fumigating Stations, 1831 (i).
General Statistics, 1827 (i), 6274 (iv).
Historical Data *re* Acadians, 1830 (i).
Live Stock Records, 6680 (iv).
Patent Record, 1472 (i).
Printing, &c., of Bulletins, 6926 (iv).
Quinquennial Census, Man., Saskn. and Alta., 9608 (v).
Year Book, 1474 (i).
Charges of Management :
General Vote, 69 (i), 6249 (iv), 8691, 9052 (v).
Civil Government :
Agriculture, 91 (i), 9053-57 (v).
Auditor General's Office, 77, 90 (i), 6721 (iv).
Board of Civil Service Examiners, 75 (i), 6249 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Civil Government—*Con.*
Contingencies :
Agriculture, 92 (i), 9057 (v).
Auditor General's Office, 6721 (iv).
Finance, 118 (i), 6268 (iv).
Governor General's Secretary's Office, 70 (i), 6248 (iv).
Interior, 116 (i).
Justice, 73 (i).
Labour, 100 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, 105 (i), 2442 (ii), 6265 (iv).
Militia and Defence, 9068 (v).
North-west Mounted Police, 78 (i).
Post Office, 95 (i), 6240 (iv), 9060 (v).
Privy Council Office, 72 (i).
Public Printing and Stationery, 76 (i).
Public Works, 94 (i).
Railways and Canals, 94 (i).
Secretary of State, 75 (i).
Trade and Commerce, 9034 (iv).
Customs, 78 (i), 9069 (v).
Depts. Generally, 121 (i), 6268 (iv).
Finance, 119 (i), 6268 (iv), 9060 (v).
Geological Survey, 122 (i), 6248 (iv).
Governor General's Secretary's Office, 70 (i), 9052 (v).
High Commissioner's Office, 120 (i).
Indian Affairs, 116 (i).
Inland Revenue, 89 (i), 9069 (v).
Interior, 114 (i), 6234 (iv), 9070 (v).
Justice, 72 (i).
Labour, 100 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, 102 (i), 6265 (iv), 9050 (v).
Militia and Defence, 112 (i), 9067 (v).
North-west Mounted Police, 78 (i).
Post Office, 95 (i), 9058 (v).
Privy Council Office, 71 (i).
Public Printing and Stationery, 76 (i).
Public Works, 94 (i), 6724 (iv), 9071 (v).
Railways and Canals, 93 (i), 9061, 9066 (v).
Secretary of State, 74 (i), 6248 (iv), 9071 (v).
Trade and Commerce, 96 (i).
Culling Timber, 7236 (iv).
Customs :
Gratuity to Jeffrey Foot, 6434 (iv).
Gratuity to Widow of Late J. B. Shadwell, 6435 (iv).
Gratuity to Widow of Late John Turner, 6435 (iv).
Salaries, Contingent Expenses, &c., 256, 405 (i).
Salaries, Travelling Inspectors, Expenses, &c., 405 (i).
Dominion Lands :
Contingencies, 6406 (iv), 9292 (v).
Mines Branch, Iron Ore Electric Smelting, 9303 (v).
Salaries, &c., 9251 (v).
Extra Clerks, &c., 9289 (v).
Surveys, &c., 6406 (iv), 8671, 9306 (v).
Timber Lands Protection of, 9297 (v).
Dominion Police :
General Vote, 137 (i).
Excise :
Adulteration of Food, 1699, 1710 (i).
Extra Duty Pay *re* Overtime, 1688 (i).
Methylated Spirits, 1690 (i).
Preventive Service, 1688 (i).
Provisional Allowances to Officers, 1690 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Excise—*Con.*
Salaries, &c., 1679 (i).
To pay Collectors of Customs Allowance for Duty collected, 1689 (i).
To pay L. A. Fréchette for Translation, 1690 (i).
Travelling Expenses, Rent, Fuel, &c., 1689 (i), 6724 (iv).
Weights and Measures :
Metric System, 1698 (i).
Rent, Fuel, Travelling Expenses, &c., 1695 (i).
Salaries, &c., 1692 (i).
Salaries *re* Light Inspection, 1696 (i).
Fisheries :
Bait Freezers, 9620 (v).
Commission on Fisheries, 9172 (v).
Fog Fish, Reduction Works *re* 9173 (v).
Fish-breeding Establishments, &c., 2904 (ii), 6635 (iv).
Fishing Bounty, Expenses *re*, 6636 (iv).
Fish-curing Establishments, 9173 (v).
Honorarium to R. N. Venning, *re* Russian Seizures, 6630 (iv).
New Boilers, &c., Cruiser 'Petrel,' 6630 (iv).
Oyster Culture, 2911 (ii).
Protection Service, 2907 (ii).
Salaries to Overseers, &c., 2878 (ii), 6630 (iv).
Geological Survey :
Books for Library, 8671 (v).
Compiling of Field Notes, &c., 8670 (v).
General Vote, 8669 (v).
Metallurgical, Petrographical Assistance, 8671 (v).
Special Surveys in B.C. and Yukon, 8669 (v).
To pay Frank Nicolas, 9249 (v).
Govt. of Northwest Territories :
Land Titles Offices, Expenses, &c., 9249 (v).
Govt. of Yukon Teritory :
Additional Living Allowance, Major Z. T. Wood, 9250 (v).
General Vote, 7716 (iv), 9622 (v).
Grant for Local Purposes, 7718 (iv), 9250 (v).
Immigration :
Agents' Salaries, Can., G. B. and Foreign Countries, 7684 (iv), 9226, 9308 (v).
Contingencies in Canada, British and Foreign Countries, 6384, 7709 (iv).
Indians :
British Columbia :
Dom. Exhibition at New Westminster, 9339 (v).
Industrial Schools, &c., 6556 (iv), 9339 (v).
Medical Attendance, &c., 6555 (iv).
Miscellaneous, 9339 (v).
Pemberton Reserve, 9339 (v).
Travelling Expenses, 6556 (iv).
Generally :
P. H. Bryce, Medical Inspector, 6558 (iv).
Printing and Stationery, 6558 (iv)
Manitoba and N.W.T.:
Annuities, 6538 (iv).
Implements, 9336 (v).
Live Stock, 6539 (iv).
Provisions, &c., 6550 (iv), 9338 (v).
Seeds, 6539 (iv).
Surveys, 6552 (iv).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Indians—*Con.*
New Brunswick :
Medical Attendance, 6516 (iv).
Miscellaneous and Unforseen, 6517 (iv).
Relief and Seed Grain, 6516 (iv).
Salaries, 6516 (iv).
Supt.'s Salary, 9336 (v).
Nova Scotia :
General Vote, 6514 (iv).
Ontario and Quebec :
Blankets, &c., 226 (i).
General Legal Expenses, 237 (i).
Grant for Agriculture Society, Munceys, 237 (i).
Indian Treaty No. 9, Expenses *re*, 9336 (v).
Land Management Fund, 236 (i).
Legal Expenses, 9335 (v).
Medical Attendance, 223 (i).
Park in Thousand Islands, 9335 (v).
Salaries of Chiefs, &c., and Agent Oka, 235 (i).
Schools, 225, 230 (i).
St. Regis Lockup, 237 (i).
Surveys of Reserves, 236 (i).
P.E.I.:
Medical Attendance, 6537 (iv).
Yukon :
Inspection of Staples :
Further Amount, Wages and Contingencies, 6901 (iv), 9616, 9681 (v).
Inspector's Salaries, &c., 7224 (iv).
Justice :
Atlin District, Judge's Allowance, 9683 (v).
Exchequer Court :
General Vote, 125 (i).
Judges' Travelling Expenses, 122 (i).
Miscellaneous, including N.W.T., 101, 102 (i), 6721 (iv).
Prince Albert, Court House, &c., 124 (i).
Remuneration of N.W.T. Stenographers, 125 (i).
Salary, County Court Judge, N.S., 124 (i).
Supreme Court :
General Vote, 125 (i).
Three Rivers, Judge, 9682 (v).
Yukon :
Fees, &c., 135 (i).
Judges' Travelling Allowances, 126 (i).
Law Books, 136 (i).
Living Allowances, &c., 132 (i).
Maintenance of Prisoners, 134 (i).
Miscellaneous Expenditure, 137 (i).
Legislation :
General :
Printing and Binding, 6948 (iv).
Printing, &c., of Laws, 6948 (iv).
Voters' Lists, 6897, 6954 (iv).
House of Commons :
Committees, 6594 (iv).
Contingencies, 239 (i).
Debates, 239 (i), 6592 (iv).
General Vote, 6268 (iv).
Salaries, 238 (i).
Sergeant-at-Arms Estimate, 240 (i).
One Additional Messenger, 6613 (iv).
Pages, 6613 (iv).
Sessional Messengers, 6610 (iv).
Sessional Clerks, 239 (i), 6595 (iv).
Stationery, 6594 (iv).
Telephone Com., Expenses *re* Translation, 9621 (v).
Voters' Lists, &c., 6897 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Legislation—*Con.*
Library :
Books, 6944 (iv).
Salaries, 6944 (iv).
Senate :
Further Amount for Contingencies, 6620, 6943 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service :
Agencies, Rents and Contingencies, 2705 (ii).
Aids to Navigation, &c., 2758, 2850 (ii), 9175 (v).
Expenses *re* Late Fall Navigation, Upper Lakes, 6645 (iv).
Maintenance and Repairs, &c., 2706, 2725 (ii), 6636 (iv), 9035 (v).
Marconi Stations, 2869 (ii).
Montreal Pilot Commissioner's Court, 2760 (ii).
Parry Sound, Buoy Depot, 9175 (v).
Repairs to Str. 'Scout,' 6643 (iv).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 2697 (ii), 9175 (v).
Salaries of Temporaries, Draughtsmen, &c., 2760 (ii).
Signal Service, 2760 (ii).
Submarine Signals, 2871 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions :
Amount authorized by Statute, 7094 (iv).
Annapolis and Hull, 966 (i), 9622 (v).
Baddeck, Grand Narrows and Iona, 934 (i).
Canada and G.B., 864 (i).
Canada and Mexico, 895 (i), 9622, 9680 (v).
Canada and New Zealand, 7094 (iv).
Canada and South Africa, 971 (i).
Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie, 934 (i), 9616 (v).
Gaspé Basin and Paspebiac, 944 (i).
Gaspé Basin and Quebec, 926 (i).
Grand Manan and Mainland, 922 (i).
Halifax and Canso, 937 (i).
Halifax and Nfld., via Cape Breton Ports, 906 (i).
Halifax, Nfld. and Liverpool, 902 (i).
Magdalen Islands and Mainland, 906 (i).
Manchester and Canada, 932 (i).
Petit du Grat and Mulgrave, 966 (i).
Murray Bay and River Ouelle, 938 (i).
Pictou and Cheticamp, 935 (i).
Port Mulgrave and Bras d'Or Lakes, Ports, 934 (i).
Port Mulgrave and Canso, 935 (i).
Pictou, &c., and Montague Bridge, 926 (i).
Port Essington and the Queen Charlotte Islands, 9616 (v).
P.E.I. and G.B., 927 (i), 7088 (iv).
P.E.I., Cape Breton and Nfld., 940 (i), 7092 (iv).
Quebec and Blanc Sablon, 936 (i), 9617 (v).
Quebec and Murray Bay, &c., 938 (i), 7091 (iv).
Quebec and Natashquan, &c., 967 (i).
St. John and Annapolis Basin, &c., 966 (i)
St. John and Digby, 904 (i).
St. John, Dublin and Belfast, 902 (i).
St. John and Glasgow, 902 (i).
St. John, Halifax and London, 903 (i), 7087 (iv).
St. John, Halifax and W. I. and South America, 7087, 7176 (iv), 8691 (v).
St. John and Halifax, via Yarmouth, 923 (i), 6901 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions—*Con.*
St. John and Minas Basin, &c., 926, 971 (i), 8691 (v).
St. John, Westport, &c., 966 (i).
St. Stephen, Campobello and Black Bay, 936 (i).
Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence, 937 (i).
Tadousac and St. Catherine's Bay (winter) 948 (i).
Victoria and San Francisco, 906 (i).
Victoria, Vancouver and Skagway, 7091 (iv).
Victoria and Vancouver Island Ports, 938 (i).
Wrecking Plant on St. Lawrence River, 957 (i), 7094 (iv).
Marine Hospitals :
Care of Sick Seamen in Mar. Provs. and Repairs, 2686 (ii).
St. John, N.B., Grant to Fernhill Cemetery 6628 (iv).
Shipwrecked and Distressed Seamen, 2688 (ii).
Yarmouth, Marine Hospital, 9172 (v).
Militia :
Annual Drill, 441 (i), 6512 (iv).
Armoury, 5th Royal Scots, 9169 (v).
Arms, &c., Purchase of Lands, 9105 (v).
Dominion Arsenals, 445 (i), 7012 (iv), 9170 (v).
Salary, Lt.-Col. F. M. Gaudet, 6513 (iv).
Esquimalt Defences, 9170 (v).
Grants to Rifle Associations, &c., 444 (i). 9169 (v).
Louisburg, Preservation of Old Fort Site, 9170 (v).
Militia Stores, 6513 (iv).
Military Survey, 439 (i).
Pay and Allowances, 415 (i), 6510 (iv).
Royal Military College, 7000 (iv), 9170 (v).
Transport and Freight, 6513 (iv).
Miscellaneous :
Academy of Arts, 6959, 7238 (iv).
Army and Navy, Remission of Customs, Duty *re*, 6724, 6812 (iv).
Assay Office, Vancouver, 7720 (iv).
Astronomical Work of Interior Dept., 7719 (iv).
Banff Park, Construction of Roads, &c., 6423 (iv).
Water Works, &c., 9306 (v).
Can. Bank of Commerce, Compensation *re* Yukon, 9615 (v).
'Canada Gazette,' 6723 (iv).
Canada Temperance Act, Expenses *re*, 6957 (iv).
Canadian Mining Institute, 7247 (iv).
Champlain, Monument at St. John, N.B., 9340 (v).
International Boundary Line Wire Fence, 8672 (v).
Keewatin, Maintenance of Lunatics, 7720 (iv).
'Labour Gazette,' 7511 (iv).
Legal Expenses, 6723, 7247, 7720 (iv).
Litigated Matters between Dom. and Provs., 6959 (iv).
Maps, Lithographing, &c., 6424, 7721 (iv), 9307 (v).
Naturalization Act, Expenses *re*, 6957 (iv).
Pacific Cable, 7239, 7276 (iv).
Paris Agency, 6958 (iv).
Printing, 6723, 6901, 6957 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Miscellaneous—*Con.*
Printing Bureau, Plant, 9614 (v).
Public Accts. Com., Expenses *re*, 9616 (v).
Quebec City, Contribution *re* International Congress of Americanistes, 9621 (v).
Relief for Distressed Canadians, 7247 (iv).
Revised Statutes, Commission, 7241 (iv), 8672 (v).
Sault Ste. Marie Canals, Celebration *re*, 9621 (v).
Seed Grain, 9307 (v).
Sunday Observance Legislation, Legal Services *re*, 6722 (iv).
Tariff Commission, 9614 (v).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, 7248 (iv).
Unforseen Expenses, 6958 (iv).
Yoho Park Reserve, Roads, &c., 7719 (iv).
Mounted Police :
General Vote, 6957 (iv), 8657 (v).
Yukon :
Pay of Force, 8662 (v).
Ocean and River Service :
Allowance to Capt. J. Harrison *re* SS. 'Grecian,' 6466 (iv).
Coast Service and Surveys, N. W. Coasts of Canada, 6468 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance, &c., and Ice Breakers, 2595 (ii), 6463 (iv), 9034 (v).
Additional Ice Breakers, 9617 (v).
Honorarium to A. P. Low, 6473 (iv).
Ice Boats, New, Vc., 9177 (v).
Masters' and Mates' Examination, 2623 (ii).
Naval Militia, 9178 (v).
New Boilers, &c., Str. 'Aberdeen,' 6464 (iv).
Patrol Boat, N.W.M.P. in Hudson's Bay, 9178 (v).
Patrolling Northern Waters, &c., 9177 (v).
'Quadra,' Str., Repairs, 9171 (v).
Removal of Obstructions in Navigable Waters, 2647 (ii).
Rewards for Saving Life, 2624 (ii).
School of Navigation, 2639 (ii).
Tidal Service, 2647 (ii).
Winter Mail Service, 2648 (ii), 6467 (iv).
Wrecks, Investigations into, 6466 (iv).
Wrecking Plant, Mar. Provs., &c., 9177 (v).
Penitentiaries :
B.C., To pay W. A. Duncan, 9684 (v).
Dorchester, 480 (i).
Edmonton Jail, 481 (i), 9684 (v).
General, 465 (i).
Salary of W. P. Archibald, Parole Officer, 6721 (iv).
Manitoba, 481 (i), 9684 (v).
Prince Albert Jail, 481 (i).
Regina Jail, 481 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul, 480 (i).
Pensions :
Compensation in Lieu of Land, 6956 (iv).
Fenian Raid, 6956 (iv).
Rebellion of 1885, &c., 6957 (iv).
Post Office :
A. W. Cairns, P. O. Inspector, Salary, 6629 (iv).
Compassionate Allowance to Family of the late P. Callery, 6628 (iv).
Mail Service, 176 (i), 6629 (iv), 9609 (v).
Miscellaneous, 194 (i).
Outside Service, 138, 165 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Capital :
Buildings :
Astronomical Observatory, 9542 (v).
Dom. Archives, 603 (i).
Eastern Building, 9547 (v).
New Block, 9605 (v).
Parlt. Buildings, Additions to Main Block 9542 (v).
Royal Mint, 606 (i).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 754 (i).
Western Deptl. Block, Addition, 765 (i).
Harbours and Rivers :
Ontario :
Port Arthur, &c., Harbour Improvements, 784 (i), 6729, 6900 (iv).
Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements, 815 (i).
Quebec :
Dredge 'J. Israel Tarte,' Explosion, Compensation *re*, 6463 (iv).
Montreal Harbour, St. Mary's Current, 814 (i).
Permanent Piers, Lake St. Peter, &c., 6453 (iv), 9171 (v).
Quebec Harbour Improvements, 770 (i), 6724 (iv).
River St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 2448 (ii).
New Dredge below Quebec, 6436 (iv), 9171 (v).
Transportation Facilities :
Georgian Bay to Montreal, Surveys, 7637 (iv), 9547 (v).
Public Works—Collection of Revenue :
Collection of Slide and Boom Dues, &c., 7629 (iv).
Gatineau River, Use of Booms at Cascades, 7630 (iv).
Land and Cable Lines, Lower St. Lawrence, 7632 (iv).
Repairs and Working Expenses, Harbours, Slides, &c., 7632 (iv).
Telegraph Lines, B.C., 7635 (iv).
N.W.T., 7633 (iv).
P.E.I., 7632 (iv).
Yukon Territory (Ashcroft-Dawson) 7635 (iv).
Telegraph Service Generally, 7636 (iv).
To pay Upper Ottawa Improvement Company, 7629 (iv).
To pay J. C. Taché, 6897 (iv).
Public Works—Income :
Buildings :
British Columbia :
Dom. Buildings, Renewals, &c., 1641 (i), 6735 (iv).
Fernie, Public Building, 1641 (i).
New Westminster, Public Building, 1641 (i).
Vancouver, Public Building, 1642 (i).
Generally :
Armouries, Construction, 1649 (i).
Salaries to Resident Clerks, &c., 1642 (i).
Manitoba :
Brandon Drill Hall, 1633 (i).
Dom. Buildings, Improvements, 1634 (i).
Neepawa, Public Building, 9549 (v).
St. Boniface, Public Building, 9549 (v).
Selkirk, Public Building, 1634 (i).
Virden, Drill Hall, 1634 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Manitoba—*Con.*
Winnipeg, District Military Stores Building, 1635 (i).
Examining Warehouse, 9549 (v).
Immigration Building, 1635 (i), 9550 (v).
Military Buildings, Quarters, 1635 (i).
New Postal Office, 1636 (i).
Postal Station, 9549 (v).
New Brunswick :
Campbellton, Public Building, 1048 (i).
General Vote, 7283 (iv).
Richibucto, Public Building, 6730, 6813 (iv).
St. John, Drill Hall, 1049 (i), 7503 (iv).
Immigration Detention Building, 1050 (i).
Quarantine, Partridge Island, 1052 (i).
Woodstock Armoury, 1057 (i).
Northwest Territories :
Barracks for Strathcona Horse, 1637 (i).
Calgary, Public Buildings, 1638 (i).
Land Titles Office, 1638 (i).
Court Houses, &c., 1638 (i).
Edmonton, Dom. Lands Office, 9550 (v).
Immigrant Building, 9550 (v).
Jail, 1638 (i).
Public Building, 9550 (v).
Lloydminster, Immigrant Building, 6734 (iv).
Medicine Hat, Public Building, 1638 (i).
Moosejaw, Public Building, 1638 (i).
Prince Albert, Public Building, 1638 (i).
Red Deer, Court House, 1639 (i).
Regina, Public Buildings, 1639 (i).
Saskatoon, Public Building, 1640 (i), 9550 (v).
Nova Scotia :
Antigonish, Public Building, 846, 1015 (i).
Canso, Public Building, 1023 (i).
Glace Bay, Public Building, 1034 (i).
Halifax, Dom. Building, 1036 (i).
Immigrant Building, 1036 (i).
New Public Building, 1037 (i).
Inverness, Public Building, 1040 (i).
Shelburne, Public Building, 1043 (i).
Sydney, Public Building, 1044 (i).
Sydney Mines, Public Building, 1045 (i).
Ontario :
Belleville, 1547 (i).
Bowmanville, 1549 (i).
Brantford Drill Hall Addition, 1549 (i).
Bridgeburg, Public Building, 1550 (i).
Chatham Armoury, 1551 (i).
Cobourg Armoury, 1554 (i).
Guelph Armoury, 1555 (i).
Hamilton Drill Hall, 1559 (i).
Hawkesbury, Public Building, 1560 (i).
Kingston Military Barracks, R.C.F.A., 1560 (i).
Military Buildings for Field Battery, 1561 (i).
Military College, Addition to Drill Hall, 1561 (i).
——— Servants' Quarters, 1561 (i).
——— Stable, 1561 (i).
London Drill Hall, 6732 (iv).
Military Magazine, 1562 (i).
New Stores Building, 1562 (i).
Post Office, 1563 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
North Bay, Public Building, 1563 (i).
Orillia, Public Building, 9549 (v).
Oshawa, Public Building, 1564 (i).
Ottawa Deptl. Buildings :
Fittings for Savings Bank Branch, 9549 (v).
Improvements in Main Building, 1565 (i).
New Coal Shed, 1565 (i).
Pavement on Wellington St., 1571 (i).
Post Office Repairs, &c., 1573 (i).
Printing Bureau, Additions, &c., 1575 (i).
Steel Drawers, &c., 1564 (i).
Owen Sound Public Building, 9547 (v).
Peterborough Armoury, 1578 (i).
St. Catharines Drill Hall, 1578 (i).
St. Mary's, Public Building, 1578 (i).
Sandwich, Public Building, 1579 (i).
Simcoe Public Building, 1581 (i).
Stratford Armoury, 1581 (i).
Toronto, Customs House, 1581 (i).
Drill Hall, 1581 (i).
Examining Warehouse, 1583 (i).
Military Buildings, Barracks, 1589 (i).
Post Office, Additions, Pneumatic Plant, 1590 (i).
——— Additional P. O. Station, 1591 (i).
——— Postal Station 'C,' 1592 (i).
Prince Edward Island :
Souris, Public Building, 1047 (i).
Quebec :
Actonvale, Public Building, 1101 (i).
Chicoutimi, Public Building, 1106 (i).
Dom. Buildings, Repairs, &c., 1107 (i).
Grosse Isle, Quarantine Station, 1108 (i), 6734 (iv).
Lachute, Public Building, 1111 (i).
Levis, Public Building, 1112 (i).
Longueuil, Public Building, 1113 (i).
Magog, Public Building, 1114 (i).
Montmagny, Public Building, 1117 (i).
Montreal, Barracks for Permanent Corps, 1118 (i).
Examining Warehouse, 1119 (i).
Inland Revenue Building, Addition, 1119 (i).
Military Buildings, New Stores Building, 1125 (i).
Post Office, Improvements, 1127 (i).
Post Office, Pneumatic Tube System, 1131 (i).
Quebec :
Hospital, 1138 (i), 9547 (v).
Immigrants Buildings, Generally, 1138 (i).
St. Johns Public Building, 1143 (i).
Sherbrooke, Public Building, 1139 (i).
Valleyfield, Public Building, 1143 (i).
Rents, Repairs, &c. :
Dom. Buildings, Caretakers, &c., 1663 (i), 6822 (iv).
Fuel, 6822 (iv).
Furniture, 6817 (iv).
Rents, 6818 (iv).
Ottawa, Dom. Buildings :
Additional Fittings, Treasury Vault, 6825 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Rents, Repairs, &c.—*Con.*
Ottawa, Dom. Buildings—*Con.*
Elevator Attendance, 667 (i), 6816 (iv), 9551 (v).
Fuel, 1670 (i).
Grounds, 6817 (iv).
Heating, Engineers' Salaries, &c., 1667 (i), 6816 (iv).
Lighting, 1667 (i), 6816 (iv).
Major's Hill Park, 6817 (iv).
Post Office Fittings and Supplies, 9551 (v).
Removal of Snow, 6823 (iv).
Rents, 1663 (i).
Repairs, &c., 6815 (iv).
Rideau Hall, including Grounds, 6823 (iv), 9550 (v).
Telephones, 1669 (i), 6814 (iv).
Rents, 1663 (i).
Yukon :
Yukon, Public Buildings, &c., 1666 (i).
Dredging :
British Columbia :
General Vote, 7579 (iv).
To replace Snag Boats, &c., 7578 (iv).
General Dredge Repairs, 6890, 7576 (iv).
Manitoba :
Generally, 7579 (iv).
New Plant :
Generally, 7578 (iv), 9604 (v).
Manitoba, New Tug, &c., 7577 (iv).
Mar. Provs., 6891, 7578 (iv).
Ont. and Quebec, 7577 (iv).
Ont. and Que.:
Generally, 7579 (iv).
P.E.I.:
New Dredge and Scows, 6891, 7576 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers :
British Columbia :
Anderson and Kennedy Lake, Clearing Outlets, 7573 (iv).
Chilliwack, Wharf, 7573 (iv).
Columbia River, General Improvements, 7573 (iv).
Above Revelstoke, Obstructions, 7573 (iv).
Below Revelstoke, Improvements, 7574 (iv).
Improvements above Golden, 7574 (iv).
Improvements below Golden, 7574 7574 (iv).
Fraser River, Ship Channel, 7574 (iv).
Harbours, Rivers, and Bridges, General Improvements, 7575 (iv).
Langley, Protection Works, &c., 7575 (iv).
North Thompson River, 7575 (iv).
Salmon River, Removal of Obstructions, &c., 7575 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, Dredging, &c., 7575 (iv).
Williams' Head, Quarantine Station, 7576 (iv).
Generally, 7576 (iv).
Manitoba :
Lake Dauphin, Lowering, 7569 (iv).
Lake St. Francis Outlet, 7572 (iv).
Quarry Channel at Narrows, Lake Manitoba, 7572 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Manitoba—*Con.*
Selkirk, Wharf Extension, 7573 (iv).
Wharf on Lake Winnipeg at Gimli, 7573 (iv).
White Mud River, Dredging, 7573 (iv).
Winnipegosis, Mossy River Channel, 7573 (iv).
New Brunswick :
Campbellton, Wharf Extension, 1744 (i).
Cape Tormentine, Harbour Improvements, 7497 (iv).
Chance Harbour, Breakwater, 7497 (iv).
Clifton, Breakwater, 7497 (iv).
Dipper Harbour, 7498 (iv), 9588 (v).
Durham Wharf, 7498 (iv).
Great Salmon River, Groyne and Breakwater, 7498 (iv).
Miscou Harbour, Wharf, 7498 (iv).
Mud Cove, Breakwater, 7500 (iv).
Petit Rocher, Breakwater, 7500 (iv).
Pointe du Chêne, Breakwater, 7500 (iv).
Quaco Harbour, Improvements, 7501 (iv).
Richibucto, Pier Extension, 7501 (iv).
River St. John Tributaries, 7501 (iv).
Wharfs, &c., 7502 (iv).
St. John Harbour, 7503 (iv), 9588 (v).
Northwest Territories :
General Repairs, 7573 (iv).
North Saskatchewan River, Surveys, 9602 (v).
Nova Scotia :
Annapolis, Repairs to Queen's Wharf, 9576 (v).
Apple River, Wharf, 1727 (i), 7395 (iv).
Baddeck, Wharf, 7396 (iv), 9585 (v).
Barachois, Boat Harbour, 7396 (iv).
Barrington Passage, Wharf, 9581 (v).
Bass River, Wharf Repairs, 7397 (iv).
Battery Point, Breakwater, 9552 (v).
Bay St. Lawrence, Boat Harbour, 7397 (iv).
Bear Cove, Breakwater, 7397 (iv).
Beckerton, Public Wharf, 7397 (iv).
Boisdale, Wharf, 9585 (v).
Bourgeois Inlet, 9581 (v).
Breton Cove, Boat Landing, 7397 (iv).
Bridgewater, Dredging, 7398 (iv).
Broad Cove Marsh, Wharf Repairs, 7398 (iv).
Carlos Cove, Breakwater, 7398 (iv).
Clark's Harbour, Removal of Rocks, 7398 (iv).
Country Harbour, Improvements, 7398 (iv).
Cow Bay (Port Morien), 7399 (iv).
Cow Bay Run, Breakwater, 7401 (iv).
Culloden, Breakwater, 7401 (iv).
Cunningham's Point, Wharf, 7402 (iv).
Devil's Island, Breakwater, 7402 (iv), 9551 (v).
Digby Pier, Repairs, 7402 (iv).
East Chezzetcook, Breakwater, 7402 (iv).
Economy, Wharf, 9579 (v).
Fort Lawrence, Landing Pier, 6838 (iv).
Freeport, Landing Pier, 7402 (iv).
Frude's Point, Wharf, 9581 (v).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Gabarus, Harbour Improvements, 7402 (iv).
General Vote, 7237 (iv).
Georgeville Wharf, 7402 (iv).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements, 9577 (v).
Habitant River, Wharf, 7402 (iv).
Half Island Cove, Breakwater, 9584 (v).
Harrigan's Cove, Wharf, 7403 (iv).
Indian Harbour, Wharf, 7403 (iv).
Inverness (Broad Cove) Mines Harbour, Repairs, 7403 (iv).
Irish Cove, Wharf, 9578 (v).
Janvrin's Island, Wharf, 7406 (iv).
Jersey Cove (Eel Cove), Wharf, 7407 (iv).
Kelly's Cove, Wharf, 9582 (v).
L'Ardoise, Breakwater Extension, 6838, 7407 (iv).
Larry's Breakwater, 7407 (iv).
Litchfield, Breakwater, 7407 (iv).
Little Brook, Breakwater, 7407 (iv).
Little Judique, Boat Harbour, 7407 (iv).
Lunenburg, Dredging Harbour, 7408 (iv).
Mabou Bridge, Breakwater, 7408 (iv).
Mahone Bay, Dredging, 7408 (iv).
Main-à-Dieu, Breakwater, 7409 (iv).
Malignant Cove, Harbour, 7409 (iv).
Marble Mountain, Wharf, 9580 (v).
Margaree Harbour, Improvements, 7409 (iv).
Margaretsville Harbour, Repairs, &c., 7412 (iv).
Meteghan Cove, Breakwater, 7413 (iv).
Mill Cove, Breakwater, 7413 (iv).
New Campbellton, Ballast Wharf, 7413 (iv).
Newport Landing, Wharf, 7413 (iv).
Noel, Wharf, 7413 (iv).
Ogden's Pond, Channel Protection, 7413 (iv).
Parker's Cove, Breakwater, 9552, 9576 (v).
Parrsboro Harbour, 9578-9 (v).
Pembroke, Breakwater, 7414 (iv).
Phinney's Cove, Breakwater, 9552 (v).
Petit Rivière, Improvements, 9580 (v).
Pleasant Bay, Wharf, 7414 (iv).
Plympton, Breakwater, 7414 (iv).
Poirierville, Landing Pier, 9581 (v).
Porter's Lake, Channel, 9583 (v).
Port Greville, Breakwater, 7414 (iv).
Port Hastings, Wharf, 7414 (iv).
Port Hawkesbury, Wharf, 6837 (iv).
Port Hood, Pier Repairs, 7414 (iv).
Port La Tour, Breakwater, 7415 (iv).
Pugwash, Wharf, 9578 (v).
Ray's Creek, Wharf, 9576 (v).
River Hebert, Wharf, 9578 (v).
Round Hill, Wharf, 9552 (v).
Scott's Bay, Extension Breakwater, 7415 (iv).
Shelburne Harbour, Dredging, 7418 (iv).
Skinner's Cove, Boat Channel, 7418 (iv).
Summerville, Wharf, 7418 (iv).
Sydney Quarantine Station, Wharf, 9578 (v).
Tatamagouche, Wharf, 9579 (v).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Three Fathom Harbour, Protection Works, 7418 (iv).
Toney River, Boat Harbour, 9581 (v).
Victoria Beach, Wharf, 7418 (iv).
Wallace Harbour, Repairs, 7419 (iv).
West Arichat, Wharf, 7419 (iv).
White Head, Wharf, 7419 (iv).
Wolfville Wharf, Reconstruction, &c., 7419 (iv).
Yarmouth Harbour, Protection Works, 7419 (iv).
Ontario :
Amherstburg, Harbour, 7546 (iv).
Barrie, Pier, 9595 (v).
Barry's Bay, Madawaska River, 6873 (iv).
Bayfield, North Pier Extension, 7546 (iv).
Beaverton, Harbour, 7546 (iv).
Blanche River, 7547 (iv).
Blind River, Dredging, 6870 (iv).
Bracebridge Wharf, 7547 (iv).
Bronte, Harbour Improvements, 7547 (iv).
Cobourg, Pier Repairs, 7548 (iv).
Collingwood, Harbour Improvements, 6879, 7548 (iv).
Crowe's Landing, Wharf, 9600 (v).
Depot Harbour, Breakwater, 7552 (iv).
Echo Bay, Wharf, 9598 (v).
Georgian Bay and Point au Baril Route, 6888 (iv).
Goderich Harbour Improvements, 7553 (iv).
Grand Bend, Breakwater, 7553 (iv).
Grand River, Dredging, 6873 (iv).
Haileybury, Wharf, 6887, 7556 (iv).
Hamilton, 7556 (iv).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, General Improvements, 7555 (iv).
Honora Wharf, 6887 (iv), 9597 (v).
Kincardine Harbour, 7558 (iv).
Lake Temiscaming, Wharf, 7559 (iv).
Little Current, Channel Improvements, 6886, 7559 (iv).
Matchedash Bay, Channel Improvements, 7560 (iv).
Meaford Harbour, Improvements, 7560 (iv), 9599 (v).
Midland Harbour, 7560 (iv), 9601 (v).
Newcastle Pier, 7561 (iv).
Oliphant, Wharf, 7561 (iv).
Oshawa, Harbour, 9600 (v).
Ottawa, Wharf at Foot of Rideau Canal 7561 (iv).
Owen Sound, Protection Works, 7561 (iv), 9600 (v).
Dredging, 6886 (iv).
Parry Sound, Wharf, 7562 (iv).
Pembroke, Wharf, 7562 (iv).
Penetanguishene, Dredging, 7563 (iv).
Petewawa Wharf, 7562 (iv).
Point Edward, Dredging, 6869, 7563 (iv).
Port Bruce, Wharf, 7563 (iv).
Port Burwell, Improvements, 7563 (iv)
Port Dover, Improvements, 7564 (iv).
Port Hope, Repairs, &c.. 7564 (iv).
Port Stanley, Harbour Improvements, 7564 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Rama, Wharf, 9602 (v).
River Otonabee, Dredging at Peterborough, 6886, 7564 (iv).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements, 7564 (iv).
Rosseau, Wharf, 9600 (v).
Sarnia, Dredging, 7564 (iv).
Saugeen River, Improvements, 7565 (iv), 9602 (v).
Sault Ste. Marie, 6881 (iv).
Severn River, 9602 (v).
Silverwater, Wharf, 9597 (v).
Spanish River, Dredging, 7565 (iv).
Stokes Bay, Wharf, 9598 (v).
Thessalon Breakwater, 7565 (iv).
Thornbury, Dredging, 7565 (iv).
Toronto Harbour, Eastern Entrance, 7565 (iv).
Extension of Island Breakwater, 7567 (iv).
Trenton, Dredging, 9600 (v).
Whitby Harbour, 6880 (iv).
Wiarton, Dredging, 7569 (iv).
Prince Edward Island :
General Vote, 9585 (v).
Higgin's Shore Pier, Reconstruction, 1734 (i).
McPherson's Cove, Wharf, 1735 (i).
Miminegash Harbour Works, 1735 (i)
New London, Breakwater, 1735 (i).
Point Prim Island, Wharf, 1736 (i).
Repairs to Piers, &c., 1737 (i).
Creosoted Timber, 1737 (i).
Richmond Bay, Grand River Wharf, 1738 (i).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater (South Entrance), 1738 (i).
St. Peter's Bay, Breakwater, 1739 (i).
Summerside Harbour, Breakwater, 1739 (i).
Wood Islands, Breakwater, 1743 (i).
Quebec :
Anse à Beaufils, Pier, 7285 (iv).
Anse aux Gris Fonds, Improvements, 7285 (iv).
Anse à L'Iloi, Pier, 9591 (v).
Anse St. Jean, Pier, 7286 (iv).
Baie des Pères, Wharf, &c., 7287 (iv).
Barachois de Malbaie, Breakwater, 7287 iv).
Belœil Guide Piers, &c., 7287 (iv).
Bic Harbour, Wharf, 7287 (iv).
Canton Fabre, Wharf, 7288 (iv).
Chambord, Wharf, 7289 (iv).
Champlain, Wharf, 7290 (iv).
Château Richer, Harbour Improvements, 7290 (iv).
Desjardins, Allumette Island, Wharf, 7298 (iv).
Disraeli Wharf, 9593 (v)
Doucet Landing, Dredging, 6849, 7298 (iv).
Douglastown, Isolated Block, 9592 (v).
East Templeton, Wharf, 7300 (iv).
English River, Removal of Obstructions, 9591 (v).
Escoumains, Pier, 7303 (iv).
Gatineau Point, Wharf, &c., 7303 (iv).
Grands Méchins, Breakwater, 7303 (iv).
Grande Rivière Beaupré, 9592 (v).
Grondines, Wharf, 9592 (v).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Grosse Isle, Extension Pier, &c., 9608 (v).
Harbours and Rivers, General Repairs, 6868, 7305 (iv).
Lake Megantic, Piers, 9591 (v).
Lake St. Francis, Wharves, 9591 (v).
Lake St. John, Dredging, 7306 (iv).
Laprairie Ice Piers, and Protection Walls, 7306 (iv), 9590 (v).
Lavaltrie, Pile Wharf, &c., 7306 (iv).
Le Tableau, Wharf, &c., 7307 (iv).
Little Pabos, Harbour Improvements, 7307 (iv).
L'Ile d'Alma, Removal of Rocks, 7307 (iv).
Lotbinière, Wharf Improvements, 9592 (v).
Lower St. Lawrence, Removal of Rocks, 7308 (iv).
Magdalen Islands, Breakwater and Piers, 7308 (iv).
Mille Vaches, Landing Pier, 7309 (iv).
Mistook (Deslisle) Wharf, 7310 (iv).
Mont Louis, Wharf, 7310 (iv).
Montmagny, Wharf, 7311 (iv).
Montmorency Falls, Cribwork, &c., 6852, 7311 (iv).
New Carlisle, Wharf, 7312 (iv).
Newport Breakwater, 9592 (v).
Nicolet River, Dredging, &c., 7312 (iv)
Notre Dame du Portage, Wharf, 731 (iv).
Peel Head Bay (Missisquoi Bay), Wharf, 7314 (iv).
Petit Rivière Peribonka, Removal of Snags, 9591 (v).
Percé Wharf, 9592 (v).
Pierreville, Wharf, 6868 (iv).
Portneuf, Wharf, 7314 (iv).
Repentigny, Wharf, 7314 (iv).
Rimouski, Pier Extension, 7320 (iv).
River Batiscan, Dredging, 7322 (iv).
River Chateauguay, Dredging, 6847, 7322 (iv).
Enlargement at Discharge into St. John River, 7322 (iv).
River du Loup, (en haut), Dredging &c., 7325 (iv).
(Fraserville), Harbour, 7323 (iv).
River Lièvre, Dam Reconstruction, &c., 6839, 7325 (iv), 9590 (v).
River Maskinongé, Dredging, 6842, 7325 (iv).
River Ottawa, Wharf at Lièvre River, 7375 (iv).
River Ouelle, Pier, 7325, 7375 (iv).
River Renards, Breakwater, 9592 (v).
River Richelieu, St. Thérèse, Dredging, 7376 (iv).
River Saguenay, Dredging, 7377 (iv).
River St. Louis, Improvements, 7379 (iv).
River St. Louis, Feeders, &c., 7380 (iv).
River St. Maurice, Channel, 7326 (iv).
River St. Maurice, Dam, 7326 (iv).
——— Dredging Eastern Channel, 6851, 7330 (iv).
River Verte, Improvements, 7390 (iv).
Sacre Cœur, Wharf, 7390 (iv).
St. Alexis, Pier, 7390 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
St. Alphonse de Bagotville, 6868 (iv), 9591 (v).
St. André de Kamouraska, Wharf, &c., 7390 (iv).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, Pier, 7390 (iv).
St. Charles Boromée, Wharf, 7390 (iv).
Ste. Famille, Extension Pier, 7390 (iv).
St. Fidèle, Wharf, 7390 (iv).
St. François, Isolated Block Approach, 7391 (iv).
St. François de Sales, Wharf, &c., 7391 (iv).
St. Fulgence, Wharf, 7392 (iv).
St. Gédéon Islands, Wharf, 7392 (iv).
St. Genevieve, Piers, 9592 (v).
St. Jean, Wharf, 7393 (iv), 9592 (v).
St. Siméon, Wharf Extension, 7393 (iv).
Sorel, Ice Piers, 6841 (iv).
Deep Water Wharf, 9593 (v).
Terrebonne, Wharf, &c., 7394 (iv).
Yamaska River, Dredging, 7394 (iv).
Miscellaneous :
Arbitrations and Awards, Payment *re*, 7611 (iv).
Authorized Works, Balances *re*, 7628 (iv).
Cement Testing Laboratory, 7613 (iv).
Chief Architect's Office, Salaries, &c., 7618 (iv).
Chief Engineer's Office, Salaries, &c., 6895 (iv).
Deep Waterways Commission, 6894 (iv).
National Art Gallery, 7618 (iv).
Survey of Head Waters of Ottawa River, 7612 (iv).
Surveys and Inspections, 7611 (iv).
Technical Books of Reference, 7627 (iv).
Telegraph Service, Staff, 7620 (iv).
Temporary Clerical Assistance, &c., 7620, 7626 (iv), 9605 (v).
Transportation Commission, 7627 (iv), 8692 (v).
Roads and Bridges :
Battle River, Bridge at Battleford, 7587 (iv).
Bryson Bridge, 7585 (iv).
Colonization Roads in Man. and N. W. T., 7594 (iv).
Dom. Traffic Bridges, Generally, 7592 (iv).
Ottawa City, Dufferin and Sappers' Bridges, &c., 6889, 7585 (iv).
Ordinary Repairs, &c., 7585 (iv).
Shellmouth Bridge over Assiniboine River, 7591 (iv).
Slides and Booms :
St. Maurice River, 7579 (iv).
Telegraph Lines :
British Columbia :
Kamloops—Lower Nicola, 7610 (iv).
Nanaimo—Parksville, Alberni, &c., 9604 (v).
Vancouver Island—Salt Spring Island Telephone, 7610 (iv).
Mar. Provinces :
Mabou, Cheticamp, &c., to Bay St. Lawrence, 7606 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Telegraph Lines—*Con.*
North-west Territories :
Qu'Appelle, Edmonton and Moosejaw, 6893 (iv), 9604 (v).
Ontario :
Pelee Island and Mainland, 7609 (iv).
Quebec :
Bersimis to Godbout, 7608 (iv).
Descente des Femmes to Sacré-Cœur, 9604 (v).
Grosse Isle, Marconi, 9604 (v).
Yukon :
Ashcroft-Dawson, 9605 (v).
Quarantine :
Cattle Quarantine, 6690 (iv).
Health of Animals, 2309 (ii).
Organized Districts, Salaries, &c., 2301 (ii).
Public Health, &c., 1841 (i).
Public Works Health Act, 1845 (i).
Steamer for Service at Grosse Isle, 1838, (i).
Steamer for Service at William Head, 1841 (i).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 1845 (i).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals, 1846 (i).
Railways and Canals :
Canals :
Beauharnois, Repairs, 6307 (iv).
Chambly :
Denault's Farm, Culvert, 6301 (iv).
Macadamized Road, 9378 (v).
Strengthening Banks, 9378 (v).
Cornwall :
Concreting Apparatus, 6298 (iv).
Enlargement, 1219 (i).
Filling in between old and new Locks, 1494 (i).
Improvements, 9381 (v).
Reducing Shoals West of Cornwall, 6289 (iv).
Farran's Point, Acetylene Gas Plant, 6308 (iv).
Galops, Enlargement, 1220 (i).
Removing Shoals below Lock 28, 9354 (v).
To stop Leak in Bank, 1492 (i).
Galops Rapids, To complete Channel, 1230 (i).
Generally :
Staff and Repairs, 1546 (i).
Sunday Service, 1547 (i).
Grenville, Guide Piers, Greece's Point, &c., 1499 (i), 6305 (iv).
Lachine, Atwater Avenue Bridge, 1240 (i).
Electrical Installation, 1240 (i), 9354 (v).
Enlargement and Improvements, 6294 (iv).
Lock Gates, 6300 (iv).
Machinery for Shops, 1240 (iv).
Paving Mill St., 6301 (iv).
Power House, Flume, 6299 (iv).
Rebuilding Wall, Basin No. 2, 1421 (i).
Rebuilding Wharf below Dock, 1421 (i).
Repairs, 6306 (iv).
Slope Walls, 6294 (iv).
Underpinning Wall, Basin No. 2, 6298 (iv).
Walls, St. Gabriel Basin, 9378 (v).
Widening Tail Race, 6299 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Canals—*Con.*
Murray, To rebuild Piers, &c., 1495 (i).
North Channel, Dam, &c., 1230 (i).
Rapide Plat, Upper Entrance Enlargement, 6289 (iv).
Rideau, Extension, 1333 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie, Construction, 1334, 1406 (i).
St. Ours, New Boom and Pier, 1499 (i).
Wharf, 6302 (iv).
St. Peter's, Dredging, 6303 (iv).
Repairs, 6308 (iv).
Soulanges :
General Repairs, &c., 1421 (i).
Steel Bridge at Power House, &c., 6290 (iv).
Trent :
Construction, 1420, 1471, 1476 (i).
Dams, Surveys *re*, 9376 (iv).
Holland River, Surveys, 9359 (v).
Improvements, 1499 (i).
Lowering Floor of Lock, 6302 (iv).
McLaren's Creek, Road, 9379 (v).
Staff on Dams, 9383 (v).
Survey of Routes, &c., 6291 (iv), 9354 (v).
To complete New Dam, Peterborough, 6303 (iv).
To pay Geo. Matthews Co. Claim, 6303 (iv).
Welland, Electric Light Power Plant, 1231 (i), 9377 (v).
Lowering Head of, Lock No. 1, 6309 (iv).
Port Colborne, Elevator, 1266, 1288 (i).
Improvements at Entrance, 1230 (i).
Removing Obstructions, 1231 (i).
Retaining Wall, Rock Cut, 1499 (i).
Stone Protection to Banks of New Canal, 1496 (i).
Summit Level Deepening, Port Colborne to Thorold, 1232, 1283 (i), 6290 (ii).
To make Survey, 1234 (i).
To pay Stephen Vanderburg, 6305 (iv).
To rebuild bridges, &c., Niagara and Queenston Streets. 1234 (i).
Williamsburg Steam Hoist and Pump, 1494 (i).
Miscellaneous :
Arbitrations and Awards, 1508 (i).
Costs of Litigation, 1521 (i).
Railway Commission, Board of, 1524, 1541 (i).
Railway Statistics, 1521 (i).
Salaries of Engineers, &c., 1521 (i), 9382 (v).
Salaries of Extra Clerks, 1521 (i), 6306 (iv).
School of Ry. Engineering, McGill, Contribution, 9381 (v).
Sunday Work on Canals, 9383 (v).
Surveys and Inspections, Canals, 1509 (i).
Surveys and Inspections, Railways, 1520 (i).
Railways :
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry., Surveys, &c., 2277, 2298 (ii), 6427, 7496 (iv), 9489 (v).
Construction, 9498 (v).
Terminals and Right of Way, 9498 (v).
Intercolonial Railway :
Additional Sidings, Facilities, &c., 1970. (i), 6428, 6431 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Railways—*Con.*
Intercolonial—*Con.*
Amherst, Increased Accommodation, 1983 (i).
Antigonish, Increased Accommodation, 1967 (i).
Belœil and St. Lambert, Double Tracking, 2183 (ii).
Campbellton, Improvements, 1963 (i).
Cape Road Crossing, Elimination, 6432 (iv).
Double Tracking, 1933 (i), 2027 (ii), 9290 (v).
Drummondville, Accommodation, 1960 (i).
General Vote, 2204 (ii), 7445 (iv).
Gratuity to Family, Late C. J. Carter, 2183 (ii).
Halifax, Dredging at Deep Water Terminus, 2026 (ii).
Improving Grades, 1987 (i).
Increased Accommodation, 2031 (ii), 9391, 6429 (iv), 9432 (v).
Indiantown and Blackville, Maintenance, 9482 (v).
Machinery for Shops, 6428 (iv).
Memramcook, Accommodation, 1977 (i).
Mitchell, Diversion of Line, 1940 (i).
Moncton Accommodation, 1946 (i), 9391 (v).
New Castle, Improvements, 1967 (i).
Original Construction, 1912 (i).
Pictou, Increased Accommodation, 9390 (v).
River du Loup, Engine House, 9389 (v).
Rolling Stock, 1986 (i), 2037 (ii), 9482, 9501 (v).
St. Cyrille, Diversion of Public Road, 1969 (i).
St. Fabien, Subway, 1980 (i).
St. Flavie, Increased Accommodation, 9390 (v).
St. John, Increased Accommodation, 9389 (v).
St. Moïse, Station, 1976 (i).
Semaphores at Stations, 1986 (i).
Steel Rails, 1988 (i), 2038 (ii).
Strengthening Bridges, 1912 (i), 9384 (v).
Sydney Accommodation, 1912 (i).
Sydney Mines Extension, 1987 (i)
Truro, Increased Accommodation, 9391 (v).
Water Supply, 2170 (ii).
Working Expenses, 6901 (iv), 9384 (v).
Prince Edward Island Ry.:
Air Brakes, &c., 2178 (ii).
Bloomfield, Agent's House, 6432 (iv).
Branch Line, Cardigan to Montague Bridge, 2171 (ii), 9482 (v).
Branch Line to Vernon River Bridge, 2177 (ii).
Charlottetown, Increased Accommodation, 2024 (ii).
Extension along Water Front, 6433 (v).
Freetown, Agent's House, 2180 (ii).
Georgetown, Increased Accommodation, 2179 (ii), 9486 (v).
Kensington, Increased Accommodation, 2178 (ii).
M. C. B. Couplers, 2178 (ii).
Morrell River Draw Bridge, 2177 (ii).
Murray Harbour Branch, &c., 2038, 2127, 2204 (ii), 8692 (v).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Railways and Canals--*Con.*
Railways—*Con.*
Prince Edward Island Ry.—*Con.*
Summerside, Improvements, 2176 (ii).
Water Service, 2170 (ii).
Working Expenses, 6901 (iv).
Scientific Institutions :
Hydrographic Surveys, 2679 (ii), 6623 (iv), 9172 (v).
Steamer for Atlantic Coast, 9172 (v).
Meteorological Service, 2679 (ii).
Observatory, Salaries, &c., 9248 (v).
Steamboat Inspection :
Inspection of Dom. Steamers, 2695 (ii).
To pay the Widow of Douglas Stevens, Esq., 6628 (iv).
Trade and Commerce :
Administration of Chinese Immigration-tion Act, 981 (i), 7204 (iv).
Bounties on Iron and Steel, &c., 7216 (iv).
Commercial Agencies, &c., 9037 (v).
General Vote, 7218 (iv).
Unprovided Items :
Generally, 6902 (iv).
Concurrence :
Archives, 6918 (iv).
Cattle Quarantine, 6911 (iv).
Civil Govt., Interior Dept., 6909 (iv).
Fenian Raid Pensions, 6961 (iv).
Geological Survey, 9685 (v).
Immigration, Salaries, Can., G.B., &c., 9769 (v).
Militia, Ordnance, Lands, &c., 9689 (v).
National Transcontinental Ry., Surveys, &c., 6910 (iv).
Post Office, Mail Service, 9772 (v).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act (salaries) Amt. B. No. 205 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) Res. prop., 9705 ; in Com. on Res., 9760 ; 1°* of B., 9760 ; 2°* ; in Com., and 3°*, 9796 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 47.)

Supreme Court Bench, N.S., Vacancy, Appnmt., &c., Delay : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6837 (iv).

Supreme Court Judgeship, N.S., Vacancy *re* : Information asked for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5209 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5036 (iii).

Supreme Court Rep., Delay in Printing, Cor , &c. : M. for Copy* (Mr. Monk) 1398 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1341 (i).

Supreme Court Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 125 (i).

Surveys and Inspection *re* Public Works : in Com. of Sup., 7611 (iv).

Surveys, Dom. Lands : in Com. of Sup., 9306 (v).

Sussex Rifle Range, Inspector : Remarks (Mr Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7011 (iv).

Sutherland, Hon. James, Decease of : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5316 (iii).

Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 937 (i).

Sydney Harbour Pilots, Charges *re* Widows and Orphans Fund : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9036 (v).

Sydney, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1912 (i).

Sydney, Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1044

——— Quarantine Station Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).

——— Station, I.C.R., Collections for Freight, &c. : M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Ret., 1767 (i).

Sydney Mines, Extension of I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1987 (i).

——— P. O. : in Com. of Sup., 1045 (i).

Tache, J. C., Special Remuneration *re* Tel. Service : in Com. of Sup., 6897 (iv).

Target Ranges : in Com. of Sup., 445 (i).

'Tampican,' SS., Grounding of : *See* 'Montreal Wharfs.'

Tariff Commission, Expenditure *re* : in Com. of Sup., 9614 (v).

Tariff *re* Freight Rates, Advancement : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1544 (i). *See* 'Rys,' &c.

Tatamagouche Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9579 (v).

Tay Canal, Ref. to in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Haggart) 1301 (i).

Telegraph Lines in Canada, Americanizing of, in Violation of Alien Labour Act (Mr. Monk) to adjn., 7642 (iv).

Telegraph Lines, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 7635 (iv).

——— Mar. Provs. : in Com. of Sup., 7606 (iv).

——— N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6893 (iv).

——— Que. : in Com. of Sup., 9604 (v).

Telegraph Service Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 7620 (iv).

Telephone Grievances, Rep. of Telephone Com. Legislation, &c. : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 9523 (v).

Telephone Systems, Investigation *re* Committee: (Sir William Mulock) 2681, 2841 (ii).

——— M. (Sir William Mulock) to add Names, 4186 (iii).

——— Rep. Govt. Policy *re* : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9687 (v).

——— Translation of Evidence : in Com. of Sup., 9621 (v).

Telephone Lines, Pet. *re* Municipal Control : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 1244 (i).

Telephone Service, Ottawa Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i), 6914 (iv).

Telephones : *See* 'Municipal,' 'Northwest Telphone B. 28.'

Telephone and Telegraph Lines, Govt. Construction, &c.: Ques. withdrn. (Mr. Boyce) 6105 (iv).

——— Govt. Control : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 187 (i).

Temiscamingue, Establishment of Experimental Farm : in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Barr) 6167 (iv).
Temiscaming Lake, Baie des Peres Wharfs : in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).
Terrebonne Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7394 (iv).
Thames River Dredging : Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 6872 (iv).
Thames River, Ice Jam : Remarks (Mr. Clements) 1013 (i).
Thames River, Lake St. Clair, Survey, Completion and Cost : Ques. (Mr. Clements) 590 (i).
Thermograph Records *re* Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 2778 (ii).
—— M. (Mr. Henderson) for Copies, 1767 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 868 (i).
—— Ret. laid on Table (Mr. Fisher) 7016 (iv).
Thessalon Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
Thessalon Postmaster, Appnmt. and Sureties : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 6105 (iv).
—— Dismissal of W. J. B. Dobie : M. for Cor. (Mr. Boyce) 3202 (ii).
—— Irregularities, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Boyce) on M. for Sup., 6192 (iv).
—— Papers laid on Table (Sir William Mulock) 6232 (iv).
—— Further Papers laid on Table (Sir William Mulock) 6646 (iv).
—— Salary Warrants Issued : Inquiry for (Mr. Boyce) 6239 (iv).
—— M. to reduce Salary (Mr. Foster) 9772 (v).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Thompson, Capt. Thos., Preventive Officer at Port Bruce, Dismissal, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 1763 (i).
Thornbury Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
Thousand Islands Park, Construction of Wharves, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9335 (v).
Three Fathom Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Three Rivers, Additional Judge : in Com. of Sup., 9682 (v).
Three Rivers, Gas and Electric Light Inspection : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1760 (i).
Three Rivers, St. Maurice, Maskinonge and Champlain incorp. B. No. 57 (Mr. Bureau) 1°*, 986 ; 2°*, 1101 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 167.)
Tidal Service, Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).
Ties, &c., I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 6429 (iv).
Tignish Breakwater, Tenders *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 7018 (iv).
Timagami Ry. Co.'s B. No. 91 (Mr. McCool) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 3135 ; 3° m., 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 161.)
Timber on Indian Lands, Procedure *re* Sale of : Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 9280 (v).
Timber Lands, Sale or Lease of, since 1896, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 9698 (v).
Timber Limits, Sale in N.W.T. and Man., Advertisements *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7097 (iv).
Time Table, I.C.R., Changes and Delays : on M. for Sup., 6827-9 (iv).
—— Printing in English and French : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 6827 (iv).
Tison, B. Aimé, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 6475 (iv).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. No. 99 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 2108 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com., 3651 (ii) ; 4680 ; 3° m., 4964 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 162.)
Tobacco and Cigars imported from U. S., Duties paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5687 (iii).
Tobacco Industry, Inspection *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1681 (i).
Todd, James, Dismissal from Burritt's Rapids Locks : Ques. (Mr. Reid) 8384 (v).
Toney River, N.S., Boat Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).
Toronto Centre, Electoral District, Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 4370 (iii).
—— Issue of Writ, Registration, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2777, 3251 (ii).
—— Issue of Writ : Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3362 (ii).
—— notification (Mr. Speaker) 2841 (ii).
Toronto Customs House, Alterations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1581 (i).
Toronto Drill Hall, Additional Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 1582 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Macdonnell) in Com. of Sup., 1657 (i).
Toronto Examining Warehouse, Addition to : in Com. of Sup., 1583 (i).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s B. No. 48 (Mr. Calvert) 1°m., 817 ; 2°*, 909 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1541 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 163.)
—— B. No. 110 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 164.)
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. No. 79 (Mr. Zimmerman) 1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; in Com., 4259 · 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 165.)
Toronto Harbour, Eastern Entrance : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
—— Expenditure from 1880 to 1904 : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 403 (i).
—— Fog Horns, Nuisance *re* Testing : Remarks (Mr. Kemp) 9281 ; Cor., &c. (read) 9282 (v).
—— Fog Signals, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).

Toronto, Island Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7567 (iv).
——— Straightening of Don River : Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. of Sup., 6888 (iv).
——— Tender *re* Breakwater at Eastern Gap : Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1761 (i).
Toronto Meteorological Building, Erection of : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1149 (i).
Toronto Military Buildings, Barracks, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1589 (i).
Toronto Pneumatic Postal Service, Contract *re* : Remarks (Mr. Hyman) 5921 (iii).
——— Contract *re* Trench (Mr. Foster) 5922 (iii).
——— Plant, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
——— Pneumatic Service : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5807 (iii).
Toronto Postal Station 'C' Quarters : in Com. of Sup., 1592 (i).
——— remarks (Sir William Mulock) 1584 (i).
Toronto Post Office, Additional Postal Station : in Com. of Sup., 1591 (i).
——— Erection of a new Building : Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for Sup., 6833 (iv).
Toronto Trades and Labour Council, Memo. *re* Immigration in G.B.: Read (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 9309 (v).
Tracadie Lazaretto, Quarantine : in Com. of Sup., 1845 (i).
Trachoma Hospital, Halifax, Disposal of to Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2303 (ii).
Trachoma Hospitals in Quebec : in Com. of Sup., 1138 (i).
TRADE AND COMMERCE :
Annapolis Basin SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 966 (i).
Annapolis and G. B. SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
Annapolis and London Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 9622 (v).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 892 (i).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Baddeck and East Bay SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 934 (i).
Campbellton and Gaspé Basin Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 9616 (v).
Canada and France SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7094 (iv).
Canada and G. B. Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 864 (i).
Canada and Mexico Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 891, 1560 (i), 9622, 9680 (v).
Canada and Mexico SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., conc., 6909 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 66 (i).
Canada and New Zealand SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 7094 (iv).
Canada and S. Africa SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).
TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*
Commercial Agencies in Can., Location, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Martin) 403 (i).
Commercial Agencies : in Com. of Sup., 7208 (iv).
——— Letter *re* Mr. Jackson's ability (read) in Com. of Sup., 7210 (iv).
Davie, Geo. T., Co., Wrecking Plant *re* Ship Channel : Remarks (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. of Sup., 2479 (ii).
Furness, Withy & Co., Contract *re* S. African Trade : in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).
Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 934 (i).
Grain Survey Boards, Pets., Memorials, &c., *re* : M. (Mr. Ames) for Copies, 1763 (i).
Grand Manan and Mainland, SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 922 (i).
G. B. and Canada Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 864 (i).
Halifax and Canso SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 937 (i).
Halifax and Newfoundland SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 906 (i).
Halifax, St. John's Nfld. and Liverpool Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 902 (i).
Halifax and W. Indies SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 7087 (iv).
'King Edward' and 'St. Lawrence' Strs. SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
Magdalen Island SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 906 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c., Information *re* System, Utility, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 923 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 864, 919, 932 (i), 6901, 7176 (iv), 8691, 9616, 9680 (v).
——— conc., 6909, 7087 (iv).
Mexico Steamers, Subsidy *re* : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1560 (i).
Montreal and G.B., St. John and Manchester, SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 932 (i).
Murray Bay and Rivière Ouelle SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 938 (i).
Paspebiac and Gaspé Basin SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 944 (i).
Petit de Grat SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 966 (i).
Pictou and Cheticamp SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 935 (i).
Pictou and Montague Bridge SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 926 (i).
Port Essington, B.C., and Queen Charlotte Islands Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 9616 (v).
Port Mulgrave and Bras d'Or Lakes SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 934 (i).
Port Mulgrave and Canso SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 935 (i).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*
P.E.I. and G.B. SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 7088 (iv).
——— Claims of SS. Cos.: in Com. of Sup., 927 (i).
——— Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7088 (iv).
P.E.I. and Mainland SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 919 (i).
P.E.I. and Newfoundland SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 940 (i), 7092 (iv).
Quebec and Blanc Sablon SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 937 (i), 9617 (v).
Quebec and Gaspé Basin SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 926 (i).
Quebec and Natashquan SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 948 (i).
St. François and Quebec SS. Subsidy, Requests *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1504 (i).
St. John and Digby SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 904, 966 (i).
——— Res. from Moncton Board of Trade : Read (Mr. Daniel) 904 (i).
St. John, N.B., Dublin, Belfast Winter Service : in Com. of Sup., 902 (i).
St. John, Halifax and London SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 903 (i), 7087 (iv).
——— Memorial from Board of Trade, St. John : Read (Mr. Daniel) 903 (i).
St. John, Halifax and W. Indies Mail Subsidies : in Com. of Sup., 7176 (iv).
——— Res. from Montreal Corn Exchange : Read (Mr. Ames) 7178 (iv).
St. John and Halifax via Yarmouth SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 923 (i), 6901 (iv).
St. John and Minas Basin SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 926, 971 (i)
St. John River, Mail Subsidy paid to Star Line : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 181 (i).
St. John and St. Martins, N.B., Mail Contract : Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2776 (ii).
St. John and W. Indies and S. America, Mail Subsidies : in Com. of Sup., 8691 (v).
St. John and Westport SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 966 (i).
St. Stephen and Black Bay SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 936 (i).
S. Africa and Canada SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).
Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 937 (i).
Trade and Commerce, Salaries, Deptl. Contingencies, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 96 (i), 9034 (v).
Victoria and San Francisco SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 906 (i).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*
Victoria, Vancouver and Skagway SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 7091 (iv).
Victoria and Vancouver SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 938 (i).
Wrecking Plant, B.C., Subsidies to : in Com. of Sup., 9177 (v).
Wrecking Plant, 'Lord Strathcona' Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 957 (i).
Wrecking Plant, St. Lawrence : in Com. of Sup., 7094 (iv).
Trade and Navigation, Deptl. Rep. : Presented (Mr. Paterson) 50, 321 (i).
Trading Stamps, Abolition of, Legislation *re* : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7684 (iv).
——— Res. *re* Abolition of : Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 6903 (iv).
——— Legislation *re*, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7020 (iv).
——— Legislation *re* Suppression : Ques (Mr. Stockton) 5425 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) 5134 (iii).
See 'Criminal Code B. 196.'
Traffic Arrangements I.C.R. with Foreign and Can. Rys., Amounts received : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4703 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 1915 (i).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2228 (ii).
Train Service, I.C.R., Stalled by Snowstorms, Tel.: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 695 (i).
——— Explanation (Mr. Emmerson) 726 (i).
Trans-Canada Ry. Co., Claims for Surveys along G. T. Route : Remarks (Mr. O. E. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 9494 (v).
Transcontinental Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7916 (iv).
Transcontinental Railway Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 6427 (iv) ; conc., 6910 (iv).
Transcontinental Ry. : *See* 'G. T. Pacific,' &c.
Transportation Commission : in Com. of Sup., 7627 (iv).
——— Appnmt. of Chairman : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 404 ; Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 492 (i).
——— Complete Membership and Reps. *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 321 (i).
——— Constitution and Progress, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9679, 9687 (v).
——— Expenditure : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 8692 (v).
——— Interim Rep. *re* St. John Harbour : Inquiry for (Mr. Daniel) 2595 (ii).
——— Preliminary Rep : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 731 (i).
——— Rep. of Mr. Bertram : Read (Mr. Emmerson) 1288 (i).
——— Rep. *re* C. A. Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. on B. 45, 4225 (iii).

Transportation Commission: Progress *re* Works, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6438 (iv).
See 'Waterways,' &c.
Transportation Facilities, Georgian Bay Survey : in Com. of Sup., 7637 iv).
——— I.C.R., *re* Fish Trade, Mar. Provs.: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) 1930 (i).
Transportation Problem *re* Waterways : in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1288 (i).
——— and Wharf Building : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Travelling Expenses, Inspectors of Weights and Measures : in Com. of Sup., 1695 (i).
Treadgold Concessions, Instruction to Commissioners : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7101 (iv).
——— Rep. of Judge Britton : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 821 (i).
Tree Culture and Forest Protection, Man., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9297 (v).
Trelawney, Agnes Hedevig Helga Salusbury, Relief B. No. 198 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 9278 ; 2°*, 9587 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9760 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 166.)
Trent Valley Canal, Claims for Damages, Mr. Jas. Clark, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Ward) for Copy, 1395 (i).
Trent Canal, Construction, 1420 (i).
——— Dismissal of J. Ritchiel, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Foster) 2777 (ii).
——— Incomplete Return : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4750 (iii).
See 'Canals,' &c.
——— Geo. Matthews Co., Claim *re* Damages by Flood : in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).
——— Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1499 (i).
——— Lowering Floor of Lock : in Com. of Sup., 6302 (iv).
——— McLaren's Creek Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 9379 (v).
——— Peterborough Dam : in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).
——— Ref. to in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Lennox) 1311 (i).
——— Staff on Dams, Taken by Dom. Govt.: in Com. of Sup., 9383 (v).
——— Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 1471, 1476 (i).
——— Letter from Sir Wilfrid Laurier to Mr. Aylesworth : Read (Mr. Ward) 1476 (i).
——— Surveys, Completion : in Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv), 9354 (v).
——— Surveys of Dams taken by Dom.: in Com. of Sup., 9376 (v).
——— Surveys, Rice Lake, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 153 (i).
Trenton, Dredging Trent River : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).
Truro, Dining Room, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 2255 (ii).
Truro, Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 9391 (v).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of : prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1351 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Perley) for Special Com., 8636 (v).
——— Rep. of Joint Com.: Presented (Mr. Perley) 9392 (v).
——— M. (Mr. Perley) to conc., 9522 (v).
Tuberculosis Grant : in Com. of Sup., 7248 (iv).
Turner, Mrs. J., Gratuity to : in Com. of Sup., 6435 (iv).
Turriff, J. G., Employment by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8266 (v).
Underwood Typewriter Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 146 (Mr. Grant) 1°*, 4644 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii); in Com., and 3° m., 6383 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 169.)
——— Patent No. 69772 Relief B. No. 146 (Mr. Grant) 1°*, 4644; 2°*, 4977; in Com., and 3°*, 6383 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 168.)
Uniforms for Customs Officers : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 413 (i).
——— for Letter Carriers, Contracts *re* : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 206 (i).
——— Militia, Regulations *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 438 (i).
Union Labour Labels B. No. 10 (Mr. Smith, B. C.) in Com. on Res., 272 ; 1°*, 279 ; 2°*, 601; in Com., 918, 1770 ; 3°, 1780 (i).
U.S. Tariff Drawbacks on Raw Materials, &c.: M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 746 (i).
Unprovided Items : in Com. of Sup., 6902 (iv).
Upper Ottawa Improvement Company : in Com. of Sup., 7629 (iv).
Valleyfield Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1144 (i).
Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 131 (Mr. Macpherson) 1°*, 4081 ; 2°*, 4414 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 171.)
Vancouver Dry Dock : Personal Explanation (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 1317 (i).
Vancouver Island and Salt Spring, Telephone Line : in Com. of Sup., 7610 (v).
Vancouver Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1642 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. No. 139 (Mr. D. Ross) M. to receive Pet., 3743 ; 1°*, 4550 ; 2° m., 4700 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii) ; in Com., 8315, 8637 ; 3° m., 8818, 9040 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 172.)
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. No. 42 (Mr. Macpherson) 1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1541 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 173,)
Vanderburg, Stephen, Claims *re* Injuries on Welland Canal : in Com. of Sup., 6305 (iv).

Vats for dipping Quarantined Cattle, N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) in Com. of Sup., 2312 (ii).
Vegetables, Canned, Preserved, &c., Value of Imports : M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Monk) 279 (i).
Venning, R. N., Honorarium to : in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).
Ventilation in the House of Commons : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7812 (iv), 8695 (v).
Verdun, Damage by Floods, Cor. from Board of Trade, Montreal : M. for Copies (Mr. Monk) 457 (i).
Vernon River Bridge Branch Line, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 2177 (ii).
See 'I.C.R.—P.E.I. Ry.', &c.
Vessels, List of : Rep. Presented (Mr. Préfontaine) 6907 (iv).
Veterans of 1886 and 1870, Grants of Lands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6047 (iv).
Veterinary Inspectors employed by Govt., *re* Hog., &c., Diseases : Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1933 (i).
Vibert, Philip, Relief B. No. 172 (Mr. Zimmerman) 1°*, 7095 ; on Order for 2°, 7218 ; 2° m., 7261 ; in Com., and 3°*, 7624 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 174.)
Victoria Beach Wharf ; in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Victoria Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
Victoria Harbour Mail Contracts : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2191 (ii).
Victoria and San Francisco SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 906 (i).
Victoria and Vancouver SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 938 (i).
Victoria, Vancouver and Skagway SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 7091 (iv).
Virden Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1634 (i).
'Virginian,' SS. and Landing of Mails at Sydney : *See* 'Post Office,' &c.
Voters' Lists, Algoma, East and West, Revision, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 594 (i).
Voters' Lists *re* Edmonton Election, Preparation of : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).
Voters' Lists Electoral Atlas : in Com. of Sup., 6722 (iv).
Voters' Lists for Macdonald, &c. : M. for Copy* (Mr. Staples) 697 (i).
Voters' Lists for Man., Printing, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 60 (i).
Voters' Lists for Unorganized Ters., Cor. *re* Instructions, &c. : M. (Mr. Boyce) for Copies*, 1397 (i).
Voters' Lists in N. W. Ters., used in Dom. Elections, 1905 : M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 601 (i).
Voters' Lists, Printing, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6897, 6954 (iv).
Voting in Ottawa Provincial Elections : Personal Explanaion (Mr. Logan) 562 (i).
Walkerton and Lucknow Ry. Co.'s B. No. 25 (Mr. McKenzie, Bruce) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1101 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 175.)
Wallace Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Walsh, Maj. John, Superannuation, and Appnmt. of Mr. Binks : Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 8146 (v).
Walton, Mr. R. M., Arrest by U. S. Authorities in the South : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4199 (iii).
Water Meters, Inspection B. No. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) Res. prop., 8385 ; in Com. on Res., 8674 ; 1°* of B., 8676 ; 2°*, 9409 ; in Com., 9409 ; 3°*, 9524 ; Sen. Amts., 9816 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 48.)
Water Rights Reservations, N.W.T., Rep. of Mr. Burley, &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1398 (i).
Waterways and Transportation Problem : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1288 (i).
See 'Transportation,' &c.
Watson, Mr., Customs Collector, Collingwood, Superannuation, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 408 (i).
Waverley Postmaster,, Duties and Residence &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5427 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5807 (iii).
Ways and Means : M. for Com. (Mr. Paterson) 50 (i).
——— M. for Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6966 (iv).
Ways and Means—The Budget, Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 8888 (v).
——— Resolutions moved, 8914 (v).
Weights and Measures Inspectors . in Com. of Sup., 1692 (i).
Weights and Measures Standards : in Com. of Sup., 1695 (i).
Welland Canal, Deepening, Expenditure, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 588 (i).
——— Deepening Long Level : in Com. of Sup., 6290 (iv).
——— Deepening Summit Level at Port Colborne, 1263 (i).
——— Electric Power Plant : in Com. of Sup., 1231 (i), 9377 (v).
——— Employees during Oct., Nov. : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 453 (i).
——— Emplymt. of Labour, Political Influence : Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 6855 (iv).
——— Lowering Head of Lock No. 1 : in Com. of Sup., 6309 (iv).
——— Port Colborne : in Com. of Sup., 1263 (i).
——— Port Colborne Elevator : in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1288 (i).

Welland Canal, Removal of Obstructions : in Com. of Sup., 1231 (i).
——— Removal of Piers and Bridge Building : in Com. of Sup., 1234 (i).
——— Stone Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 1496 (i).
——— Survey : in Com. of Sup., 1234 (i).
——— Surveys : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1520 (i).
——— Water Power Leases, Names, Quantity, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. German) 2097 (ii).
Wellington Street Pavement : in Com. of Sup., 1571 (i).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. No. 135 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 4555 ; 2°*, 4700 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 176.)
Western Deptl. Block, Addition to : in Com. of Sup., 766 (i).
Western Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 108 (Mr. Adamson) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., 4684 ; 3°*, 4700 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 74.)
Westinghouse Brakes, P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 2178 (ii).
Wharf Building, Policy of Govt. : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1727 (i).
Wharfs in N.S., Expenditure *re* : Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 2611 (ii).
Wharfs. Piers, Docks, constructed by Govt. since 1896 : M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2777 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 8178 (v).
Wharfs in Tidal Waters : in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).
Wheatley River Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. James Power, Cor., &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 9698 (v).
See 'Post Office.'
Whitby Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6880 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Christie) 2190 (ii).
White Head Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
White Lead : in Com. on Ways and Means, 8983 (v).
——— Amt. *re* Customs Act : in Com. on Bill, 9761 (v).
White, Mr. O., Dismissal, &c. : M. for Cor. *re* (Mr. Crocket) 193 (i).
——— Dismissal as Station Agent, I.C.R. : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 107 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 2205 ; Cor. (read) 2206 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 2235 (ii).
White Mud River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Wiarton Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7569 (iv).
Williamsburg and Cornwall Canals, Water Power Leases, Dates, Rentals, Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 4809 (iii).
Williamsburg Canal, Steam Hoist : in Com. of Sup., 1494 (i).
William's Head Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 1841 (i), 7576 (iv).
Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s incorp. B. No. 101 (Mr. Costigan) 1°*, 2108 ; 2°*, 2297 (ii).
Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s B., Cor., &c., *re* : M. for Copies* (Mr. Costigan) 9697 (v).
Wines, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 8983 (v).
Wines, Preferential Tariff : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Customs Bill, 9762 (v).
Winnipeg, Customs Examining Warehouse : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
——— Hospitals : in Com. of Sup., 1846 (i).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 2318 (ii).
Winnipeg, Immigration Building : in Com. of Sup., 1635 (i), 9550 (v).
——— Military Buildings, N.C.O. Quarters : in Com. of Sup., 1635 (i).
——— Postal Station : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
——— Post Office, Land and Building : in Com. of Sup., 1636 (i).
Winnipegosis Channel Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Winter Communication, P.E.I. and Mainland : Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 6643 (iv).
Winter Mail Service, P.E.I., Ice Boat : in Com. of Sup., 2648 (ii).
——— Cor. Read (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2649 ; Res. from P.E.I. Delegates : Read (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2651 (ii).
——— Statement of Trips of Ice Boats : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2675 (ii).
Winter Mail Service : in Com. of Sup., 6467 (iv).
See 'P.E.I.', &c.
Wire Fencing, Inspection by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 585, 685 (i).
Wire Fencing *re* N.W.T., Boundary Line, Contract *re* Erection : M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., Cor., read, &c., 5578 (iii).
See 'N. W. T. Boundary,' &c.
Wireless Telegraphy Regulation B. No. 186 (Mr. Préfontaine) 1° m., 8177 ; 2°*, 9031 ; in Com., 9031 ; 3°*, 9032 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 49.)
Wolfville Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Woodill, Seymour, Emplymt. on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 2191 (ii).
Wood Island, Protection to Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1743 (i).
Wood, Major Z. T., Additional Living Allowance *re* Yukon : in Com. of Sup., 9250 (v).

Woodstock Armoury, N.B., Ownership of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 4920 (iii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 1057 (i).
Woodstock and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 80 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 1°*, 1671; 2°*, 1758 (i).
Woodstock Rifle Range, Purchase of Land: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 5132 (iii).
Working Expenses, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 6907 (iv), 9384 (v).
Worthington, Mr., M.P., Disqualification for H. of C., as Medical Officer of Militia: Remarks and Cor. read (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9149 (v).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Wrecks, Investigation *re*, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6466 (iv).
Wrecking Plant, B.C., Subsidies to: in Com. of Sup., 9177 (v).
Wrecking Plant *re* Life-Saving Stations: in Com. of Sup., 2624 (ii).
Wrecking Plant, 'Lord Strathcona,' Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 957 (i).
Wrecking Plant *re* St. Lawrence Channel: in Com. of Sup., 2476 (ii), 7094 (iv).
Wright Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1846 (i).
—— Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 98 (i).
'W. S. Fielding,' Completion, &c., of New Dredge: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 6891 (iv).
Yamaska Lock: in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
Yamaska River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7394 (iv).
Yarmouth Bank of N.S., Investigation, Punishment of Offenders: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9690 (v).
Yarmouth Harbour Retaining Walls: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Year-Book: in Com. of Sup., 1474 (i).
—— Statistics, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. on B. 5, 997 (i).
'Yellow Dog,' Attack on Orangemen by Quebec Newspapers: Ref. to in Com. on B. 69, 8350 (v).
See 'Autonomy,' &c.
Yoho Park Reserve, N.W.T.,: in Com. of Sup., 7719 (iv).
Yonge Street Bridge, Toronto, Order *re* Construction, Tel. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 586 (i).
Young, Thos., and G. C. McNab, Dom. Officials and Political Organizers: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9154 (v).
Yukon Ter., Annexation to Provs., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Thompson) 6509 (iv).
Yukon-Ashcroft-Dawson Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 7635 (iv), 9605 (v).
Yukon, Buildings, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i).
—— Commissionership, Vacancy *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5036 (iii).
—— Court Fees: In Com. of Sup., 137 (i).
—— Customs, Living Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).
—— Elections for Dom., Delay in opening Ballot Boxes: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 987 (i).
—— Election, Cor. *re* Returning Officer: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1254 (i).
—— information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1152 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 453 (i).
—— return of Member Elect: Telegrams read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1066 (i).
Yukon Govt. Administration, Living Allowance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 126 (i), 7716 (iv).
—— Grant to Local Council: in Com. of Sup., 7718 (iv), 9250 (v).
—— Judge's Allowances: in Com. of Sup., 126 (i).
—— Law Books: in Com. of Sup., 136 (i).
—— Legal Adviser, Appnmt. of Mr. Congdon, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 7020 (iv).
Yukon Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 203 (i).
Yukon, Orders-in-Council, Regulations, &c., Approval of, &c.: prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 9725 9784 (v).
—— Ordinances: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 54 (i).
—— Post Office Officials, Salaries, Living Allowances, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).
—— Prisoners, Maintenance of: in Com. of Sup., 135 (i).
—— Reforms *re* Government, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Thompson) on M. for Sup., 7021 (iv).
—— Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 6896 (iv).
—— Territorial District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2322 (ii).
—— Witnesses Fees, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 135 (i).